

DECADE OF THE NEW CHARTER OF ATHENS AND UNSUSTAINABLE 2D VISIONS OF CITIES

VELIMIR LJ. CERIMOVIĆ^{1*}

¹University Union – Nikola Tesla, , The Faculty of Architecture, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract: This 2013 marks a decade of unsustainable 2D combinatorics and 3D visions of 21st century cities sublimation by the New Charter of Athens created in 2003. This is a good occasion to review some of its outdated and unsustainable 2D principles, the ones that have failed for entire decade to create better cities of tomorrow and are now far away from achieving it. The problem is seen in the fact that the New Charter of Athens, through unsustainable implementation of the outdated 2D terminology, sees the physical structure of a city in a proselytical and unsustainable way and accepts only high-built objects or artifacts, regarding them to be only built space and structures since they do possess walls. Therefore, the so-called visionary charter perceives the vision of the European cities of the 21st century, and the implementation of 2D terminology and 2D quasy-knowledge shows its unawareness of the fact that apart from social (local) communities and high-built physical structures, cities consist of two more types of physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts having no walls. That is why its 3D vision has not been completed yet, ever since the day it was adopted in 2003, because it does not perceive and recognize low and landscape built 3D objects and artifacts. Moreover, it regards them to be the so-called non-built, the so-called free, the so-called open space. Therefore, it is certainly not unusual to note that the charter does not even mention a significant eco-reciprocity and eco-urban continuity between immanent, integrative, compatible and complementary high, low and landscape built objects or artifacts within the physical structure of cities.

Key words: New Charter of Athens; 2D vision of cities; high, low and landscape built objects; physical city structure

Introduction

Planning and urban restructuring in the European Union countries and other countries as well, are based on the European Charter of Town, known as the New Athens Charter (hereinafter: NAC: 2010, 9-37). It was adopted on November 20th 2003 in Lisbon. The principles and main guiding ideas were made by the Council of European Urbanism (hereinafter CEU), regarding the chart to be a visionary one. It is surprising that the European urbanists and planners, even Serbian ones, see the Charter as a representative model for better future of the 21st century cities.

Thus, these supreme European institutions, with the highest professional (expert?) and political level of management and decision making in the European Union, point out and define their political goals regarding city planning and territorial organization of the 21st

^{1*} cervel@sbb.rs

century European cities, which is ostensibly aimed at sustainable space management and better future for all the cities and regions. As for this, CEU points out the needs of social, economic and territorial cohesion that serves as the base for spatial dimensions of sustainable management.



Fig. 1. The New Charter of Athens

It would be perfect if it were not for its obvious pretentiousness, which is the result of unsustainable implementation of outdated 2D knowledge and 2D terminology (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2009a, 87-106; 2010a : 553-570; 2006a : 133-146). In other words – it deals with the physical structure of cities in a proselytical way, recognizes only high built structures or artifacts and regards them to be the only built objects and space. This might be explained by the fact that only high-built structures or artifacts have walls, unlike all other low and landscape built types of objects or artifacts.

As for this 2D method, it is clear that the Charter fails to see that a city, apart from social (local) communities and high built physical structures, includes two more relevant, integrative, compatible and complementary types of physical 3D structures, objects or artifacts that have neither walls nor capacities of high built objects.

Such oversight or quasy-expert ignoring those visible and relevant facts, leads to numerous questions demanding proper answers. Some of them are: how can we regard the NAC to be modern and recommended professional and scientific model of the so-called better vision of the 21st century European cities, if it is clear that NAC implies the outdated 2D principles and 2D terminology?

Furthermore, is it possible to define this European Charter of Town as visionary if it deals with the physical city structure one-sidedly, recognizing nothing but high built objects or artifacts, and failing to see that the physical city structure includes low and landscape built physical (3D) structures, objects and artifacts as well? Also, what are the scientific and expert principles saying that only high-built objects represent the built physical (3D) structures? What are the principles included in the definition saying that only low and landscape built objects are to be regarded as the so-called non-built, the so-called green or non-colored areas? What is the base of the quasy-expert ignoring the fact that the planned and designed low and landscape built physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts do not have physicality, as in the case of high-built ones?

Also, what is the principle by which low and landscape built structures, objects or artifacts are defined, described and analyzed as the so-called non-built, the so-called free, the so-called open areas, the so-called green zone, the so-called green areas, the so-called greenery, the so-called natural surroundings and so on, or in other words – everything and nothing at all, everything and anything but what it really is in both conceptual and factual

sense? Similarly, what is the principle by which low and landscape-built physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts are not equally valuable and significant in the process of forming physical (3D) structure of physicality of a city, as well as architectural and cultural identity, physical subjectivity and capacity, eco-reciprocity, eco-urban continuity, solvency, legality, urban environmental image, memory, landscape and morphology?

These endless questions have no proper, visible and reasonable answer provided by NAC and it is obvious that the architects, urbanists, planners and landscape architects in Serbia, Europe and the rest of the world are facing enormous professional and scientific challenges, since they are still between the unsustainable 2D and sustainable 3D design (Toskovic, D.: 2006, 68) and space management (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2012a, 289-300). This unsustainable condition is based on the outdated and counter-productive 2D education, 2D principles, 2D terminology, 2D bibliography, 2D documents, 2D decisions, 2D suggestions, etc. Those are basic reasons that affect the established pseudo-urbanization of cities, consequential increase of negative ecological heritage and negative green-house effects (Cerimovic, Lj.V. and Vetmic, M. : 2008, 233-247; Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2007, 183-189).

Also, the mentioned questions without proper answers, along with many other questions as well, show that not even multi-disciplinary structures of workmen, either individuals or team-players taking part in the process of unsustainable combinations of 2D and 3D theories and urban-spatial design pragma, have not yet dealt with numerous scientific and professional challenges, temptations and relevant field-forming, city-forming, eco-forming and life-forming issues that are significant for the local community development, urban environmental habitats and bio-diversity survival, although they do have a responsible task regarding the creation of healthy and sustainable living conditions throughout the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century. It is particularly evident when it comes to establishing a relevant, needed and sustainable eco-reciprocity and urban environmental continuity of physical structures that represent and reflect a sustainable level of balanced capacities between high, low and landscape-built physical structures, objects or artifacts within urban-environmental habitat, being a sustainable city-construction ambient for every local community.

As for the above-mentioned facts, the complexity of ekistics dimension of city-construction and spatial issues (Doxiades, K. : 1982, 27-47) clearly shows the way 2D urban and regional design is limited to outdated and unsustainable 2D education, 2D terminology, 2D regulation and consequentially 2D land use planning without the third dimension and detailed analysis about space itself. In this way, 2D urban planners reduced the physical form and dimensions of cities to 2D principles, one of which was 'location' and distribution of certain contexts within functional-traffic way and the other one was arbitrary 'visual playing' around with the images of formalized settlement plans (Radovic, R. : 2009, 3).

Certainly, this virtual 2D land-use planning, which is the legacy of the outdated 2D heritage coming from 'dimensional', 'compositional', 'technical' and 'sectoral' urbanism, is still the most significant 2D base (document) used for city planning. All these reasons explain why 2D city planning neglects a creative activity. Similarly, spatial planning is lost in 2D theoretical research, and 3D analysis of the problem issue is almost no longer in use (Doxiades, K. : 1982, 25). All these reasons provide sufficient insight into the principles explaining why NCA, 2D city and regional planning as well as modern architecture have not

yet succeeded in creating better 21st century cities, or in other words – they are still participating in increasing negative ecological heritage and negative green-house effects.

ECU and ASU orientation based on unsustainable 2D principles

However, although it is about the new European charter made at the beginning of the 21st century, it can almost be defined as outdated and not a city-forming, life-forming and sustainable one, taking into consideration the scientific and professional aspects of its principles, adoption, promotion and a decade long implementation. The fact that it is not life-forming can be confirmed by saying that we still do not live in better, ‘harmonized’ cities (NCA: 2010, 11), and unsustainable 2D city planning, instead of sustainable 3D eco-urban planning, together with consequential pseudo-urbanization and increasing of negative ecological heritage are increasingly generating negative green-house effects on local and global level (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2010a, 553-570; Milosevic, V.P. and Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2010, 47-70). It means that we are still facing the consequences of decades-long faults in the field of city construction, which was originally based on 2D theories and pragma, and today it is based on unsustainable combination of 2D and 3D theories and pragma regarding planning and space management (Cerimovic, Lj, V. : 2012a, 289-300; 2011 : 117-138).

Based on the proclaimed part of 2D ecological principles in NCA from 2003, in artificial surroundings, instead of planned, designed and built 3D objects and artifacts of landscape-architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2008b, 293-326; 2012b : 52-67), there is an unsustainable emphasis and accent on establishing the so-called natural areas. Still, an obvious fact is being neglected here – natural areas, natural resources and processes cannot be planned, designed and built. Therefore, it is about the God-given or God’s creation dominated and ruled by natural processes, unlike any planned, designed and built urban habitat that is an artificial creation comprising the three mentioned types of city construction physical 3D structures, objects or artifacts (high, low and landscape) as well as urban processes. It means that natural processes and natural products are not the same as urban creation and processes and vice versa.

Also, as for the environmental field, it magically stresses virtual and suggests the so-called free and the so-called open space and the so-called green urban zone, which clearly means that it does not regard parks and landscape to be included in art or landscape architectural formation and creation, just like the principles of Bauhaus were at the beginning of the 20th century (Obad Scitaroci, M. : 1992, 153).

Although Le Corbusier pointed out in the 1933 Charter of Athens that urbanism is the science consisting of three dimensions (Le Corbusier: 1998, 102), it seems that the Charter of Athens, at the beginning of the 21st century, due to the mentioned misapprehension of Bauhaus and other Modern theorists, is still taking away the third dimension, creative, architectural, cultural, spiritual and functional identity, physical subjectivity and capacity, eco-urban legality and solvency from landscape built physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts.

Also, another fact is being neglected as well: apart from high and low built structures, there are landscape physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts, instead of the so-called open, the so-called free, the so-called non-built space or the so-called green areas

or speculative open, speculative free and speculative non-built so-called areas. Also, ever since the second part of the 20th century, causal and sustainable eco-reciprocity between intriguing, complex and multi-layered social factor as well as high, low and landscape built physical structures have been ignored and marginalized, which led to predominance of high built objects within urban settlements, to the detriment of landscape built structures and low-built structures, objects or artifacts. It all diminished creativity and it is not unusual to see that regional planning lost itself in theoretical research, and ekistics approach is almost no longer in use (Doxiades, K. : 1982, 25-31; Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2012v, 523-529; 2011a : 137-172).

Also, the European NCA is outdated, which is seen in its principles based on 2D regulations and outdated 2D urban doctrines. This is obvious in all the segments dealing with urban surroundings (NCA: 2010, 19), the so-called free (NCA: 2010, 20), the so-called open (NCA: 2010, 21) and the so-called non-built space, instead of 3D landscape – architectural – urban and city-forming micro-ambiences, structures, objects and artifacts. Such decades long quasi-professional 2D terminology uses 2D solutions and unsustainable 2D tractates about non-existent nature within artificial surroundings and equates designed, planned and built structures, objects or artifacts of landscape-architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage with natural resources (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2011, 117-138; 2011 : 39-63).

Thus, we approach the unsustainable 2D theories and pragma leading to unbelievable absurdity saying that natural resources and natural processes, i.e. God-given natural creation, can be planned, designed and built within construction environment. Such quasi-professional inconsequence neglects a significant fact – artificial surroundings is dominated by urban products and urban processes and capacities are possible to be built, planned and designed (Cerimovic, Lj. V. : 2011, 27-34). Therefore, the planned, designed and built parks and other landscape – urban structures, objects or artifacts are not and cannot be natural resources because their inorganic and organic contents and types are planned, designed and built in architectural – urban 3D objects and artifacts having landscape, architectural, creative and cultural identity, urban and functional significance, position and role, physical subjectivity, urban legality and artificial and urban-environmental and ecological solvency and capacity (Cerimovic Lj. V. : 2010, 28-38).

Such unfounded and expert reliance on 2D urban doctrines and consequential affirmation of speculative terminology, legislation and regulation, especially regarding such an important document made and recommended by superior Council for the European Urbanists (CEU), and adopted and recommended by the countries – members and political institutions of the European Union, shows their lack of knowledge and consequential (un)conscious ignorance and marginalization of physical (3D) structures of objects and artifacts of landscape-architectural construction, culture, creation, art and culture-park heritage (Cerimovic Lj.V.: 2010b, 297-309; 2009b : 188-205).

Having translated it into Serbian in 2010 on the occasion of their 55th anniversary, the Association of Serbian Urbanists (ASU) failed to perceive and understand its absurd and unsustainable mistakes and even recommended this European Charter of Town to those looking for some new future methods. According to the editor of the Association of Serbian Urbanists, NCA is an inspiration, idea, meaning that apart from the European urbanists, Serbian urbanists ‘gained the opportunity to do something.’ And what is that ‘something’? It

seems that unsustainable combination of 2D and 3D terminology in this Charter leads to the following conclusion: it is inconsistent, rather than consistent, i.e. unsustainable rather than sustainable town.

Still, ASU ‘recommends this Charter to its members, in order to promote it, realize and even surpass’ (NCA: 2010, Introduction). Certainly, the promotion of 2D principles and 2D patents from this quotation is not acceptable, the only acceptable part is the word ‘surpass’. It can be achieved by rejecting unsustainable 2D derivatives, unsustainable 2D planning-urban notions and vague conceptual guidelines, in favor of 3D theories, education, terminology, regulation, bibliography and pragma (Cerimovic, Lj.V: 2012b, 52-67) regarding this paper segments.

Why should one think when they could follow the European urbanists

Taking the above mentioned text into consideration, it can be concluded that the Serbian urbanists agree with the European urbanists and their unsustainable 2D visions of the 21st century cities. It also turns out that they are not familiar with the issue, that they have for decades ignored and marginalized the structures, objects and artifacts of landscape architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage of both Serbia and Europe. This is a proper example of how the European creators and the Serbian followers and protagonists of this Charter have expressed ardent belief in 2D principles hidden by 2D education, 2D terminology, 2D legislative, 2D regulative, and so on, in order to promote quasy-professional knowledge about speculative and mimicry 2D patents, such as the so-called non-built, the so-called open, the so-called free space and the so-called green (speculative) areas, instead of the knowledge about 3D structures, objects or artifacts of landscape architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage.

Still, Europe is familiar with the masterpieces of landscape architectural construction (Versailles, Schonbrunn, Nymphenburg, Het Lol...) but the Serbian urbanists, landscape architects, planners and architects, along with speculative, mimicry, unsustainable and established 2D patents (but not competent workers dealing with natural resources and culture protection) fail to recognize the works and achievements of culture-park heritage as well as culture, creation, art, landscape architectural construction of Serbia (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2009v, 142-163). When it comes to the planned, designed and built objects of landscape architecture construction of Serbia, such as: the Pioneer Park and Academic Park in Belgrade, Patriarchal palace garden in Sremski Karlovci (Nature Protection: 1991, 148; Protection of natural resources, Belgrade, 2008: 70-77; Milanovic, H.: 2006, 150-171), they ignore and diminish their planning, designing, constructional and physical dimension, as well as urban and cultural processes dominating them.

In this way, they fail to see urban process in a city, being an artificial system or urban environmental habitat, but make up some natural process that are non-existent, that are not planned, not built and not designed (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2012v, 523-529). Hidden under the quasy-expert theses and 2D terminology, the planned, designed and built physical 3D structures of culture-park heritage and other physical units and landscape architecture entities are unsustainably treated, protected and regarded to be natural resources (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2012b, 52-67; 2012g : 66-71).

Regarding the facts about 2D approach, status and marginalization of structures, objects and artifacts of landscape architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage of Serbia, as well as 2D visions of the same ones, the so-called open, the so-called free, the so-called non-built (speculative) space through current Serbian 2D theory and practice of urban and spatial planning, it is clear why 2D urbanists of Serbia recognize, support and promote NCA (2003) and its unsustainable 2D concepts, as ostensibly futuristic recommendations and vision of the 21st century towns.

This is a simple acceptance and adoption of the Charter itself, without analysis or checking any presented fact. The Charter is said to be thoroughly designed and filtered and adopted by highest levels of political and scientific institutions, organizations and associations in the European Union and many people consider it to be a stable, proven and unquestionably valuable document, a recommended obligation. It seems that those who a priori accepted and understood the Charter wanted to say: why think at all, or they just wanted to indirectly free themselves or even considered themselves incompetent to evaluate and analyze it from the scientific point of view. In this way, all the needs to create a thorough analysis about typology of physical structures and space, as well as sustainable eco-3D reciprocity between three relevant types of physical structures, objects or artifacts in the physical structures of cities, turned out to be marginalized and ignored. Such approach led to a quasi-expert, virtual and unsustainable 2D land use plan that has been suppressing for decades, before and after 2003, the third dimension of low and landscape built objects and artifacts and that is still the most significant base (document) of city planning.

There is nothing surprising in the fact that before and after 2003, the young Master students of the faculties of Architecture and Urbanism allegedly studied the synergy programs of open (read the so-called non-built and speculative) and closed space (Culibrk-Medic, K., Bandic A., Miljus, I.: 2010, 65-68). These 2D educational programs offered at state universities of urbanism, architecture and landscape architecture in Serbia, include the elimination of the third dimension of low and landscape built architectural structures or their two-dimensional degradation, promoting the idea saying that 2D = 3D and vice versa (Cerimovic, Lj.V: 2009a, 87-106; 2006a : 161-168), that low and landscape designed, planned and built physical (3D) structures represent the so-called non-built and the so-called open space, the so-called surface, etc. However, there is not a single fact explaining the way an empty space is designed. Or, is everybody familiar with the expert principles of construction area design, when it turns out everybody possesses quasi-expert knowledge about green area design, instead of 3D objects of parks, gardens, squares...?

Le Corbusier pointed out in the Charter of Athens in 1933 (Le Corbusier: 1998, 102) that 'urbanism is the science consisting of three dimensions, not two.' Still, the New Charter of Athens (2003) recognizes the combination of unsustainable 2D and sustainable 3D terminology. Unfortunately, such contradictory issue of unsustainable combination, maybe even 'free interpretation', is rather obvious and degrading when it comes to the mentioned Le Corbusier Charter, which confirms the domination of 2D principles and consequential 2D patents, being virtual products degrading its real quality, solvency and mission.

In this way, low built 3D structures and units, especially landscape built physical (3D) structures, objects or artifacts, are slightly left without the third dimension or physicality. Therefore, it can be said that it is about unsustainable integration and promotion of 2D education, 2D principles and unsustainable 2D space management and design, as well

as unsustainable 2D theories and pragma, which contribute to unsustainable affirmation of a virtual 2D concept and interpretation when necessary, or even unsustainable interpretation performed by individual interests of various corruptive and political establishment profiteers.

Typology of landscape and low-built 3D objects, their physical subjectivity and capacity, eco-urban solvency and legality, is eliminated in that way, which leads to implementation of speculative concepts, interests and opportunities. As for the Serbian relations, such was the old (47/2003) and today the new law on planning and construction (72/2009). It affirms 2D anti-system of the so-called green areas, as well as the planned, designed and built park in the Article 2, paragraph 6, being defined as the public use space. Also, this law still prefers 2D land use plan and that is why it does not recognize and it also marginalizes the existence of the landscape and low built physical 3D structures or objects.

Therefore, from the scientific point of view, the creators of this NCA failed to elevate themselves above the outdated 2D knowledge and theories and they were not able to make a certain needed distance of the outdated and obsolete unsustainable principles that are the result of 2D education, 2D terminology, literature, legislative, regulation and pragma. Thus, considering the mentioned reasons, especially the title Connection with Ecology (NCA: 2010, 19-21) through unsustainable implementation of comprehensible and broad, speculative and vague concepts that apply the quasy-expert patent $2D = 3D$ and vice versa, the third dimension of the objects of landscape-architectural construction is suppressed and ‘the vision of the 21st century cities’ is allegedly predicted, created and analyzed.

It is specially obvious and risky when it comes to eco-reciprocity between high, low and landscape built physical structures within urban environmental habitat or settlement. Therefore, the entire NCA, as well as consequential legislative and regulation, marginalize and unsustainably adopt, promote and initiate virtual 2D knowledge and terminology, which forces and provokes speculative planning-urban 2D patents, the ones that are already affirming the hegemony of investor’s urbanism, capital and corporatocracy within the Serbian relations, and unquestionably contaminate, pseudo-urbanize and deregulate any urban habitat and local community. Everybody is familiar with such examples, like ‘The Fifth Park’ in Zvezdara, shopping mall Usce in New Belgrade and many other examples (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2011b, 267-279; 2010g : 300-309; 2003 : 75-80).

Terminological inconsistency of the Chart

These presented problems reveal the fact that 2D visions of the NCA of Towns (2003) failed to reach its expected complexity, quality and solvency of positive effects. That is why it can be said that there are numerous reasons explaining why it does not recognize the objects of landscape and why it has ignored and suppressed, for the whole decade (2003 – 2013), the third dimension of structures and artifacts of landscape-architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2009a, 87-106; 2008v : 111-122).

Therefore, it implies and supports the outdated quasy-expert and consequential speculative combination of 2D and 3D terminology. In this way, a quasy-expert and unsustainable planning-urban 2D patent $2D = 3D$ and vice versa is stimulated, recommended, encouraged and carried out. Also, it leads to absurdity and collapse of city-

forming, eco-forming, life-forming and urban-environmental solvency and capacity and it affirms corruption and profiteering environment, as well as pseudo-democracy, pseudo-regulation and other forms of contamination of each urban-environmental habitat (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2012a, 289-300). These are basic problems to be dealt with and they have negative effects on affirmation and implementation of knowledge and pragma of 3D eco-urban design, as well as needed and sustainable eco-urban continuity and a decades long ignoring eco-reciprocity between high, low and landscape built physical 3D structures or units. Thus, the first decade of the 21st century deals with the issue of sustainable 3D structuring of urban environmental habitat, sustainable eco-urban capacity and solvency and sustainable development and survival of local communities.

Taking the above mentioned facts into consideration, it is not difficult to realize and consider this Chart to be terminologically inconsistent, due to unsustainable combination of unsustainable 2D and sustainable 3D terminology. Also, it is one-sidedly hierarchically directed and defined, since it points out and accentuates, recognizes, articulates and separates nothing but 3D objects, forms and artifacts of high built construction, as the only built ones, and in a hierarchical sense the most significant existing units when it comes to physical structure of settlements. Besides, it is also incoherent because it ignores the current condition of the obvious facts and fails to regard a settlement, being an artificial structure and relevant urban-environmental habitat, as a planned, designed and built unit based on eco-reciprocity principles between social structures, high, low and landscape built physical (3D) structures. Thus, the planned, designed and built landscape-urban units are not at all natural resources, but architecturally structures and cultured urban objects and 3D landscape-architectural systems, products and units that are certainly not the so-called non-built or non-existing units, and especially they are not the so-called emptiness within a physical city structure (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2009a, 87-106; 2012b : 52-67).

Besides, it is obvious that landscape built structures, objects or artifacts represent cultivated landscapes, architectural and urban structures and forms, as well as organic, functional and spatial relations with direct landscape surroundings. Such landscape-urban structures represent a creative 3D landscape-construction wholeness, which is integrative, compatible and complementary part of 3D system of urban-environmental, i.e. landscape architectural urban physical structures and it also creates and enables a subtle landscape-architectural and cultural-urban connection and striving for gravitating landscape surroundings (Cerimovic, Lj.V. : 2010a, 553-570).

In holistic sense, it means that 'pure nature' is something that is very rare and that human activities have already 'invaded' it, making it more or less changed in comparison to the original God-given form. It means that purity or the existence of original nature is rather rare and usually unattainable category in the 21st century. Dioxides clearly stated that urban-environmental habitat changes natural processes and flows and that original nature of its genius loci turns into artificial ambience (Dioxides, K.: 1982, 41-42), i.e. artificial creation.

Certainly, it is clear that it is not possible to 'establish natural areas in cities' under such conditions (NCA: 2010, 19), as written in the Charter. Not only it is not possible, it also does not mean returning to the original condition or setting 'clean nature' that would resemble the original nature, connected to the given genius loci.

Still, genius loci is always accepted and respected as an inherited spatial value and natural ability of terrain and climate (spatial resource). However, human activities regarding

planning, designing, building and remodeling the parts of urban agglomeration within the given genius loci, transformation processes of the original natural heritage into urban or agglomerative substrate are constantly progressing, rather aggressively, leading to formation, cultivation, articulation and defining of artificial processes and structure of urban environmental habitat.

Thus, when it comes to the Charter and dealing with natural areas in cities, there is only the subtitle “Nature, surroundings and free city areas” revealing that it is about using targets and money language or unsustainable 2D terminology. Namely, the following text of the quoted subtitle explains that it is about parks, squares and other (NCA: 2010, 20) so-called open areas, instead of planned, designed or built low-construction and landscape-architectural physical 3D structures.

Also, terminological incoherence and unsustainable 2D and 3D terminology is obvious in saying that urbanism will be the measure for creating the so-called open space (NCA: 2010, 20-21) ‘which makes urban tissue connected’, instead of noting that 3D eco-urban design of cities as urban environmental habitat provides sustainable eco-reciprocity between integrative, compatible and complementary high, low and landscape built physical 3D structures. Only in this way it is possible to provide sustainable urban-forming, life-forming, harmonized functional, architectural, landscape and eco-urban identity, subjectivity, capacity, solvency and legality of significant and valuable high, low and landscape built physical 3D structures within inherited and new-built urban substrate.

Green color is not a structural element in the physical city structure

Previous research, numerous analyses and published scientific works of this paper’s author reveal that unsustainable 2D education led to unsustainable 2D terminology, 2D legislative and regulation, 2D bibliographic units, especially 2D theory and pragma, 2D documents, 2D decisions, 2D recommendations and 2D opinions (Cerimovic, Lj.V: 2010v, 28-38; 2006a : 133-146; 1994 : 79-82), which was made by 2D staff to be powerful, one-sided and speculative, contaminating critical mass of 2D pseudo-expert and quasy-professional waste. It leads to decades long negative ecological heritage that consequentially provokes contamination on local level and still creates diseased human settlements, while at the same, on global level, pollutes environment. Thus, it is expected to see the increase of speculative and unsustainable 2D faults, because of which the planned, designed and built 3D structures and objects of landscape-architectural construction, creation, art and culture-park heritage, only because of phenophasis of green color, are considered to be the so-called greenery that is almost always deserted and left forever (Radovic, R.: 2009, 4), having not a single one characteristic of parks or gardens (Pegan, S: 2007, 14), i.e. the so-called green zones (NCA: 2010, 20), which are always yellow or brownish in autumn (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2010a, 553-570; 2012b : 52-67).

When it comes to the color of vegetation element composition, there is a varying phenophasis phenomenon that is connected to organic elements of the objects of landscape-architectural construction, but the color is neither their structural element nor it is the physical city structure element (Cerimovic, Lj, V.: 2009a, 87-106; 2012g : 66-71). Certainly, the phenophasis of valer of any color is desirable and significant in both esthetic and artistic sense (Vasiljevic – Tomic, D: 2009, 12-22; 2011 : 95-103), as well as in

phenophasis of visible changeability within landscape-urban design, as a narrower volume, and physical urban environmental structure, as a broader artificial volume within their cultivated presence.

However, since floristic colors possess the characteristic of phenophasis phenomenon, esthetic and art likeability and attractiveness, they are not relevant and adaptable to any conceptual design, especially when it comes to scientific definition of structures, objects or artifacts of landscape-architectural construction, creation, art, culture and culture-park heritage. Also, regarding scientific sense, due to green color of leaves, it is not acceptable and justifiable to regard the spring landscape architecture to be the so-called green architecture or the so-called green construction, and in autumn, when yellow color dominates, to regard it to be the so-called yellow architecture or the so-called yellow construction. That's why it is unsustainable to define landscape-urban structures, objects or artifacts as the so-called greenery (yellowness) or the so-called green areas (yellow areas), the so-called green (yellow) zones, the so-called green (yellow) colored or virtual surfaces.

Also, ecology is often associated with green color, the symbol of life. Still, from the scientific and professional aspect it is not acceptable and it would be absurd to rename ecology in spring as greenology and in autumn as yellowology, just because of its phenophasis green color (Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2009a : 87-106; 2010a : 553-570). If green color is a basic, phenomenal, material, structural and conceptual element that simply defines ecology as a professional field and science and if green color really represents the field of ecological research and work, then there is a significant question: are those facts and scientific arguments enough to rename ecology in greenology and lifeology in conceptual and phenomenal sense!?

Therefore, if everything is possible in these post-modern aspirations, tendencies, pseudo-para-meta lingual and metaphorical achievements in the scientific field, then it means that ecology, as a relevant scientific discipline, simply and conceptually equates with research, study and synthesizing of phenophasis changeable values, energy efficiency and landscape-urban sustainability and its resources that vary between yellow and green as well as other colors containing their value shades. Thus, if it is a 'new' domain, frame and subject of work and activity, then it is about scientific and expert wasteland and labyrinth of 2D terminological 'patents', absurdities or paradoxes saying that ecology and landscape architecture, 3D eco-urban and eco-regional (eco-spatial) planning are about to become something completely different. In other words – they are everything and nothing, everything and anything, everything but what they should be in professional forming, city-forming and life-forming sense.

Thus, scientific and expert discipline dealing with real ecology issues within physical urban-environmental structure, 3D eco-urban planning and spatial design and its territorial organization, remain uncovered, incomplete and unknown from the conceptual and phenomenal point of view. It leads to a new and unsustainable absurdity or paradox and it means that a 'new' conceptual and field-relevant definition should be made, the one containing and representing structure, essence and idea of real and responsible future scientific activity within each scientific field.

It is not difficult to see that science, professional field and physical urban environmental structure leaves no place for improvisation, pseudo-structure, pseudo-objects, para and meta lingual derivatives. The subject of work and the results of research and

analyses as well as aspirations, endeavor and achievement are to be explained by a proper scientific and professionally based name, language and knowledge. In other words – conceptual sense is to be reflected, contained and recognized in conceptual 3D sense and vice versa.

It is not unusual to see that previous unsustainable 2D education and 2D terminology, consisting of lots of absurdities, paradoxes and quasi-knowledge, as well as ‘free’ interpretation, inflict enormous damage (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2010b, 297-309; 2008g : 71-94) to previously well-planned measures by the creators of the European Charter. However, when it comes to conceptual and phenomenal sense, due to 2D quasi-knowledge and quasi-terminology, those intentions and plans have not expressed and presented its real purpose, messages and mission. This is obvious in the field of landscape-architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage, 3D eco-urban design and spatial management as well as ecology and physical city structure.

This is where the so-called environmental NGOs and other allegedly ecological associations, which have their so-called green workshops in order to promote and support unsustainable 2D terminology and phenophasis greenology. Therefore, hidden under ecology field, 2D terminology and so-called educational green courses and workshops are unsustainably placed, and the issued 2D certificates given to those who attend these courses, represent discriminating references for Master studies in the European Union countries and worldwide. Also, there are the catalogues of works, written essays, exhibitions, awards and questionable 2D certificates (paid by very pricey fees) of allegedly acquired 2D knowledge and skills in the field of the so-called green, virtual or non-existent architecture or ecology.

Also, spring brings the so-called workshops about the so-called green roofs, walls, cities. These workshops might be called yellow in autumn, and so on, going from one absurdity to another one, from one paradox to another one, from one labyrinth to another one, in order words – to eternity leading toward increasing pseudo-urbanization and consequential growth of negative ecological heritage and negative glass-house effects under the authority and direction of NGOs. Under the guise of ecology, without evaluation and control imposed by the competent Ministry and through cooperation and partnership with the faculties of architecture and urbanism and some similar schools of high education, 2D knowledge about young generations are placed, emphasizing unsustainable 2D pragma in the field of design, planning and construction of urban environmental structure and protection of environmental habitat (Cerimovic, Lj.V. ; 2011v, 27-34; 2008a : 171-180).

Finally, both foreign and some domestic green-course lecturers of those so-called educational courses, often incomprehensibly affirm ignorant or global approach to interpolation, articulation, restoration and protection of local cultural, spiritual and architectural identity (due to the lack of knowledge about local cultural identity, ethnic values and tradition) until the level of complete assimilation and globalization of rich and valuable local ethnic tradition and heritage.

Epilogue

This critical analysis of the unsustainability of 2D city visions in the NCA in 2003 noted a significant part of basic reasons that contributed to its decade long inefficiency. Certainly, all these facts do not have one-sided goal to debase and devalue the original

endeavor of its creators. On the contrary, the author's good intentions are obvious and are aimed at leaving the outdated 2D visions in order to do some rethinking and redefining in favor of 3D city visions.

However, the domination of the outdated, virtual and unsustainable 2D education, the implementation of 2D terminology and outdated solutions regarding 2D regulations are the reasons explaining why these good intentions of this paper's author have neither reached nor carried out the expected and affirmative expert knowledge, scientific and professional inconsistency and expected high level of responsibility. It reduced its solvency a lot as well as its quality and complexity and devalued its expected successful mission, conceptual and phenomenal sense. Thus, this is the opportunity to emphasize and point out its visible weaknesses and enormous faults, because the consequential substandard capacities of 3D landscape-urban structures, objects and paradigms are still evident and they deal with daily contaminating forms of pseudo-urbanization and pseudo-democracy, quasi-expert degradation, deconstruction, pseudo-regulation and deregulation on the level of local and global community, i.e. urban-environmental habitat and living residence.

Therefore, apart from a critical review of 2D theories and prisma, this work points out the need and necessity of 3D scientific approach in favor of integrative 3D urban-environmental and eco-spatial (eco-regional) planning and space management (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2012a, 289-300). In order to confirm these statements, a substantial part of the author's argumentation is presented here. This argumentation clarifies the need to reconsider and abandon unsustainable 2D in favor of sustainable 3D premises, theories and prisma, because those are basic reasons for the current long-lasting and harmful effects within evident conditions of local and global climate changes and apocalyptic hints.

These fragments of the presented problems are enough to realize that we have reached the 'turning point'- the moment when it is necessary to leave all unsustainable 2D theories and prisma. At the same time, the new and sustainable 3D scientific and expert paradigms are to be developed in order to create proper conditions for redesigned activities in the field of 3D eco-urban and eco-regional planning and space management, its creation and achievements.

Certainly, it is necessary to articulate and affirm the sustainable 3D principle: there are only equally important types of high, low and landscape built 3D objects or artifacts that are immanent in structuring comprehensive physical structure of urban environmental residence. Then, the planning-urban documents, regulations and all the supporting documents, decisions and recommendations, it is necessary to articulate and affirm a 3D principle of the same level of detail for all equally valuable types of high, low and landscape built 3D structures, objects or artifacts in the planning process, design and construction.

Also, it is necessary to establish an important and sustainable 3D principle: the planned, designed and built low-architectural and landscape-architectural 3D achievements or artifacts, in both conceptual and phenomenal sense, do represent the built objects although they have no walls. Therefore, it is evident that the planned, designed and built objects or artifacts of the landscape-architectural construction, creation, culture, art and culture-park heritage are not and cannot be the so-called non built, the so-called open, the so-called free, the so-called green areas, space, zones, whatever else, since they are unsustainably left without the third dimension (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2011a, 137-172).

It is also important to articulate and affirm a 3D principle: low and landscape built objects or artifacts are not the elements of urban discontinuity; they are valuable elements and pivots of needed and sustainable eco-urban continuity and 3D landscape-architectural urban system (Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2012a, 289-300).

Eventually, when it comes to the European Charter of the 21st century town, it must be pointed out that the basic citizens' rights are to be respected, which means that all the necessary spatial conditions are to be provided in architectural and city planning field. Those rights are: health protection rights, aggression protection rights, democratic control of local communities, disturbing noise protection, urban environmental pollution protection, right to have a minimal prescribed living standard, right to satisfy all the cultural needs and movements.

However, many decades of the 2D unsustainable theories implementation within the process of 2D urban and regional planning, lead to a question: what is the extent to which those rights are integrated and implemented in real qualities of urban-environmental living anywhere in the world?



Fig.2. The city as a place comprising the basic rights of its citizens, without relevant eco-reciprocity between high, low and landscape-built structures, implies a significant reduction of some of the listed rights

Therefore, a city does represent a place where its territorial organization and spatial volume must create proper conditions and enable the integration of the basic rights of its citizens. Still, nowadays, a great number of the cities all over the world do not have balanced eco-reciprocity between local social community, high, low and landscape built objects in the physical urban-environmental structure. It is not difficult to conclude that a significant part of the mentioned rights has been reduced or denied to a great extent.

This is undoubtedly the example of unsustainable combination of the incompatible 2D and 3D theories and pragma, which have taken away the third dimension of the landscape built objects or artifacts, ever since the proven mistakes of Bauhaus and other modernists, and have eliminated the equal evaluation of three familiar types of the listed physical structures (high, low and landscape), although it is about immanent built capacities and units in the field of structuring physical urban-environmental units. In this way, high-built physical structures are supported, and low and landscape built structures are discredited and devaluated (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2012b, 52-67). The latter are not even mentioned in 2D education and 2D regulations, and they remain totally unknown in the decade long period of implementing NCA (2003).

This approach is to be reorganized and redesigned as soon as possible, because this decade long practice is taking us to absurdity of negative ecological heritage and harmful

green-house effects. The redesigned turning point is a necessity. According to Einstein, if one really wants to find the solution to a problem the earthly community is facing, i.e. to find a sustainable turning point, development and survival, it is clear that one should not follow the path that has already involved us into actual problems of local and global climate changes.

Thus, the main problems in city construction we have been dealing with for decades, cannot be solved at the same level of thinking and decision making as we used to be at the moment of their appearance or the moment we are now, because we still implement the same 2D method when we create, provoking the increase of negative ecological heritage and negative green-house effects.

That is why the actuality of ‘turning point’ is only a good chance to leave all the previous 2D theories and activities in favor of sustainable 3D eco-urban visions and activities regarding the city of future. Considering the provoked and threatening climate changes, it is only an opportunity to leave the labyrinth of apocalyptic forms of contamination as soon as possible. These forms of contamination are inevitable consequence of quasy-professional degradation, industrial and post-industrial pseudo-urbanization, modern and post-modern pseudo-democracy, deconstruction, pseudo-regulation and deregulation of local communities, urban environmental residence and living habitats (Cerimovic, Lj.V.: 2011a, 137-172).

Reference

- Vasiljević-Tomić, D. (2009). Kultura boje u gradu, *Arhitektura urbanizam*, br. 26.
- Vasiljević-Tomić, D. (2011). Colour in space: Couloristic culture, *Zbornik Muzeja primenjene umetnosti*, br. 7.
- ***(2008). *Zaštićena prirodna dobra Beograda - Zapis 2008*, Beograd: Grad Beograd – Sekretarijat za zaštitu životne sredine i Zavod za zaštitu prirode Srbije.
- Doksijadis, K. (1982). *Čovek i grad*, Beograd: Nolit.
- Le Korbizje (1998). *Atinska povelja*, Beograd: Klub mladih arhitekata
- Milanović, H. (2006). *Zelenilo Beograda*, Beograd: JKP „Zelenilo-Beograd“
- Milošević, V. P. i Čerimović, Lj. V. (2010). Eko-grad Beograd – kontinuitet sistemskih ogrješnja o održivost, *Izgradnja*, godina LXIV, br. 1-2.
- ***(2010). *Nova atinska povelja 2003 – Vizija gradova u 21. veku Evropskog saveta urbanista*, Beograd: Udruženje urbanista Srbije.
- Obad Šćitaroci, M. (1992). *Hrvatska parkovna baština*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga
- Pegan, S. (2007). *Urbanizam*, Zagreb: Arhitektonski fakultet
- Radović, R. (2009). *Forma grada*, Beograd: Građevinska knjiga
- ***(1991) *Pregled zaštićenih objekata prirode za period 1948-1990. godine – II deo*, Zaštita prirode, br. 43-44, Beograd: Republički zavod za zaštitu prirode
- Tošković, D. (2006). *Uvod u prostorno i urbanističko planiranje*, Beograd: Akademski misao
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2012a). 2D ili 3D regulativa, planiranje i upravljanje urbanim i regionalnim prostorom, U *Zborniku radova „Lokalna samouprava u planiranju i uređenju prostora i naselja“*. Beograd: Geografski fakultet, Beograd, APPS ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2012b). Da li je planirani, projektovani i građeni park kulturno ili prirodno dobro, ili zelena površina, ili...?, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, god. IV, br. 9., Banja Luka ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2012v). Klimatske promene i planiranje urbanosredinskog prebivališta, *Tehnika*, god. LXVII, br. 66 (2012) 4., Beograd ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2012g). Da li je Pionirski park prirodno dobro?, *Prostor*, br. 19., Banja Luka ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2011a). (Ne)održivo 2D planiranje struktura urbanog i predeonog pejzaža u uslovima klimatskih promena, U *Zborniku radova „Budućnost razvoja naselja u svetlu klimatskih promena“*, Beograd: Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB) ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Čerimović, Lj. V. (2011b). Pseudourbanizacija i korporatokratija protiv održivog razvoja (Pseudo-urbanization and Korporata-ism against sustainable development), In *Proceedings 5th International scientific conference „Architecture, civil engineering – modernity“*, Varna: Varna Free University „Chernorizets Hrabar“ Faculty of Architecture ; www.pipaugs.org.rs

- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2011v). Pseudourbanizacija kao posledica zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Tehnika*, god. LXVI, br. 65 (2011) 1. ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2011g). Neodržive pseudourbane posledice zakonske i urbanističke terminologije, *Glasnik Srpskog geografskog društva*, sv. XCI, br. 3. ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2011d). Urbanizacija ili pseudourbanizacija, *Nasleđe*, god. VIII, br. 17., Kragujevac: Filološko-umetnički fakultet (FILUM) ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2010a). Moći zakonodavne i urbanističke kvazistručne terminologije, i vice versa: Peti parkić Beograd – Trotoari Sarajevo – Akademski park Beograd, *Izgradnja*, god. LXIV, br. 9-10., Beograd ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2010b). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe kao integrativni deo zaštite graditeljske baštine i održivog razvoja (Primer Akademskog parka u Beogradu), U *Zborniku Pete konferencije o integrativnoj zaštiti*, Banja Luka: Republički zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog nasleđa Republike Srpske ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2010v). Održiva urbanizacija i neodrživa pseudourbanizacija, *Savremeno graditeljstvo*, god. II, br. 04, Banja Luka ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2010g). Održivost, građena sredina i klimatske promene, U *Zborniku* (pdf) „*Zaštita životne sredine u energetici, rudarstvu i pratećoj industriji*“, Beograd: Univerzitet „Union – Nikola Tesla“ - Fakultet za ekologiju i zaštitu životne sredine, Beograd: Asocijacija geofizičara Srbije ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2009a). Neprikladna stručna terminologija u knjigama i zakonskoj regulativi, *Izgradnja*, god. LXII, br. 3-4., Beograd ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2009b). Savremena urbanost i kulturno-parkovno nasleđe u uslovima lokalnih i globalnih promena (Modern urbanity and cultural-park heritage in the conditions of local and global changes), U *Proceedings part I „The space in European architecture – tradition and innovation“* („The palace“ – the town of Balchik, Bulgaria 3-5. june 2009.), Ministry of culture – Republic Bulgaria, State Cultural Institute „The palace“ – the town of Balchik, Varna: Varna Free University „Chernorizets Hrabar“ Faculty of Architecture ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2009v). Efekti marginalizacije i diskontinuiteta pajzažno-arhitektonsko-urbanih struktura u građenoj sredini, U *Zborniku radova* (CD) „*Kontinuitet-diskontinuitet u planiranju gradova*“, Beograd: Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB) ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2008a). Plansko-urbanistička terminologija na štetu ekourbanih resursa, *ECOLOGICA* - Posebno tematsko izdanje, god. XV, br 16., Beograd ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2008b). Očuvanje i zaštita postojećeg – danas još nepoznatog kulturno-parkovnog nasleđa u uslovima globalnih promena, U *Zborniku Druge i Treće konferencije o integrativnoj zaštiti „Očuvanje kulturnog i prirodnog nasleđa u uslovima globalnih promjena“*, Banja Luka: Republički zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog nasleđa Republike Srbije ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2008v). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe Srbije kao vredan graditeljsko-urbani i eko-turistički resurs, U *Zborniku radova* (CD) „*Perspektive razvoja ekoturizma*“, Sremska Mitrovica: Ekološki pokret Sremska Mitrovica – Centar za razvoj eko i ruralnog turizma ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2008g). Plansko-urbanistička i zakonodavna terminologija u funkciji pseudourbanizacije, U *Zborniku radova „Integracija – dezintegracija grada?“*, Beograd: Društvo urbanista (DUB) ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V., Vetmić, M. (2008). Pseudourbanizacija ugrožava kvalitet vazduha u gradovima i naseljima Srbije, U *Zborniku radova „Kvalitet zaštite vazduha 2008“*, Beograd: Privredna komora Srbije – Odbor za zaštitu životne sredine i održivi razvoj ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2007). Ekourbana (ne)kultura ugrožava kvalitet vazduha u urbanim sredinama, U *Zborniku radova „Zaštita vazduha 2007“*, Beograd: Privredna komora Srbije – Odbor za zaštitu životne sredine i održivi razvoj ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2006a). Planski dokumenti, terminologija, legislativa i kulturno-parkovno nasleđe, U *Zborniku radova „Rekonstrukcija i revitalizacija grada“*, Beograd: Društvo urbanista Beograda (DUB) ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2006b). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe Srbije, *ECOLOGICA* - Posebno tematsko izdanje, god. XIII, br. 12., Beograd ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (2003). Obnova duhovnih, graditeljskih i pejzažnih vrednosti Vojvodine, U *Monografiji II „Zaštita životne sredine gradova i prigradskih naselja“*, Novi Sad: Ekološki pokret grada Novog Sada ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćerimović, Lj. V. (1994). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe Beograda, U *Zborniku radova „Zelenilo u urbanističkom razvoju grada Beograda“*, Beograd: Udruženje inženjera Beograda, Beograd: Skupština grada, Beograd: RTS-Beogradski TV program ; www.pipaugs.org.rs
- Ćulibrk-Medić, K., Bandić, A. i Miljuš, I. (2010). Sinergija programa otvorenih i zatvorenih prostora, *Nauka+Praksa*, br. 13., Niš: Građevinsko-arhitektonski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, Niš: Institut za građevinarstvo i arhitekturu