

B.U. Kuspangaliyev¹, K.I. Samoilo¹, O.N. Priemets^{2*}

¹Satbayev University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²International Education Corporation, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Information about authors:

Kuspangaliyev Bolat Uraykhanovich – doctor of Science (Architecture), Professor, Academician, Director of the Institute of Architecture and Construction named after T.Basenov, Satbayev University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1821-7139>, email: kazmaam@mail.ru

Samoilov Konstantin Ivanovich – doctor of Science (Architecture), Professor, Department of Architecture, Satbayev University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2310-8367>, email: samconiv@mail.ru

Priemets Oxana Nikolaevna – candidate of Science (Architecture), Professor Assistant, Faculty of Architecture, International Education Corporation (KazGASA campus), Almaty, Kazakhstan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4869-3718>, email: oksana.priemets@mail.ru

ARCHITECTURE OF KAZAKHSTAN ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROSPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT

Abstract. *The history of the past thirty years of Kazakhstan's development has been vividly reflected in its architecture. Kazakhstan's acquisition of state independence has defined a new, very peculiar stage in the development of domestic architecture. The architecture of Kazakhstan has become an essential component of the world architectural process, and the architectural school formed in the middle of the last century has ensured the constant reproduction of specialists who are in demand and successfully work in many countries of the world in the current century.*

Keywords: *architecture of Kazakhstan, shaping, styles, innovation, sustainable development.*

Introduction

The architecture of Kazakhstan is a peculiar phenomenon. Geographically located in the center of the Eurasian continent, the territory of the Republic and its multi-ethnic population have repeatedly been involved in major political conflicts and economic cataclysms over the centuries, alternating with periods of relatively stable development. This was naturally reflected in the formation of the life environment. Moreover, each time this process was adjusted taking into account the factors of natural-climatic and engineering-geological conditions of a particular part of the territory having a different degree of stability, the availability of local or delivered construction materials, the level of development of productive forces, the specifics of economic activity, the way of life and worldview of local residents with different periods of residence in a given area, as well as the administrative-territorial division of emerging and disintegrating state entities. That is, the factors determining the originality of architecture came into force.

A special place in the development of architecture in Kazakhstan is occupied by the twentieth century, when, unlike previous eras, multidirectional social collisions, in a historically short period, replacing each other, were accompanied by ab-

rupt changes in the way of life and ideology at the state and household level, combined with a sublimated growth of development of territories incomparable with previous centuries, both in the zones of established settlements and in newly developed areas. A distinctive feature, in the historical aspect, was that these processes took place with the state borders unchanged for most of the century. The social processes of the last quarter of the twentieth century were characterized by the gradual crystallization of the dominance of the global-territorial cultural-regional Eurasian phenomenon, where the presence of sufficiently striking sub-regional features sublimates the development of regional cultural ties.

Socio-economic trends of the 1980s led to major political changes in the country in the early 1990s. In Kazakhstan, on October 25, 1990, the Supreme Council of the Republic adopted the “Declaration on State Sovereignty of the Kazakh SSR”. The Kazakh SSR was renamed the Republic of Kazakhstan, and on December 16, 1991, the Constitutional Law “On the State Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan” was adopted. On December 10, 1997, the capital of the state was moved to Nur-Sultan city, where the construction of buildings for various purposes began to develop at an accelerating pace. The relocation of the country's capital gave a significant impetus to the development of architecture. The massive reconstruction of buildings and structures at the end of the XX century and intensive new construction at the beginning of the XXI century radically changed the appearance of this city. A peculiar interpretation of the established trends in the development of architectural and artistic forms, new features and interesting approaches to solving figurative problems in the architecture of Kazakhstan, manifested by original examples, being implemented in the capital, have a strong influence on the creative search of architects and aesthetic preferences of customers, reflected in the construction of other cities. For example, the city of Atyrau received a new impetus for construction in connection with the development of oil fields on the Caspian shelf. The city of Turkestan began to be built up intensively, which acquired the status of a regional center. The pace of construction is gradually increasing in other cities of the Republic.

Materials and methods

The peculiar political and economic situation of the turn of the century in Kazakhstan caused a certain slowdown in the previously rather high rates of mass construction of housing and public buildings.

Naturally, these processes of development of architecture in Kazakhstan have attracted the attention of researchers, in whose works, including at the dissertation level, both the architectural process itself and its individual components are understood. Thus, the analysis of the results of the development of housing architecture in Kazakhstan by the beginning of the current century was summed up by B.Kuspangaliyev [1]; the work of A.Abilov is devoted to the comprehension of urban planning features [2]. E.Duisebai [3] considered the possibilities of adaptation of public buildings, taking into account the dynamics of socio-economic development. The features of architectural and artistic aspects of shaping, especially at the turn of the century, were demonstrated by K.Samoilov [4]. Z.Popova [5] emphasized a number

of parameters of the development of cult architecture. A large number of scientific papers appeared at the end of the first decade of this century. The specifics of regionalism were demonstrated by G.Abdrasilova [6]. The work of N.Kozbagarova [7] is devoted to the development of landscape architecture. S.Aldungarova [8] and A.Hamedov [9] examined the stylistic features of the development of domestic architecture. Clearly manifested national features of architecture are considered by D.Toyshubekov [10]. The most important feature of the national form is the ornament, the specificity of which is demonstrated by O.Priemets [11]. By the end of the second decade, works appeared concerning the peculiarities of the work of design firms – D.Kuzenbayev, G.Sadvokasova, K.Samoilov [12]; as well as innovative trends in the development of architecture – O.Priemets, K.Samoilov, I.Zayats, J.Kenesarina, E.Usembayeva [13].

The process of property redistribution that has begun (especially in the real estate sector) has led to the emergence of numerous private and corporate customers who have not only different financial capabilities, but also different views on the solution of space-planning, material-structural and compositional-plastic tasks. Often, this customer is well acquainted with the domestic and world practice of building the type of buildings he is interested in, has personal impressions and ideas of interpretation formed on their basis, and mainly – combining elements to obtain the desired result. And most importantly, the customer began to have the economic opportunity to “dictate” his vision to specialists in almost all sections and at all stages of design, as well as during construction. The “justification” for this is that the customer bears almost the entire burden of financial risks and the natural desire in such conditions to control the accuracy of the implementation of their plans, or, in exceptional cases, to take into account often – technical, sometimes – legal, rarely – economic and never – creative justifications for their adjustment.

The peculiarity lies in the fact that such a customer, who has predominantly universal thinking and is very far from the reverence for mythologized creativity that once dominated the worldview, is essentially indifferent to the means of implementing the plan and the personal and professional problems of specialists. The criterion for the tender selection of performers is a predictable, with a certain degree of accuracy, harmonious combination of costs and the resulting quality of the product, which must also have a sufficient probability of liquidity based on the possibility of partial or complete reinterpretation, depending on the changed needs. Appropriate, albeit somewhat paradoxical, models of new approaches to design appear, assuming initial consideration of possible reconstructions [3]. On the other hand, this “new” (in the sense that it has not been for more than three quarters of a century) customer is quite malleable to conduct various material and structural and especially architectural and artistic experiments, which opens the way for very interesting works. However, some of them are blamed in professional circles for creative permissiveness and excesses. As examples: The “Apple Town” Complex, Almaty (arch. B.Kuspangaliyev); The “Highvill” Complex, Nur-Sultan (arch. B.Kuspangaliyev); The Olympic Village, Almaty (arch. Sh.Yusupov); The “Legend” Complex, Almaty (arch. “Basis-A”); The “Europolis” complex, Almaty (arch. K.Samoilov); The “Baysanat” complex, Nur-

Sultan; The Regional Kazakh Drama Theater named after I.Omarov, Kostanay (arch. V.Toskin, V.Toskina, V.Yarotsky); The “Rixos Hadisha Shymkent” Hotel, Shymkent (arch. A.Guletkin).

This served as the basis for the formation of a special type of universally synthetic specialist with a kind of basic or repurposed education. Its characteristic feature is also the worldview corresponding to the situation: “Acting as a subject of the market, the architect largely gives up the ambitions of the creator, even if he follows not someone else's or extrapersonal, but his own version of the world. [...] Compliance with the interests of the market is all the more characteristic of the standard figure of a practicing architect, quite freely changing languages, styles, moving from neoclassical to modern, from modern to folklore, etc., as a rule, without feeling a change in the actual picture of the world”, A.Bokov points out [14, p.169].

Moreover, the nomenclature of subjects of project activity, previously consisting mainly only of large design institutes of various degrees of specialization, has been replenished by numerous design and construction firms that have significantly displaced them and occupied a significant market sector, as well as personal creative workshops and individual designers who undertake almost typologically any object, bearing in mind the possibility of free cooperation of specialists of the appropriate profile and changes in the number of personnel within fairly wide limits. Intraprofessional competition has sharply increased. Of great importance for professional development is the cooperation of domestic architects with large foreign firms and outstanding architects who have been actively working in the Kazakh architectural and construction market since the last decade of the twentieth century (K. Kurokawa, N. Foster, A. Smith, R. Varacalli, M. Nickoletti, A. Guletkin, M. Posokhin, A. Asadov, N. Yavein, etc.).

Mass standard design and construction has practically disappeared, since each design solution is considered as a “know-how”, the distribution of documentation of which significantly reduces the competitiveness of the manufacturer, and the legal fixation of copyrights is hopeless due to the complexity of identity proofs and the impossibility of effectively tracking the practice of application. On the other hand, the demand for the individual appearance of frequently encountered objects, economically justified by the customer, has expanded the practice of re-applying projects with facades redesigned to one degree or another with direct or mirror linking of layout, structural and engineering solutions within design firms. It is significant that, to a certain extent, for Kazakhstan, it is possible to state, for example, in Russian architecture [15, P.412], the similarity of a number of organizational, activity and stylistic aspects of the frontiers of the XIX-XX centuries and XX-XXI centuries.

The appearance of works in which a priori there is a complexity of attribution by species from spatial-parametric and operational-semantic positions has also become mutually conditional. Even more problematic in the context of the often forced literal realization of personal taste preferences is the definition of the stylistic orientation of both individual objects and architecture as a whole. The most important figurative characteristic of the architecture of Kazakhstan, as well as a number of other countries, at the turn of the century and the first decades of the current century was a kind of polystyllicity.

Mass privatization has led to the fact that in most cases the owners of the housing stock, both individual parts and entire public and a number of industrial buildings have

become independent from each other legal entities and individuals. Accordingly, the active transformation of the first floors has become one of the characteristic features of the urban environment. Here, in place of apartments, large shops, canteens, design and research institutes, small shops, cafes, hairdressers, dental offices, modeling and gaming salons, clubs, offices, etc. have appeared. Such enterprises, occupying part of the building, have independent entrances with a corresponding canopy or a whole vestibule and a staircase leading to the sidewalk. The architectural and artistic solution of each of them in most cases is emphatically individual, contrasting with the appearance of the rest of the building. In addition, in large cities, these enterprises change the owner, or even the profile of work in 2-3 years. This entails the expansion or reduction of the area occupied by them, redevelopment of premises, reconstruction of the facade and adjacent territory in accordance with the specifics of the work, tastes and capabilities of the customer, as well as the interpretation of these components by the authors of the project.

The typology of urban development has been significantly updated. Buildings of banks and business centers, offices of large companies and buildings with rented premises, mini- and supermarkets, snack bars and restaurants, various clubs and salons, shopping and entertainment and sports centers, casinos and hotels of various capacities have become an essential part of the urban landscape.

The practice of memorial and especially multi-confessional religious construction has expanded dramatically, and in most places has become a new mass phenomenon. As examples: The Mosque, Atyrau (arch. Sh.Yusupov); The Mashhur Zhusup Mosque, Pavlodar (arch. T.Abilda, M.Kabdualiev, Sh.Yusupov, S.Dautov, S.Nurrbay); The Mosque, Shymkent; The Mosque named after Ryskeldy-kazhi, Nur-Sultan (arch. S.Zhambulatov); The Church of the Holy Archangel Gabriel, Taldykorgan (arch. E.Podolskaya); The Church of the Ascension of Christ, Kokshetau (arch. D.Belik, V.Makovyak); The Beit Rachel Shabbat Lubavitch Synagogue, Nur-Sultan; The Church of the Most Holy Theotokos of Fatima, Karaganda (arch. K.-M.Ruf, V.Sergeev). The fact stated in the development of architecture in a number of neighboring CIS countries that “in the revived cult construction, the use of almost exclusively traditional three-dimensional structures, forms and details is directly pre-installed by the customer”, as noted by V.Haite [15, p.419] is also characteristic of Kazakhstan. At the same time, a number of denominations also support innovative architectural and artistic solutions.

A special phenomenon is the so-called “elite housing” of various storeys and the degree of isolation from mass development. Under this, which has become a common definition, the entire building usually falls, despite the fairly clear market criteria for the degree of comfort: actually, “elite”, “club” and “economy class” housing. The design of these objects has become a serious professional exam, because, in fact, for the customer, the criterion of the architect's skill, and, accordingly, the possibility of his “survival” in the market is the rapid sale of apartments or mansions. This applies to both new buildings and reconstructions. From those who passed the “selection”, a kind of class of “fashionable” architects was formed, the composition of which is occasionally updated.

An important aspect was the development of a significantly expanded range of structural and especially finishing materials and products, as well as solving the prob-

lem of their compatibility with widespread ones. A significant feature of the architecture of the stage was the massive use of multicolored combinations, including very saturated tones, determined by this. The constantly changing palette of finishing materials, even while maintaining the profile of the enterprise and the volume occupied by it, encourages owners to alter facades to preserve the economically attractive image of the company. Gradually, this increasingly began to concern organizations that occupy certain buildings completely. Multi-dimensional and multi-grafted inscriptions have been widely used, often actively included in the figurative solution of buildings.

Reflecting these processes, the Kazakh architecture of the period demonstrates the broad possibilities of both the one-time complex formation of individual sections of the life environment “turnkey” and the sequential “implantation” of individual elements into the emerging environmental context. Moreover, at all stages: from the formation of a plan based on multidimensional consulting, its design interpretation, to implementation – the laws of the market guarantee strict adherence to the criterion of compliance with the personal vision of the customer, and, of course, taking into account its dynamics. As examples: The “Nurly-Tau” Complex, Almaty (arch. T.Yeraliev, S.Baymagambetov); The “Yesentai Park” Complex, Almaty (arch. “Skidmore, Owings, Merrill”); The “Oval Square”, Nur-Sultan (arch. N.Boriskin); The Historical Museum, Nur-Sultan (arch. V.Laptev).

The concept of “sustainable development”, which has been widely spread since the 1990s, by the turn of the century had grown from a narrow environmental sector into a global strategy for cultural preservation. The important role of architecture in this process is increasingly being understood in adapting to the regional and sub-regional peculiarities of Kazakhstan. An increasingly visible feature of Kazakh architecture is its active involvement in the world architectural process. As examples: The Palace of Schoolchildren, Nur-Sultan (arch. N.Yavein); The “Halyk Arena” Sports Complex, Almaty; The “Khan-Shatyr” Complex, Nur-Sultan (arch. N.Foster); The “Double-Tree” Hotel, Almaty.

The acquisition of state independence by Kazakhstan also activated the processes of architectural self-identification, which had a multi-vector orientation. On the one hand, this was associated with the desire to revive regional architectural and artistic traditions, and on the other – accelerated adaptation of the achievements of architecture of the most economically developed countries. The special coloring of the process was given by the abundance of unfinished objects in various stages of construction, which included both mass construction and unique complexes. Part of this totality consisted of buildings intended for organizations that either lost the need for new buildings, or disappeared or repurposed. Accordingly, not fully implemented space-planning solutions to a greater extent and compositional-plastic ones to a lesser extent have lost the relevance necessary for immediate implementation. At the same time, a number of new and reorganized enterprises and institutions arose, the architectural interpretation of whose activities required either cardinal reconstruction of existing or unfinished buildings, or new construction. However, at the beginning of

the period, the economic situation did not allow laying new buildings, and active activity was concentrated in the field of reconstruction.

The natural delay in the architectural and artistic comprehension of the traditions perceived in a new way and the need for accelerated real construction and reconstruction led to the widespread use of “quick-mounted” thin-element cladding, double-glazed stained glass windows with glasses of various colors and transparency, as well as light panels. The specifics of the materials and structures used determined a kind of large-scale plastic, and the single-plane or single-surface (without accentuated deepening, platbands, window sill) position of wall and window panels due to the expediency of shortening the installation time of facings led to the spread of solid “all-facade glazing” and stepped-ledged transparent-blind drawings on facades. As examples: The Palace of Peace and Harmony, Nur-Sultan (the idea by N.Nazarbayev, arch. N.Foster); The Kazakhstan’s Peoples Assembly Palace, Taraz (arch. I.Baitenov, G.Isabaev); The “Kazakhstan” Concert Hall, Nur-Sultan (arch. M.Nickoletti, L.Nickoletti); The Presidential Library, Nur-Sultan (arch. N.Foster).

The original transformation of the buildings' appearance was demonstrated by extensive reconstruction activities in the second half of the 1990s. This marked the appearance and further widespread use of buildings with a kind of conditionally single-planar or smooth-surface solution of facades, when the difference in the cladding materials used begins to play a leading role, and not the different depth of the elements.

However, by the turn of the XX-XXI centuries, active multi-thematic plastic becomes the dominant direction of the development of architectural and artistic forms. The period that began was a time for the architecture of the Republic of a rather sharp increase in the pace of new construction. Stable economic development has led to an increase in the well-being of the general population, which, combined with an actively improving lending system, stimulated a surge in demand for housing of various quality, and, unlike the previous period, mainly in the primary market. This led to the intensification of housing construction. In urban development, the number of floors has increased dramatically. The pace of construction of public buildings has also increased, especially large shopping and entertainment centers, banks and insurance companies. The volume of reconstructions of the first floors does not decrease, which gradually spread to remote, “sleeping” areas of cities. Memorial and cult construction is actively underway.

Significant prospects for the development of the country’s architecture were opened by the transfer of the status of the regional center to Turkestan, where many interesting objects have appeared, reflecting the specifics of modern shaping. Each region of the Republic and the largest participants of the construction market were marked with interesting objects. As examples – new buildings in Turkestan: The “Turkestan Arena” Stadium; The Building of the regional Akimat; The “Uly Dala Eli” Cultural Center; The “Altyn Samruk” Flying theater.

Kazakhstan actively participates in major international exhibitions, and the country's pavilions are noted by organizing committees for the originality of the ar-

chitectural concept. As examples: The Kazakhstan pavilion at EXPO-2010, Shanghai; The Kazakhstan pavilion at EXPO-2015, Milan (arch. “Facts and fiction”); EXPO-2017 Complex, Nur-Sultan (arch. “Architecture of Adrian Smith + Gordon Gill”); The Kazakhstan pavilion at EXPO 2020, Dubai (arch. “ARDECO” and “Insgluk”). As part of the global process, Kazakhstan's architecture actively interprets global trends [16].

Results and discussion

The modern world architectural process is characterized by the presence of an active dialectical interaction of two phenomena. On the one hand, this is a purely personalized practice of individual project groups focused on one or more architects, and on the other hand, the work of large design or design and construction firms, where individual creativity is peculiarly blurred in the collective. The facet of this specificity is the vision of approaches to architectural and artistic shaping, which ranges from rigid stylistic binding to contextually conditioned polystylism, which manifests itself both in individual and collective creativity. The appearance of works in which a priori there is a complexity of attribution by species from spatial-parametric and operational-semantic positions has also become mutually conditional. Even more problematic in the context of the often forced literal realization of personal taste preferences is the definition of the stylistic orientation of both individual objects and architecture as a whole.

Conclusion

The subject matter of this work has the potential for development and deepening. This is how the detailing of the components of individual directions of the development of architectural and artistic forms in various sub-regional conditions of Kazakhstan, as well as by groups or individual settlements, looks promising. Here, the most relevant is a detailed and cumulative analysis of the architectural and artistic aspect of the “phenomenon of two capitals” – Almaty and Nur-Sultan – at the turn of the century, and the consideration of the “phenomenon of three capitals” (Kyzylorda – Almaty – Nur-Sultan) also seems appropriate. It is very important to consider the evolution of architectural and artistic interpretations of national motifs both in a spontaneous and purposeful form. Moreover, it seems necessary to pay special attention to the interpretation of ornamental motifs. In addition, of course, tracking trends in the development of architectural and artistic forms of the current century is of considerable interest. Thus, the acquisition of state independence by Kazakhstan created a unique situation that opened up the possibility of choosing an independent path, which by the beginning of the XXI century made it possible to talk about Kazakh architecture as a significant subject of the world architectural process and the source of a number of innovations.

References:

1. Kuspangaliev B.U. (2000) *Architectura gorodskogo zhilisha Kazakhstana [Architecture of urban housing Kazakhstan] – Almaty: KazGASA: The author's edition, 184. (in Russ.)*
2. Abilov A.Zh. (2002) *Gradostroitelstvo I ystoishivoe razvitie poseleniyi v Kazakhstane [Urban planning and sustainable development of settlements in Kazakhstan] – Almaty: KazGASA: The author's edition, 150. (in Russ.)*

3. *Duisebai E.K. (2002) Sovremennyye principy arhitekturnogo proektirovaniya obschestvennix zdaniy and sooruzheniy (adaptiruemyx k dinamike socialnyh peremen) [Modern principles of architectural design of public buildings and structures (adapting to the dynamics of social change)] – Almaty: KazGASA: The author's edition, 121. (in Russ.)*
4. *Samoilov K.I. (2004). Architektura Kazakhstana XX veka (razvitiye arhitekturno-xydozestvennyx form) [Architecture of Kazakhstan of the XX century (development of architectural and artistic forms)] – Moscow-Almaty: Mari-design, 930. ISBN 9965-576-17-3 (in Russ. + brief at Eng.)*
5. *Popova Z.V. (2007) Pravoslavnoe zodchestvo gorodov severo-vostochnogo Kazakhstana: XVIII – nachala XXI veka [Orthodox architecture of the cities of north-eastern Kazakhstan: XVIII – early XXI century] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni kandidata arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Cand. of Architecture. 22. (in Russ.)*
6. *Abdrasilova G.S. (2010) Tendentsiya razvitiya regionalnoi arhitektury i gradostroitelstva Kazakhstana [Trends in the development of regional architecture and urban planning in Kazakhstan] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni doktora arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Doc. of Architecture. 48. (in Russ.)*
7. *Kozbagarova N.J. (2010) Razvitiye landshaftnoyi arhitektury Kazakhstana XX veka [Development of landscape architecture of Kazakhstan XX veka] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni doktora arhitektury = Abstract abstract dis. ... Doc. of Architecture. 43. (in Russ.)*
8. *Aldungarova S.M. (2010) Stilivie napravleniya razvitiya arhitektury Kazakhstana XX veka (na primere obschestvennix zdaniy g.Almaty) [The style of the direction of development of architecture in Kazakhstan of the twentieth century (on the example of public buildings in Almaty)] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni kandidata arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Cand. of Architecture. 22. (in Russ.)*
9. *Toyshubekov D.E. (2010) Svoeobrazie natsionalnoi arhitekturi Kazakhstana v kontse XX – nachale XXI veka (na primere g.Almaty) [The peculiarity of the national architecture of Kazakhstan at the end of the XX – beginning of the XXI century (on the example of Almaty)] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni kandidata arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Cand. of Architecture. 24. (in Russ.)*
10. *Hamedov A.M. (2010) Razvitiye neoklassicheskoi stilistiki v almatinscom zodchestve contsa XIX – nachala XXI veka [The development of neoclassical stylistics in Almaty architecture of the late XIX – early XXI century] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni kandidata arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Cand. of Architecture. 24. (in Russ.)*
11. *Priemets O.N. (2015) Razvitiye arhitekturnogo ornamenta v zodchestve Kazakhstana XX – nachala XXI veka (na primere g.Almaty) [The development of architectural ornament in the architecture of Kazakhstan of the XX – beginning of the XXI century (on the example of Almaty)] Avtoreferat disser. na soisk. stepeni kandidata arhitektury = Abstract dis. ... Cand. of Architecture. 21. (in Russ.)*
12. *Kuzenbaev D.S., Sadvokasova G.K., Samoilov K.I. (2019) Architectural concepts of design firms (style aspect). – Almaty: “Construction and Architecture”, 186. ISBN 978-601-332-352-7 (in Eng.)*
13. *Priemets O., Samoilov K., Zayats I., Kenessarina Zh., Ysembayeva E. (2019) International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE) 8(10):2305-2313. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.J1302.0881019> (in Eng.)*
14. *Bokov A.V. (1995) Geometricheskie osnovy arhitektury i kartiny mira [Geometric foundations of architecture and the picture of the world] – Moscow: The author's edition. 176. (in Russ.)*
15. *Hait V.L. (2003) Arhitektura gorodskogo zhilya Kazakhstana [About architecture, its history and problems] – Moscow: Editorial URSS, 456. ISBN 5-354-00465-9 (in Russ.)*
16. *Samoilov K, Kuspangaliyev B, Sadvokasova G (2022) Civil Engineering and Architecture 10(4):1419-1444. DOI: 10.13189/cea.2022.100414. (in Eng.)*

Б.У. Куспанғалиев¹, К.И. Самойлов¹, О.Н. Приемец^{2*}

¹Сәтбаев университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

²Халықаралық білім беру корпорациясы, Алматы, Қазақстан

Авторлар туралы ақпарат:

Куспанғалиев Болат Урайханұлы – сәулет докторы, профессор, академик, Сәулет және құрылыс институтының Т.К. Бәсенов атындағы директоры, Сәтбаев университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1821-7139>, email: kasmaam@mail.ru

Самойлов Константин Иванович – сәулет докторы, «Сәулет» кафедрасының профессоры, Сәтбаев университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2310-8367>, email: samconiv@mail.ru

Приемец Оксана Николаевна – сәулет кандидаты, профессор ассистенті, Сәулет факультеті, Халықаралық білім беру корпорациясы (ҚазБСҚА кампусы), Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4869-3718>, email: oksana.priemets@mail.ru

ҚАЗАҚСТАН СӘУЛЕТІНІҢ ЖЕТІСТІКТЕРІ МЕН ДАМУ ПЕРСПЕКТИВАЛАРЫ

Аңдатпа. Қазақстанның өткен отыз жылдық даму тарихы оның сәулетінде айқын көрініс тапты. Қазақстанның мемлекеттік тәуелсіздік алуы отандық сәулет өнерінің дамуының жаңа, ерекше кезеңін айқындады. Қазақстан сәулеті әлемдік сәулет процесінің маңызды құрамдас бөлігіне айналды, ал өткен ғасырдың ортасында қалыптасқан сәулет мектебі ағымдағы ғасырда әлемнің көптеген елдерінде сұранысқа ие және табысты жұмыс істейтін мамандардың ұдайы өндірілуін қамтамасыз етті.

Түйін сөздер: Қазақстан сәулеті, қалыптастыру, стильдер, инновациялар, тұрақты даму.

Б.У. Куспанғалиев¹, К.И. Самойлов¹, О.Н. Приемец^{2*}

¹Satbayev University, Алматы, Қазақстан

²Международная образовательная корпорация, Алматы, Қазақстан

Информация об авторах:

Куспанғалиев Болат Урайханович – доктор архитектуры, профессор, академик, Директор Института Архитектуры и Строительства имени Т.К. Басенова, Satbayev University, Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1821-7139>, email: kasmaam@mail.ru

Самойлов Константин Иванович – доктор архитектуры, профессор кафедры «Архитектура», Satbayev University, Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2310-8367>, samconiv@mail.ru

Приемец Оксана Николаевна – кандидат архитектуры, Ассистент профессора, факультет Архитектуры, Международная образовательная корпорация (кампус КазГАСА), Алматы, Қазақстан

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4869-3718>, email: oksana.priemets@mail.ru

ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ АРХИТЕКТУРЫ КАЗАХСТАНА

Аннотация. История прошедших тридцати лет развития Казахстана ярко отразилась в его архитектуре. Обретение Казахстаном государственной независимости определило новый, весьма своеобразный этап развития отечественного зодчества. Архитектура Казахстана стала существенной составляющей мирового архитектурного процесса, а сформировавшаяся в середине прошлого века архитектурная школа обеспечила постоянное воспроизводство специалистов, которые в текущем столетии востребованы и успешно работают во многих странах мира.

Ключевые слова: архитектура Казахстана, формообразование, стили, инновации, устойчивое развитие.