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Abstract – This research explores the architectural legacy of Eižens Laube in Jūrmala city. E. Laube (1880–1967) was at those times one of the most influential Latvian architects both in praxis and in academic field. Nowadays, no significant overview on his architectural legacy in Latvia and particularly in Jūrmala has been done. The aim of this article is to provide an updated list of architectural works of E. Laube in Jūrmala, to explore the current condition of these objects and trace particular regularity in their development. The article actualizes the general necessity to explore the architectural legacy of architect E. Laube and illuminates the architectural exploration methods in Jūrmala up to the 1990s. The findings enrich the history of Latvian architecture and Jūrmala city and may serve for some architectural and touristic materials.
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Introduction and Research Methodology

In the studies of field of history of architecture, it is common to explore the legacy of a particular architect. In Latvia, the considerable studies were carried out regarding the architectural legacy of architects Jānis Alksnis [1], Modris Gelzis [2] and others. It is also common to create monographies on a particular style of architecture, for instance the book “Art Nouveau Architecture in Latvia” [3], or dedicate research to national architecture or architecture of particular cities, such as “Art Nouveau Buildings in Riga: A Guide to Architecture of Art Nouveau Metropolis” [4], “Latvijas arhitektūra no senātes līdz mūsdienām” (Architecture in Latvia from Old Times Till Now) [5], and others. In some of these works the legacy of the architect E. Laube is mentioned, but they do not give a comprehensive insight. In 1940, the architectural magazine “Latvijas arhitektūra” published a list of his works (further in text – list of 1940), and a scheme of the location of his works in Riga city [6]. The list contains 247 objects, among them 13 in Jūrmala. This source of information up to now is considered as the most significant and complete reference to the architectural legacy of E. Laube. Still some other sources of information are available from the first half of the 20th century. The absence of historical archive of architectural projects in Jūrmala is one of the main reasons why up to now the topic of architecture in Jūrmala is not very appealing for the researchers. With such limited opportunities, the most common sources of information are the historical ownership documents where the names of the initial owners have been indicated, and the publications in old magazines or books where any hint was honored. The most significant research methods were field studies and interviews with inhabitants. In the 1970s–1990s, the information processing methods were rather conventional. The database of the buildings was a set of folders. The folders were arranged according to the street names. Each folder was dedicated to one particular address and consisted of one or few sheets that contained the photo of the building, additional information and some architectural evaluation. A sample of the folder content is given in Fig. 1.

In the beginning of the 19th century the biggest misfortune was the lack of historical archive of architectural projects in Jūrmala – almost all of it was destroyed during the second half of the 20th century. The absence of historical archive of architectural projects in Jūrmala is one of the main reasons why up to now the topic of architecture in Jūrmala is not very appealing for the researchers. With such limited opportunities, the most common sources of information are the historical ownership documents where the names of the initial owners have been indicated, and the publications in old magazines or books where any hint was honored. The most significant research methods were field studies and interviews with inhabitants. In the 1970s–1990s, the information processing methods were rather conventional. The database of the buildings was a set of folders. The folders were arranged according to the street names. Each folder was dedicated to one particular address and consisted of one or few sheets that contained the photo of the building, additional information and some architectural evaluation. A sample of the folder content is given in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. A fragment of the file for the building at Dzintaru prospekts 18, Jūrmala [9].

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), in the manner agreed with Sciendo.
The research tends to study the history of objects in connection with the following historic periods in Latvia: the 18th century – in 1914, the territory of Latvia was a part of Russian Empire (further in text – the period of Russian Empire); 1918–1940 was the period of the Republic of Latvia (further in text – the first period of the Republic of Latvia); 1940–1991 – the period of the Soviet Republic of Latvia (further in text – the Soviet period); the period after 1991 was the time of regained independence of the Republic of Latvia (further in text – the time after Latvia regained independence). In this research the biggest part of information regarding the period of Russian Empire, the first period of the Republic of Latvia and the Soviet period are compiled from the archive of National Cultural Heritage Administration and books [10], [11], [12], but the biggest input in the research is from the information regarding the time after Latvia regained independence. Exploration of current condition of works of E. Laube in Jūrmala includes field studies, exploration of contemporary publications and examination of architectural projects of the buildings that were renovated [17]. Often mentioned names in text – Lielupe, Bulduri, Dzintari, Dubulti, Ķemeri, Sloka – are the denominations of some neighborhoods of Jūrmala.

I. THE UPDATED LIST OF WORKS OF ARCHITECT E. LAUBE IN JŪRMALA AND THEIR LOCATION IN THE CITY

The updated list of works of E. Laube is given in Table I. The descriptions of the objects in column No. 2 of Table I are given exactly how they are written in the reference. Notable, that majority of the descriptions are rather incomplete – no address is given. Columns No. 4–7 of Table I show the source of reference for each object. The last columns of Table I indicate the status of cultural heritage.

There are 17 objects listed in the table, which is 4 more than in a list of 1940 and 2 more than in the list of 2000. The 13 objects are taken from the list of 1940, two additional objects are mentioned in the “Senatne un Māksla” and “Latvijas Universitāte 1919–1929”, but the remaining two are mentioned in the list of 2000 and during this research the historic references were not found. That allows assuming that the number of objects by E. Laube in Jūrmala is at least 15. As further research still may reveal references to the remaining two objects, in this research it is assumed that by now the number of works by E. Laube in Jūrmala is 17. This number is taken into account in further data analysis.

The column No. 3 of Table I indicates the addresses of objects. The list of 1940 does not give the addresses, only mentions the suburb of Jūrmala where the house is located, as it is seen in Fig. 3.
These addresses are available in the list of 2000. In the research of 1990s, the locations of the buildings mostly were indicated by the names of initial owners of the buildings if they were known from the historic ownership documents. This method was accomplished by the visual evaluation of the object taking into consideration the creative approach of the architect. The most secure way of indicating the address was to find the picture of the object in some publication of those times and look for it in the city. In this case, the main aid was the architectural magazine “Latvijas arhitektūra”. Another but less secure method was to talk with the local people. In this way, the step forward was made regarding the house of A. Ģīms (Table I, No. 8). In the list of 2000, it was written “the address is not known”, but the latest assumptions made by the inspectors of National Cultural Heritage Administration propose the address – Krīšjāņa Barona iela 26. The local inhabitant of the area mentioned that the initial owner of that house was Ģīms. The visual evaluation of the building gives a belief that the house could be designed by E. Laube, see Fig. 12. Up to now, only the location of summer cottage of J. Niedre (Table I, No.17) has not been detected.

In this research the addresses are not revised, they are summarized from other studies. The location of the objects is schematically depicted in Fig.4 where the numeration is given according to Table I.

| No. | Object description                                                                 | Address                  | Reference No. | H*  |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----|
| 1.  | 1907. Volfārts, Bulduri, wooden summer cottage                                    | Jelgavas iela 8          |               |     |
| 2.  | 1909. Ops-Šmidtchens, Dubulti, two story wooden gymnasium                          | Strēlnieku prospekts 32  |               | L   |
| 3.  | 1911. Jūrmala Savings and Loans Society, Dubulti, two story masonry public building | Dubultu prospekts 19     |               | L   |
| 4.  | 1918. Idelsons, H. Dr. med., Ķemerī, two story residential building               | Pākīna iela 6            |               |     |
| 5.  | 1920. “Brāļu kapi” memorial monuments, Ķemerī, Sloka and other locations          | Šķērsu prospekts 28       |               | L   |
| 6.  | 1924. Neiburgs, L., Bulduri, Rēzeknes prospekts, summer cottage                   | Šķērsu prospekts 28       |               | L   |
| 7.  | 1928. Dāvis, J., Bulduri, 19. lietnie 1, residential building                     | 19. lietnie 1             |               | L   |
| 8.  | 1929. Ģīms, A., Bulduri, summer cottage                                          | Jāņa Barona iela 26      |               |     |
| 9.  | 1929. Lācīniš, Bulduri, one story wooden summer cottage                           | Rotas iela 3             |               | S   |
| 10. | 1932. Jansons, O., Sloka, house of apothecary                                     | Raņa iela 40             |               |     |
| 11. | 1933. hotel „Ķemerī“                                                              | Tukuma iela 42            |               | S   |
| 12. | 1935. Čakste, M., Bulduri, garage                                                | Bulduru prospekts 109    |               |     |
| 13. | 1935. Bružs, M., Dubulti, summer cottage                                          | Gončarova iela 8/10      |               | L   |
| 14. | House of Rudzītis, Dzintari                                                       | Dzintaru prospekts 18    |               | L   |
| 15. | Summer cottage of Doc. Kalniņš                                                     | Rotas iela 1             |               |     |
| 16. | 1912. House of baron Vērmanis                                                    | Baznicas iela 2, lit. 1, Dubulti |               | L   |
| 17. | 1910. Summer cottage of J.Niedre, Bulduri                                        | Location is not yet detected |               |     |

*) Cultural heritage: L – Local architectural monument; S – State architectural monument.
II. THE WORKS OF ARCHITECT E. LAUBE

The brief overview of the objects that are listed in Table I is given according to the established sequence and object description. The typological and stylistic qualities of buildings as well the brief history are described.

1907. Volfārts, Bulduri, wooden summer cottage (Table I, No. 1). The building was detected thanks to the publication in “Jahrbüch fur Bildende Kunst in den Ostseeprovinzen” [18] where the picture of the building and floor plan is given, see Fig. 5. One house in Bulduri (Fig. 6) has obvious similarities of roof construction with the small turret on the top. This house is one of the few houses in Jūrmala that has some fragments of the initial architectural project. Currently the privately owned house is renovated and many building elements have disappeared, for example the two-story veranda construction. Former summer cottage is adapted to all season use as it is common in Jūrmala in our days – the city is not a summer resort any more, as it used to be 100 years ago, but a regular city for all year living. This adaptation happens with almost all summer cottages that have been renovated, and further in the research it is not particularly mentioned. In the Soviet period, the two story house – now Jūrmala City Theater building – was constructed adjacent to the Volfārts house. That changed the environmental content and reduced the visual quality of the Volfārts house. According to the list of 1940, the Volfārts house is the first building designed by E. Laube in Jūrmala and in general the third building designed in his private praxis, as it is shown in Fig. 3. The investigation on two objects that are listed before Volfārts house shows that nothing is known about the houses in Mīlgrāvis, but the interior design of a shop in Jelgava was destroyed during World War I. This allows declaring that the Volfārts house in Jūrmala in general is the oldest existing house designed by E. Laube in his private praxis.

1909. Ops-Šmidtchens, Dubulti, two-story wooden gymnasium (Table I, No. 2). The identity of the house is proved by the historic photos of the school life and other evidences. The house is designed in classical stylistic and symmetrical composition. Presently it is in a very bad technical condition and does not function despite its excellent location and the successful
development of the adjacent lots. In autumn 2018, near the building a complex of public buildings – library, art school and music school – was completed. The abandoned and partly ruined appearance of the gymnasium building considerably deteriorates the contemporary environment. As the gymnasium building now belongs to private owners, the municipality efforts to improve the visual impact are not successful. The only possible legal action that municipality was able to do was conservation of the building by covering it with a building net. Since 1991, the owners have not been able to find a mutual agreement on the development of the property. Many ideas did not correspond with the city and cultural heritage statements, meanwhile the building is perishing. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5685.

1911. Jūrmala Savings and Loans Society, Dubulti, two-story masonry public building (Table I, No. 3). This building is located in the center of Dubulti and forms an expressive accent of the corner of streets – delicate in size and elegant in architectural details (Fig. 7). It is the first masonry building by E. Laube in Jūrmala and the only building by him in Jūrmala designed in Art Nouveau style that resembles his designs of tenement houses in Riga. Initially designed as a building for public function it still serves for some offices and services. The façade of the building is preserved, but the internal planning has been slightly changed according to the contemporary needs. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5432.

1918. Idelsons, H. Dr. med., Ķemeri, two-story residential building (Table I, No. 4). According to the historic evidences, Dr. Idelson had established the nerve disease sanatorium “Villa Martha” in Ķemeri. As it is the only house known to be owned by Dr. Idelson, it is assumed that exactly this house was designed by E. Laube. The historic photo of the building (Fig. 8) shows a traditional wooden two-story building with an extended porch and balcony composition at the center of the façade. After 1940, the building was converted into a kinder garden, later serving as part of the sanatorium “Çaika”. In 1998, the building was pulled down without the required permissions and up to now the plot is empty. The building was Local Architectural Monument No. 5651.

1920. “Brāļu kapī” memorial monuments, Ķemeri, Sloka and other locations (Table I, No. 5). During World War I, active military fights took place in all territory of Latvia including the surroundings of Jūrmala and Ķemeri bog. Several memorials were established in Jūrmala. The memorials in Ķemeri and Sloka include the works by E. Laube. The monuments still exist and are well maintained. The “Brāļu kapī” (Warrior’s Cemetery) monument at the cemetery in Sloka was unveiled in 1923 (Fig. 9). The main elements of the monument are a 240 cm high obelisk and a plate (70 x 53 cm) with the following inscription: “Latvijas atbrīvošanas kara un bijušo strēlnieku pulku cīņas kritušo varonu piemiņai 1915–1919. Dievs, sargi mūsu tēvu zemi, lai viņa ziedoša un stipra top!” (In memory of the Latvian freedom fights and the killed heroes of the Riflemen regiment 1915–1919. God, save our fatherland, may it flourish and grow strong!)

1924. Neiburgs, L., Bulduri, summer cottage (Table I, No. 6). The two-story wooden house with a plaster finish resembles a small manor with the classical building elements at the portico, fronton and ringed roof (Fig. 12). L. Neiburgs was the owner of one of the biggest building companies at those times and collaborated with E. Laube in some other projects in Riga. 1924 was also the year when E. Laube designed the private house for himself in Riga, Baložu iela 20a, which was one of the first private houses designed by him in the first period of the Republic of Latvia. It is obvious that both houses have similar stylistic features (Fig. 11). This comparison may allow stating that the approach of E. Laube to the private residential architecture evolved and developed from his own house design and these designs were rather inert to the surrounding – the resort ambient and the nearness of the sea had minor impact on architectural expressions. In the Soviet period, the house was used as a school and kinder garden. Already in the 1980s, the house was in poor condition. Since 1991, the house has not been in use and currently is up for sale. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5742.
1928. Dāvis, J., Bulduri, 19. līnija 1, residential building (Table I, No. 7). It is a two-story wooden house with plaster finish, emphasized classical portico and flat roof (Fig. 12). The house had also luxury interior finish and extended room program with swimming pool and sauna. The stylistics of this house is more advanced than that of four years earlier designed Neiburg’s house and it better reflects the ideas of E. Laube’s theoretical works regarding the identity of Latvian national architecture that includes the exquisite use of classical architectural elements. The house demonstrates the prosperity of Latvian wealthy society members of those times. J. Dāvis was a remarkable publicist and educator. The plot has an excellent location – 200 meters from the seaside. E. Laube was the owner of the plot from 1924 until he sold it to J. Dāvis in 1928. During the Soviet period the house was used as a summer residence for the leaders of the Soviet Republic of Latvia. After 1991 until the legatees regained the property, the house was used by Latvian Cultural Fund. In 2005, the house was fully renovated to the project by architect U. Zābers of architectural office “Arhitektu birojs Sīlis, Zābers & Klava”. The historic building preserved its outlook and got the extension at the right side that tolerantly responds to the scale of the building and fits well into surrounding. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5330.

1929. Ģīms, A., Bulduri, summer cottage (Table I, No. 8). It is a one-story wooden house with a ringed roof (Fig. 12). It is still in function without having had overall renovation.

1929. Lūciņš, Bulduri, one-story wooden summer cottage (Table I, No. 9). The house is small in size but a significant piece of architectural legacy of E. Laube. In our days the house is evaluated as an outstanding evidence of the artistic talent and stylistic approach of E. Laube’s particularly creative period [22]. It is National Architectural Monument No. 5661 together with its auxiliary house No. 5662. The plot is located approximately 200 meters from the seaside and originally had a wide yard that together with the buildings created elegant environment. The house is designed in neo-eclectic style using a mixture of elements of classical, art deco and gothic style (Fig. 12). The main shape of the house is a rectangular supplemented with the Neo-Gothic turret and deepened porch. This composition creates the asymmetric silhouette and extraordinary impression of the house. During the Soviet period the house was divided for two families. After 1991 the inhabitants did not invest in the development of the property and that made possible preserving much of the historical substance of the house. After the change of the owners in 2012, the house was restored, some interior replanning was made and the site improvement renewed to the project of architectural
office “Vincents arhitektūra”. The construction works were completed in 2015 and now the building is one of the best examples of fine architectural restoration in Jūrmala.

**1932. Jansons, O., Sloka, house of apothecary** (Table I, No. 10). This house with the brick finish and ringed roof was detected in the city by the name of the owner, however this house is out of the stylistic content of E. Laube’s works. Currently it is in bad technical condition.

**1933. Hotel “Ķemeri”** (Table I, No. 11). It is one of the most distinguished buildings designed by E. Laube and one of the most recognized neo-eclectic style buildings in Latvia (Fig. 10). It also may be listed among three most significant monumental objects of the first period of the Republic of Latvia that symbolize the national identity. Two other are the Statue of Liberty in Riga city center, unveiled in 1935, and “Brāļu kapi” (Warrior’s Cemetery) monument in Riga, unveiled in 1936, both designed by sculptor K. Zāle [23]. With the total room area of approximately 10 500 m² it is the biggest building designed by E. Laube. In 1931, the Ministry of the Interior of Latvia announced an architectural competition for the Ķemeri hotel. Three out of 22 submissions received recognition. Architect E. Laube was among the jury members, but in 1933, he received a commission to design this hotel [24]. The building was finished in 1936. The original project of E. Laube is not preserved, but according to the publication of 1940, the architect himself with great care and enthusiasm made hundreds of sketches for the interior design and it “might be that the versatility of his talent revealed the brightest and most convincingly in this building” [25]. In the Soviet period the building continued to function as a hotel and was well maintained. Big part of authentic interior design was preserved until 1991. By the de-nationalization process the building passed to the private owners. Since then the building frequently has changed owners and faces problems with the development. The hotel stopped functioning and since 1992 plenty of restoration projects were elaborated and restoration works initiated [23]. In 2013, the building was out for sale again and experts claimed that the state should finally buy the property and save the national architectural heritage because it had been considerably damaged [26], but it did not happen. The new owners promise to create a new wellness concept in a five star hotel by 2020. The endless renovation works force the society to avoid this topic as it is not something to be proud of. In 2016, when the building had 80 years anniversary, no one mentioned this fact. In the same year, Dzintari Concert Hall in Jūrmala had 80 years anniversary – celebrated just after the renovation of the building. The building is National Architectural Monument No. 5427. Six interior elements are Local or National Art Monuments.

**1935. Čakste, M., Bulduri, garage house** (Table I, No. 12). This auxiliary building was renovated after 1991.

**1935. Bružs, M., Dubulti, summer cottage** (Table I, No. 13). This two-story masonry building has an excellent location in the dunes near the sea and extraordinary architecture – a transition from neo-eclectic to functionalist style (Fig. 12). If there were no classical columns and balustrades for the porch decora-
tion the house could have been a fine functionalism. In the Soviet period the house was used by the Union of Soviet Writers. After 1991 it passed over to the private owner and in 2009–2010 was carefully renovated to the project of architect A. Ločmelis. The initial planning of the house was so comfortable and suitable for contemporary needs that only minor changes were implemented in the building and it was possible to fully preserve the external shape of the building. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5468.

House of Rudzītis, Dzintari (Table I, No. 14). The two-story masonry house was built in the 1920s in Neo-Eclectic style using baroque and classical forms – two-storey high pilasters that emphasize the main entrance and classical decors around the windows and cornices (Fig. 12). Together with the wide yard the house creates a prominent overall image. The client, G. Rudzītis, was a wealthy businessman demonstrating his prosperity. The interior was richly decorated. In the Soviet period the house was used as a medical establishment. Since 1991, the building has changed several owners and is not in use. As the property has a big plot and excellent location – on one of the most prestigious streets of Jūrmala and near the Dzintari Concert Hall – there have been several attempts to extend the building and convert it into a guest house, but up to now none of the project was realized. The second owner started the restoration works in 1994 that partly destroyed the historic interior decorations. Up to 2014 there was an idea to create a guest house and build a big annex to the existing building. The latest project of 2018 plans to restore the building and build a small auxiliary building in the backside of the house. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5447. Four interior elements are National Art Monuments.

Summer cottage of Doc. Kalniņš (Table I, No. 15). The house is located near Lūciņš’ house. The house was detected in the city by the name of initial owner and stylistic similarities with architecture of E. Laube.
House of baron Vērmanis (Table I, No. 16). The two-story wooden summer cottage with wooden finish was designed in 1912. The house has classical stylistic elements at the portico and fronton. In the first period of the Republic of Latvia the house was used as a sanatorium. Currently it is in poor condition, not in use and is out for sale. The building is Local Architectural Monument No. 5373.

III. CURRENT SITUATION OF THE WORKS OF E. LAUBE

The investigation on E. Laube’s works in Jūrmala allows summarizing the data from different aspects. The quantitative analysis makes it possible to evaluate the current condition of the architectural legacy of E. Laube, but the systematization of objects reveals the diversity of types of buildings and current processes.

The architect has designed a comparably small amount of buildings in Jūrmala – only 7% of the works that are included in the list of 1940 (Fig. 13). The investigation shows that the oldest existing building of his private praxis – the Volfārts house – and his biggest building – the hotel “Ķemeri” – is located in Jūrmala. The scale of buildings ranges from a big resort hotel to a garage. There is also a big diversity of functions – four are public buildings, another type is memorial objects, but the biggest part of works is cottage houses (Fig. 14). From the point of architectural styles the most significant creative approaches of E. Laube are presented in Jūrmala – an Art Nouveau and neo-eclecticism based on classical vocabulary. Hotel “Ķemeri” is the brightest sample of his neo-eclectic style buildings in Jūrmala, however his summer cottages of the 1920s and 1930s can be a remarkable collection of residential architecture of neo-eclecticism not only in architecture of Jūrmala but also of Latvia (Fig. 11). Cottage house as a type of building corresponds well with the overall resort ambient of the city, moreover the cottages designed by E. Laube demonstrate a brand new approach to the concept of summer residency and stand out among other cottages of that period.

Due to high architectural and conceptual qualities of buildings by E. Laube in Jūrmala, more than half of them are listed as architectural monuments (Fig. 15). The choice of objects was done successfully and all valuable objects got the status of architectural monuments. Regarding the current condition of the architectural monuments, the situation rather differs. Four monuments out of nine – one office building and three private houses – are fully renovated, two buildings are abandoned and do not function, one monument is in critically bad condition and two are under renovation. The architectural monuments that underwent the renovation have some common characteristics – the buildings keep their initial function, their facades are well preserved and the inner planning is not much changed. These factors allow seeing the link between at least three things: firstly, the buildings by E. Laube initially are well planned and correspond with the contemporary needs that made the task of preservation more realistic; secondly, the owners of the property understand the architectural value of the building, want to invest in it and engage the architects who can properly manage the project; thirdly, the two first factors do not contradict the demands of the National Cultural Heritage Administration. The historian M. Mintaura in his book “Arhitektūras mantojuma aizsardzības vēsture Latvijā” (The History of the Conservation of Latvia’s Architectural Heritage) mentioned that the successful preservation of architectural heritage is possible when the client understands the value of the property, the architect is professional and the heritage protection institutions are able to fulfill their duties [27]. In this case the practical situation accords with the theory. However it is obvious that the renovation process of these cultural monuments is rather slow because these objects were held back for a long time, probably they were saved relatively untouched waiting for better times or better sales price, and the legacy of E. Laube requires from the current owners as much excellence in renovation as from initial clients in building. The positive progress really happens at the moment when the property gets the owner that appreciates the historic value of the property, for instance, the irreproachable restoration of Lūčinš’ house in 2015 after it changed the owner in 2012, in contrary to Neiburgs house does not function and is still waiting for the new owner.

In general, the current condition of buildings by E. Laube in Jūrmala ranges from complete take-down to perfect restoration (Fig. 16). The condition mostly depends on property ownership in combination with owners’ ambitions and legislation at all levels. The role of architectural quality is rather influential but not ruling. This situation can be referred to the architectural heritage in general in Jūrmala and it illuminates the consequences of property nationalization during the Soviet period and denationalization after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, significance of architectural heritage protection framework and attitude of the local municipality towards the heritage.

CONCLUSION

1. The revised list of works by E. Laube in Jūrmala implements certain improvements and precisions, and consists of seventeen objects.
2. The architecture of E. Laube in Jūrmala is diverse and remarkable in several aspects. The oldest survived building of his private praxis and the biggest building are located in Jūrmala. Apart of one of the most distinguished objects designed by E. Laube – hotel “Ķemeri” – another group of buildings of great value is highlighted in this research – summer cottages of the 1920s and 1930s.
3. Seventeen objects designed by E. Laube being part of overall architectural heritage in Jūrmala indicate the current situation in architecture protection, legislation, property ownership and research in Jūrmala. The renovation works in the last three decades could have been more active and determined.
4. The status of architectural monument influences the sustainability of objects – in a positive way, if the owner appreciates the value of the property; in a negative way, if the requirements of the heritage protection do not meet the
needs of the owner. The building of hotel “Ķemerī” can be a good interdisciplinary case study to explore the role and power of private owners, municipality, heritage protection institution and society interests in Latvia after 1991.

5. The investigation on works of E. Laube in Jūrmala shows, that in the field of research some of information is based on the expert experience and assumptions. The lack of scientific references makes it difficult to trace some of the results and repeat the previous research. However further contribution to the topic is possible only by discovering new historical materials.
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