BALKANSKI ARHITEKTONSKI BIJENALE

THE CITY'S ROLE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference
Balcan Architectural Bienale
2013.

BALKANSKI ARHITEKTONSKI BIJENALE

Belgrade
26.-27. may
2013.

THE CITY'S ROLE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Zbornik radova sa međunarodne naučne konferencije

Balkansko arhitektonsko bijenale 2013.

*

Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference

Balcan Architectural Bienale 2013.

Beograd/Belgrade

2013.

IMPRESSUM/IMPRESUM

EDITORS/UREDNICI: Đorđe Mandrapa i Marko Stojanović

TITLE/NASLOV: THE CITY’S ROLE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

PUBLISHER/IZDAVAČ: Balkansko arhitektonsko bijenale

REVIEWERS/RECENZENTI: PhD Aleksandra Stupar

PhD Dragana Vasilski

PhD Tatjana Mrđenović

PhD Velimir Ćerimović

PRINT RUN/TIRAŽ: 300

PRINTED/ŠTAMPA: Pressia

PLACE AND DATE/VREME I MESTO: Beograd/Belgrade, 2013.

ISBN: 978-86-916755-0-9

SUSTAINABLE ECO-RECIPROCITY OF PHYSICAL STRUCTURES AS A FUNCTION OF SUSTAINABLE CITY

Phd. Velimir Lj.Ćerimović,cervel@sbb.rs
„Union - Nikola Tesla“ University, Belgrade, www.unionnikolatesla.edu.rs
The first institute of landscape and architectural and urban construction of Serbia, www.pipaugs.org.rs

Abstract

In the process of attaining higher education in the periods of the 20th and 21st century, through unsustainable combination mettohds of sustainable "3D" and unsustainable "2D" terminology, there is no mention of sustainable eco reciprocity of the physical structures for the sustainable city as an urban spatial residence.

Therefore, in the consequentialsense, the fullness of architectural, cultural and functional identity is significantly reduced, along side physical personality and capacity.And finally, through all of these visible and law bindedas well as unsustainable forms of the "2D" issues, we have since the Bauhaus decades a complete and regularly ignored city building or structural , spiritual, cityscape constructing, eco and lifequickening solvency and legality of the "3D" structures, objects or landscape artifacts and architectural construction, creativity, culture, arts and cultural park heritage.

The whole problem stems from the fact that the previous "2D" urban and regional planning through the unsustainable use of obsolete "2D" terminology, in the physical structure of the city proselitickly and unsustainably recognizes only highly built objects or artifacts, and considersonly them as developed spaces and objects, because they have walls.

This is why the "2D" theory and pragmatism over the decades all to the present day is not completed, because they can’t accept and ratifythe lower (smaller) and landscape built "3D" objects or artifacts, who such as they are,have no walls. Moreover, they are classified as the so-called inbuilt (unbuilt), so-called free, so-called open spaces and various surfaces.

This is how thegreat importance for sustainable eco-reciprocity and eco-urbancontinuity between the immanent, integrational, compatible, complementary, and the cause-effective higher, lower, and landscape-built buildings and artifacts in the physical structure of urban-centralized residence are unsustainablyand essentiallymarginalized.Through the affirmation of the so-called "2D"plan of the spatial use and the use of the "2D" anti-system and so-called green spaces or so-called,,the green” as originally planned, and today still more important "2D" planning basis for planning and transforming the settlements without the third dimension and without any profound opinions on urban space as a whole, or the local urban community or on the users of the urban space, with less and less quality, attractiveness, melamine , attractive and viable entities and environments.

In this way, it is apparent that the legitimacy of "physical urbanism" and aneco-reciprocity of the physical structures face a challenge in the second decade of the 21st century, and consequently a sustainable survival challenge as well as development of the city as a residence for human urban-spatial local community.

Keywords

Eco-reciprocity of the urban-spatial residence; physical structure of the city; subtypes of the physical structure of the city, high, low, and landscape-built buildings (civil engineering and landscape construction), sustainable "3D" and unsustainable "2D" terminology.

Introduction

Today, the integrative urban and spatial planning is still dominated by unsustainable books and other publications based on the principles of combining sustainable "3D" and unsustainable "2D" knowledge and terminology, have a more or less quasi professionaleffecton the current education, knowledge and regulations on spatial planning. These are the forms of literature and outdated regulations from the 20th, but are also present now in the second decade of the 21st century, that promote fixed and obsolete "2D" theory, Pragma, and speculative quasi professional "2D-patent" in the field of town and country planning. Through this unsustainable practice that is based on quasi professional "2D-patents" instead of consistent and sustained "3D" scientific and technical principles of sustainable eco-reciprocity,there have been undoubtedly, for decades, elaborated and implemented unsustainable "2D" concepts in the management and planning of space and for sustainable development[1].

In relation to this fact, this research work is the first to that clearly and completely avant-garde in its title indicates the necessity and importance of re-establishment and implementation so far marginalized the principles of sustainable ecoreciprocity between high, low and landscape built physical structures. Of course, in this regard it should be noted, that the conceptual and factual aspect of sustainable ecoreciprocity, which is implied suggests that among the subtypes of physical structures (high, low and landscape constructed) there can't be any proselytizing or hierarchical expiration of one at the expense of others or the third and vice versa.

This latest research approach consisted of finding, identifying, articulating and affirming sustainable eco reciprocity between the above mentioned causal subtypes of physical structures, clearly shows how until recently, the "2D" space planning, and now present integrated planning of unsustainable combinatoricsto sustainable "3D" and speculative and unsustainable "2D" terminology, in fact, for decades unilaterally affect pseudo urbanization, pseudoregulation, degradation and deregulation which are inherited or a new urban matrix.. These are just some of the forms of the contamination of the urban-spatial residence,which trough the validated "2D-patent" and quasi-professional and unsustainable principles by which the "3D" = "2D" and vice versa[2], from the Industrial Revolution through the Bauhaus

---

[1] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2010), Moći zakonodavne i urbanističke kvazistručne terminologije, i vice versa: Peti parkić Beograd – Trotoari Sarajevo – Akademski park Beograd, *Izgradnja*, Godina LXIV, Broj 9-10., Beograd, pp. 553-570.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2009), Neprikladna stručna terminologija u knjigama i zakonskoj regulativi, *Izgradnja*, Godina LXII, Broj 3-4., Beograd, pp. 87-106.; www.pipaugs.org.rs

[2] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), (Ne)održivo „2D" planiranje struktura urbanog i predeonog pejzaža u uslovima klimatskih promena, *Zbornik radova „Budućnost razvoja naselja u svetlu klimatskih promena"*, Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB), Beograd, pp. 137-172.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2012), „2D" ili „3D" regulativa, planiranje i upravljanje urbanim i regionalnim prostorom, *Zbornik radova „Gradovi u XXI veku"*, Asocijacija prostornih planera Srbije,

to postmodern and post-industrial development, largely contributes to the proliferation of negative environmental heritage and the effects of 'greenhouse' phenomenon.

Unsustainable proselytizing of the highly built structures

Especially in the second half of the 20th century, such "2D" benchmarks sided an unsustainable , articulated and imposed primarily of the physical structures of the high built type over the landscape and low-built ones. Thus, for decades there is aconsequently affirmed perfectionism and the exclusivity of unilateral hierarchical highlighting of the high built physical structures and their supposedly exalted corresponding one-sided hierarchical evaluation or prose lytic typological classification and elevation in relation to landscape and low built physical structures.

In this way, high built buildings are reduced seemingly only to the real objects (objectusrealis), and in fact are unsustainably risen as particularly valuable (special) objects (objectusspecialis). And on the other hand, also planned, designed and built "3D" objects of landscape and low built construction (engineering)are boiled down to the invisible, non-existent and unreal objects (objectusirealis), and in fact are unsustainably debase and marginalized as less valuable, not important and even unknown "3D"objects (objectusincognitus). The results of such "2D"approach and observations, are especially harmful to the classification, evaluation, categorization and typology of "3D" structures, objects or landscapes and architectural artifacts, architecture, creativity, culture, arts and cultural park heritage.In addition, this type of negative effect, in onlyslightly less harmfully extended, and also expressed towards the low-built "3D" structures and facilities.

However, the forced up-to-date and well known proselytizing of the distinctive high built compared to low and landscape structures built in the physical structure of the city shows unequivocally unsustainable decades of marginalization of these two equally valuable and important subtypes of physical structures. This fact is the key reason why it is necessary to point out this unsustainable approach that has resulted from the current unsustainable "2D" typology of the structural urban-spatial residence. In fact, the matter in question is about a quasi-professionalapproach and evaluation, which only shows the existence of constructed buildings and other so-called unbuilt spaces. Because of this "2D" or quasi professional absurd, it is when "3D" plane becomes "2D" and vice versa, that the planned, designed and constructed physical ("3D") structures, exclusively from quasi professional reasons, are unfounded and untenably considered and treated as if they are "3D "objects, which is because they do not have walls, as they can't have the status of a physical unit, structure, or object[3].

Univerzitet u Beogradu – Geografski fakultet, Zlatibor, pp. 289-300.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Zbornik radova Zlatibor 2012 APPS.pdf – Adobe Reader

[3] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2012), Da li je planirani, projektovani i građeni park kulturno ili prirodno dobro, ili zelena površina, ili...?, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, Broj 9., Godina IV, Banjaluka, pp. 52-67.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), Neodržive pseudourbane posledice zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Glasnik Srpskog geografskog društva*, Sveska XCI, Broj 3., Beograd, pp. 117-138.; www.pipaugs.org.rs

Of course, according to the unsustainable "2D" typology of physical structures, the other so-called unoccupied areas supposedly are not objects. In fact, from the embedded, quasi professional and unsustainable "2D" basis, to the unsustainable and "2D" patented so-called category of the undeveloped area, the planned, designed and built physical structures are ignorantly and quasi professionally classified, also the objects or artifacts of the low built (engineering) and landscape construction, because of the way they are, without walls, and a conjuring and indefinitely canceling the third dimension. With this sort of untenable reduction of the "3D" object such as a Park or a Square to the "2D" and vice versa, also quasi professional "2D" understanding, evaluating, classifying of the planned, designed and constructed lowand landscape built physical structures of the other so-calledundeveloped areas, they are subsequently reduced to quasi professional denial of physical urban planning, and then untenably marginalize ecoreciprocity between causal subtypes of physical structures, objects or artifacts of high, low and landscape construction.

Marginalization of sustainable eco reciprocity

In relation to the fact that Le Korbizie in the Athens Charter of 1933. , indicates that the urban science one of three dimensions[4], it is clear that eco reciprocity between the three subtypes of physical structures in an urban or rural type of settlement, is essential for the sustainable structuring, survival and development of any type of human settlement[5]. This only indicates that the human settlement is actually relevant to the urban environmental structures where one resides as an individual and as a social being, and it is understandable that it has a strong and an essential environmental or organic dimension of human life, residence and activities. However, compared to the current problems of multiplying negative environmental heritage for which peoplesuffer in their settlements, we can say that it is obvious for decades, that the marginalization is unsustainable for its sustainable urban-spatial concept and context.

This infact is no accident, because after the industrial revolution and rapid urbanization, of the industrial and other cities, housing or dwelling places of the human community were observed as a mere means for accommodation and care of the population. This approach reduced the human settlement on the one-sided technical fix-functionalist structure, limiting its environmental or organic importance thus making it neglectedfor decades, which is in fact more or less reflect the occurrence of greenhouse phemoenon and its negative effects with the hints of cataclysmic indications. In this sense Kristirjan Norberg-Schulz (K. Norberg-Schulz) is reminiscent of Martin Heidegger, who, as a philosopher has a complex view of the problem of housing. Thus, understanding and following M. Heidegger, K. Norberg-Schulz points out that human settlement has an atmosphere[6]. Its just such an approach that emphasizes the means spiritual, professional, city building, eco preserving and life giving organization, refinement, design, ambientalisation, aestheticization and cultivating of every urban-spatial residence, because this is necessary for sustainable survival and development of each individual, group, local, and ultimately global community .

---

[4] Le Korbizie (1998), *Atinska povelja*, Klub mladih arhitekata, Beograd, pp. 102.
[5] Doksiadis Konstantinos (1982), *Čovek i grad*, Nolit, Beograd, pp. 94-97.
[6] Norberg-Šulc Kristijan (1990),), *Stanovanje*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, pp. 19.

The situationis no better when it comes to low built structures such as city squares, churchyards and churchfolk squares. Commenting on this occasion only to Belgrade, it is evident that, for example, that the New Belgrade missing at least one square, then also the Vračar plateau in Belgrade Patriarchy is missing ports and a square, more over, near the Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel at Prince Sima Marković street, near Kalemegdan is missing an archbishop port and a Church-people's Square, and also at the Tasmajdan near the St. Mark's Church parish lacks a port and a national church square and so on.

As mentioned, landscaping and low built physical structures with relations in urban-spatial integration, are undoubtedlycompatible and complementary physicaly morphological and typological architectural elements, in terms of urban chaos, evident in numerous Belgrade mikro ambients, they would significantly change and improve their previous modest appearance, image and memory. This would positively enrich, articulate and improve the current modest architectural and design identity, alsoenhance the ecoreciprocity between, low, high and landscapebuilt structures, and then the physical personality and capacity, and also the professional, cityscape building, spiritual and eco-urban solvency and legality of the missing landscape and low built structures within these mikroambients. Of course, the consequences would be reflected in the immediate and the nearest environment, and in a broader sense, the city itself, which directly or indirectly affects the quality of life of the urban space of local and wider urban-spatial community.

In that sence, it is understandable that such a "3D" approach that emphasizes the urban-spatial dimension of human settlement or residence on the principles of sustainable ecoreciprocity between high, low and landscape built structures, objects or artifacts, the backbone of the "3D" eco-urbanistic and eco-spatial planning of settlements and its gravitating environment[7]. Similarly to this, it is the inspiring and professional that points to the need to reaffirm the pre deductive concept and context of housing and urbanization in a pattern - from the apartment, and not where the modern inductive city buliders untenably start of with a special or individual part (i.e. from the apartment city), and do not reach the general urban-spatialinnings of the physical structures and volume[8]. This is evident with respect to sustainable archetypal relationship that is original, but also the future affirmative measure and the starting point for constructing urban-spatial residence, which is very much in terms of sustainable survival and development of the town (village) and the local urban community.

This approach and understanding of the city building problem has a clearly articulate identity, importance, complexity, user-friendliness and sustainability of the "3D" vision in the planning and management of the area, which, through the introduction and consistent affirmation of the "3D" education at the university level of education, and through the implementation and consistent application of sustainable "3D" principles and regulations, as well as the appropriate relationship of planning institutions, has importance and also how they can contribute to reducing negative environmental heritage at local and global levels. At the

---

[7] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), *Urbanizacija ili pseudourbanizacija*, Nasleđe, Broj 17., Godina VIII, Filološko-umetnički fakultet (FILUM) Kragujevac, Kragujevac, pp. 39-63.; www.pipaugs.org.rs

[8] Supek Rudi (1987), *Grad po mjeri čovjeka*, Naprijed, Zagreb, pp. 10.

beginning of the second decade of the 21st century, this is a significant improvement over the current outdated and unsustainable "2D" vision in the planning and management of the area. Thus it becomes evident that only such a "3D" eco-urbanistic concept and context of consistent application in the field of education, legislation and gradual correction of inherited architectural and urban planning errors, and then affirming sustainable urbanization and housing, can lead to visible progress in city buiding, thus reproducing or reducing negative environmental heritage. For the successful implementation of such a "3D" concept and context of education and knowledge, regulations and pragma in the field of planning, design and construction of the urban-spatial residence, the abandonmentof the outdated "2D" theory and pragma, and abandonment of harmful and unsustainable combining of the sustainable "3D" and unsustainable "2D" terminology.

In relacion with that, in connection with the current way of planning, design and construction of the uban-spatial residence, there has long been present an Einstein thought, that the problem can not be solved by the same mindset that created it. If, in this context, we don't realize that we are already on the "tipping point", it just shows us how much the current university education and planning institutions, with "2D" educated personnel, are not really aware of unforeseen hazards and damages that may result from the current unsustainable marginalization of sustainable "3D" eco-reciprocity between high, low and landscape built physical structures, objects or artifacts.

Quasi-professional"2D" paradigms and errors

Compared to the current outdated and unsustainable "2D" theory and practice of urban and spatial planning, this "3D" approach of research presents a valuable developmental progress. However, this is only a small step forward compared to the fact that the previous "2D" educational and publicity of other sorts in the 20th and 21 century in this area recognizes and affirms a structures built and the planned, designed and constructed lowand landscape built structures, objects and artifacts, through the "2D" plan of use the plane magicaly, quasi professionayl and unsustainably ranks, reduces and converts to other so-called built up, free, open spaces, so-called green areas, so-called natural areas and the others a like.

With this work, it is definitely easier to understand what is already a known rural and urban type of physical structure, which includes the causal structure of the three subtypes of imminent physical structures of the urban-spatial residence. However, with modern aspirations, endeavors and achievements in this context, it is still dominated by a problematic inconsistency in the current typology subtypesof landscape and low and high built physical structures that generates and still encourages pseudo-urbanisation and other forms of contamination of human settlements. This has greatly encouraged the current one-way and unsustainable proselytic uplifting and affirming only of the high built objects, which are, in the 21th century, still considered to be the only developed spaces and objects in the cities, and the only seemingly visible, recognizable, understandable and relevant physical structures, objects or artifacts.

On this decades-old "2D" approach and understanding of space management and planning of the same, certainly there are no influences by any scientific or technical reasons. This is

evident from the very context of understanding that the "2D" typology of physical structure is that which only applies to the "3D" building construction that has walls, is recognized and classifed in existing buildings and spaces. And conversely to that, the planned, designed and built "3D" objects of civil engineering and landscape constructions with no walls, quasi professional and unsustainable are recognized and classified as other so-called constructed, free and open spaces.

The backbone of such unsustainable typological division is "2D" land use plan without any profound opinions on urban plane as a whole[9], which has introduced and installed the current unsustainable marginalization and suppression of the third dimension for landscape and low built sub-types of physical structures. Of course, it's definitely clear and evident that the fundamental reason for such a relationship, is the fact that these two subtypes have their own walls. It is this unsustainable "2D" approach and understanding, in its entirety that is particularly prevalent in the high and landscape built, yet to a lesser extent in the low built physical structures, objects or artifacts. It surely and clearly indicates that in addition to high, there are also landscaping and low built subtypes, types, groups, and other forms of these structures, objects or artefacts which are causal, immanent, integrative, complementary and compatible structural elements of the urban-spatial residence (settlements).

The very fact that the planning, design and construction of these three essentially different, visible, and then causal/affective, conceptual and factual subtypes of physical structures in the city as an artificial volume, it is clear that each of these separate subtypes is a valuable part of these objects or artifacts, as a professional, cityscape building, lifegiving, and spiritual eco-making elements, with very specific architectural identity, then also forms, subjectivity and solvency, very directly involved in structuring, layout, landscape, memory and morphology of the urban-spatial residence. For all these reasons, it is evident that they are just as valuable subtypes of the physical structures, but also completely equal city building, structural and functional elements, who such as they are in a sustainable measure should, and consequently provide a better quality of life and other activities of the current urban communities in the built environment.

Of course, the current urbanization in "2D" theory and pragma to 20th century, subsequently created the foundation for ubiquitous unsustainable and untenable "2D" education in the field of land management, and urban and spatial planning. Then came the equally unsustainable, speculative "origination" of the "2D-patent" laws, regulations and the consequent pseudo-democracy, pseudo-urbanisation, pseudo-regulation and deregulation of the space and social communities[10]. So came the one-sided and untenably strengthened and advanced legal and illegal hegemony of (qustioning) capital, and then the dominance of profiteer seeking investor's interest in urban planing, corporatocracy and corruption. Its these, many, varied and complex forms of quasi-professional contamination of the urban-spatial residences and life dwelling habitats that in their own way during the second half of the 20th century, more or

---

[9] Radović Ranko (2009), *Forma grada*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, pp. 3.

[10] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB), Beograd, pp. 137-172.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011v), Pseudourbanizacija kao posledica zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Tehnika*, Broj 65 (2011) 1., Godina LXVI, Beograd, pp. 27-34.; www.pipaugs.org.rs

less contributed to the enormous multiplication of negative environmental heritage and negative effects of the greenhouse phenomenon, due to which we all are suffering today.

In acordance with that, it was not hard to spot and detect problems that magically led to enormous production speculative of the "2D-patent", which has largely been a speculative affirmation of the principle of combinatorics of the quai-professional and unsustainable form of the "3D" = "2D" patent and vice versa. All this, again, at the end of the 20th and early 21 century caused a definite crisis in the making of the "3D" planning and urban and regional planning documents. And under the pressures from the hegemony of capital, profiteering and corrupt asserted the investor-urban lobbies and corporatocracy, and thus especially the advanced quasi professional reduction and interpretation of the landscape and low and high built physical structures into other so-called built up, free and open spaces, so-called green areas, so-called natural areas and the others a like[11].

This decades-long quasi professional seizure of the third dimension through speculative inforcement of the "2D-patents" have resulted in conversion of the necessary pseudo-urban thickening of the inherited urban substrate. So it's no wonder that the "2D" education, and then these publications, regulations, documentation, planning and management of land don't permit occupants. Such is also the example of this year's event and the residents centar which escalated in February in the year 2013[12], as planning and zoning documents are not consistent in planning of the eco reciprocity between high, low and landscape built structures, and consequently neither applicable nor sustainable for the local urban community. In this context, the users of the space as the laity especially noted and emphasized by the speculative urban planning and demagoguery and manipulation in connection with the planning and lump-called change of purpose of the so-caled green spaces, and in the cause-effect sense of such planning, the urban documentation can't be professional or cityscape building, or eco-making or life-dwelling.

Conclusion

From all these reasons presented in summary, this study compared the theoretical and pragmatic importance of the "3D" space planning, then "3D" aspirations, endeavors, achievements and knowledge, as well as a viable initiation and fundamental basis for sustainable "3D" typological classification and systematization of already marginalized, but still visible and identified subtypes of the landscape and low and high builtphysical structures and objects, even if they have no walls. And that inevitably builds sustainable land management and sustainable development of the urban-spatial residences.

Thus, we finally reached the "turning point" which starts with a brand new or thoughout "3D" stage in eco-urban and eco-spatial planning and space management. Of course, in this context, it is particularly necessary to articulate and promote a sustainable "3D" principle: that there

---

[11] Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2010), Održiva urbanizacija i neodrživa pseudourbanizacija, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, Broj 04, Godina II, Zavod za izgradnju a.d. Banja Luka, Republika Srpska, Banjaluka, pp. 28-38. ; www.pipaugs.org.rs

[12] J.V. – I.P. (2013), Još jedan protest vlasnika parcela na Zvezdari – Mirijevci ne daju zemlju, *Večernje novosti*, Beograd 06. 02. 2013., www.novosti.rs

are and exsist only equally valuable subtypes of high, low, and landscape built "3D" structures, objects or artefacts which are causal and important constituent elements for constructing a comprehensive physical structure of he urban-spatial residence.

Also, in this regard there should be a reestablished and important and an only viable "3D" principle: that the planned, designed and built lowarchitectural and landscape and architectural "3D" works or artifacts, in the conceptual and factual sense, are undeniably by themsleves, made structures, although they have no walls, just as they are undeniably built buildings and artifacts that have walls.

Only in such a sustainable "3D" basics that are visible to the eyes, lays an important qualitative difference and substantial progress of the "3D" eco-urban oreco-spatial planning compared to the previous "2D" knowledge and achievements in the field of obsolete and unsustainable "2D" quasi professional typological systematization and classification of physical structures through the constructed high-rise buildings and other so-called undeveloped areas. After the presentation of these "3D" facts on unsustainable obliteration and a magical way of reversal of the seizure of the third dimension or a physicality of the low and landscape buildings, it is not difficult to realize and understand that such a one-sided, outdated and quasi professional "2D" typology which literally falsely implies, involves and speculatively interprets itself as a landscape and low-built buildings or other so-called constructed, free and open spaces, are not objects of subtypes of physical structures, and not relevant "3D" elements of the urban-spatial residence.

Based on these intersectingfacts presented Tošković's diagnosis in the current planning area is located at the transition between two-dimensional and three-dimensional[13], and Radović's diagnosis, which statesthat thedimentional urbanismbrought into question the legitimacy of any natural urban planning, and it is evident that the so-called land usage plan without any objective consideration and profound opinions on the urban area as a whole, isn't and can not be the most important planning document for the city, not to mentionanything about the "zoning"[14].

Now it is much more visible and easily understandable, the importance of identical, consistent and sustainable typological "3D" classification, categorization, systematization, and then just as valuable affirmation of cause and effect relation, then the architectural-urban and socio-spatial relationship between, low and high built of natural landscape structures and facilities of the urban-spatial residence as the only sustainable form of human settlement. In this sense, it highlights the importance of the restoration of sustainable eco-reciposity, which indicates that there can not be any proselytizing or hierarchical grading of poselistic special significance of one form or subtype of the structural damage to the second or third, and vice versa. This sustainable approach and attitude towards the understanding, classification and systematization towards only the visible landscape, low and high built urban-spatial physical structure is definitely deeply inspiring, and the only viable professional "3D" starting point

---

[13] Tošković Dobrivoje (2006), *Uvod u prostorno i urbanističko planiranje*, Akademska misao, Beograd, pp. 68.
[14] Radović, Ranko (2009), Ibid, pp. 3.

and the paradigm for the recognition and affirmation of the essential physical, morphological, functional and environmental and architectural and urban values in structuring sustainable urban-spatial residences, and sustainable development of the "3D" eco-urban and eco-spatial planning and "3D" space management.

All this implies to the real causes and nessesities, that on the one hand we are reminded of the essential theoretical and pragmatic value of an integrated "3D" eco-urban and eco-spatial planning and "3D" space management, and on the other hand to stimulate discussion, reflection and rethinking of its contemporary and sustainable attributes, the affirmation and implementation when it comes to sustainable eco reciprocity between high, low and landscape built physical structures.

Quite appropriate, understandable, then summarized and much more detaled information and current periodicals in this regard, can be viewed on the Internet at website: www.pipaugs.org.rs.

References

1. Doksiadis Konstantinos (1982), *Čovek i grad*, Nolit, Beograd.
2. J.V. – I.P. (2013), Još jedan protest vlasnika parcela na Zvezdari – Mirijevci ne daju zemlju, *Večernje novosti*, Beograd 06. 02. 2013., www.novosti.rs
3. Le Korbizie (1998), *Atinska povelja*, Klub mladih arhitekata, Beograd.
4. Norberg-Šulc Kristijan (1990),), *Stanovanje*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd.
5. Radović Ranko (2009), *Forma grada*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd.
6. Supek Rudi (1987), *Grad po mjeri čovjeka*, Naprijed, Zagreb.
7. Tošković Dobrivoje (2006), *Uvod u prostorno i urbanističko planiranje*, Akademska misao, Beograd.
8. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2012), „2D“ ili „3D“ regulativa, planiranje i upravljanje urbanim i regionalnim prostorom, *Zbornik radova „Gradovi u XXI veku“*, Asocijacija prostornih planera Srbije, Univerzitet u Beogradu – Geografski fakultet, Zlatibor.; www.pipaugs.org.rs ; Zbornik radova Zlatibor 2012 APPS.pdf – Adobe Reader
9. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2012), Da li je planirani, projektovani i građeni park kulturno ili prirodno dobro, ili zelena površina, ili...?, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, Broj 9., Godina IV, Banjaluka.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
10. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), Neodržive pseudourbane posledice zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Glasnik Srpskog geografskog društva*, Sveska XCI, Broj 3., Beograd.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
11. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), (Ne)održivo „2D“ planiranje struktura urbanog i predeonog pejzaža u uslovima klimatskih promena, *Zbornik radova „Budućnost razvoja naselja u svetlu klimatskih promena“*, Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB), Beograd.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
12. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), *Urbanizacija ili pseudourbanizacija*, Nasleđe, Broj 17., Godina VIII, Filološko-umetnički fakultet (FILUM) Kragujevac, Kragujevac.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
13. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2011), Pseudourbanizacija kao posledica zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Tehnika*, Broj 65 (2011) 1., Godina LXVI, Beograd.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
14. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2010), Održiva urbanizacija i neodrživa pseudourbanizacija, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, Broj 04, Godina II, Zavod za izgradnju a.d. Banja Luka, Republika Srpska, Banjaluka.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
15. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2010), Moći zakonodavne i urbanističke kvazistručne terminologije, i vice versa: Peti parkić Beograd – Trotoari Sarajevo – Akademski park Beograd, *Izgradnja*, Godina LXIV, Broj 9-10., Beograd.; www.pipaugs.org.rs
16. Ćerimović Lj. Velimir (2009), Neprikladna stručna terminologija u knjigama i zakonskoj regulativi, *Izgradnja*, Godina LXII, Broj 3-4., Beograd.; www.pipaugs.org.rs