

## UNSUSTAINABLE PSEUDO-URBAN CONSEQUENCES OF LEGAL AND URBAN TERMINOLOGY

VELIMIR LJ. ČERIMOVIĆ

*University „Union - Nikola Tesla”, Faculty of Construction Management –  
Department of Architecture and Urbanism; Cara Dušana br. 62-64, Belgrade, Serbia*

**Abstract:** City planning is a complex task and through this work we face the space and natural resources that expose the exploitation (that are to be exploited and prone to unsustainable change). Often without environmental responsibility and the imperative of creating certain measures we make superstructure no matter how much the environment may be disrupted, and whether such relationships create a better society, better network of urban settlements and a better man. At that may also affect our knowledge which is often due to a variety of doctrines and legislative regulations that are applied in the planning and management space. From this it can be seen that modern architecture did not contribute to the creation of better cities. Also, urban planning is mainly restricted to the regulation and it neglected the creative action, regional-planning is lost in theoretical research, while the consideration of the whole problem is abandoned. In addition to this, in today's transitional terms and the domineering (dominant) urban crisis unsustainable combination and identification of the “2D” and the “3D” terminology is recognizable, which is only indicators that in the field of urban planning some transitional trends are prevailing. This unsustainable state of affairs in the transitional planning of urban areas can be applied in the most suitable way to pseudo-urbanization, sub-urbanization, unbalanced eco-reciprocity, non-standard construction of the urban tissue, discontinuity inherited and newly constructed urban substance. In this regard, consequently expressed negative environmental legacy of reproduction and the increased effect of the negative consequences of greenhouse gases from the threatening climate change, only shows that urban planners are not sinless and, they more or less (un)consciously complicit and participate in the contamination of urban and environment. In the end, it definitely guides us to the need to leave or transformation of the previous concept of planning and urbanization, which of us greatly and led to today's threatening effects of greenhouse gases. On this bases the need to articulate the sustainable integrative concept can be recognized with a high degree of urban eco-awareness, knowledge and skills of all professions that participate in the planning and construction of sustainable eco-urban development built environment.

**Key words:** space planning, eco-reciprocity, physical structure, residence, domicile, ekistics

### Introduction

Today, at the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century the construction field is still dealing with a significant problem of understanding, evaluation and hierarchy of physical structure and their balance in relation to man. Therefore, due to the dominance of outdated and quasi-professional “2D” terminology, a special problem is unsustainable marginalization and annulment of third dimensions of urban structures, facilities and artifacts of park or landscape architecture, creativity, culture, art and heritage (Cerimovic, Lj.V. 2009, 293-326).

As for that, it should be pointed out that the beginning of the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is also facing the usage of obsolete deductive and unsustainable two-dimensional (“2D”) doctrine, which presents a basic “3D” model of a park as a “2D” plane. However, the integrated space planning include sustainable three-dimensional (3D) doctrines, but their application has not yet reached the needed level of ekistical observation and subsequent solutions to complex urban problems the modern cities are dealing with. It means that spatial planning is still a dominant sector (deductive) approach (Stojkov, B., 2000, 16-22) and that is why a priority is given to the planning of housing and civil engineering constructions (Doxiadis’ “shells and networks”). In that way, the concern about the balance in planning, designing and building 3D eco-urban and landscape architectural

structures (parks and other structures), as well as eco-balance of urban systems and men in a ekistic and holistic sense, which certainly is an important prerequisite for those striving for creating better human settlements (Doxiadis, K., 1982, 30).

Thus, sustainable principles of ekistics are still marginalized, as well as the bases needed for the establishment of eco-balance of physical structures and local communities on the level of parts and wholeness of urban inhabitancy. This is another example of the presence of uncovered areas between the elements and disciplines involved in the process of urban planning. This imperfection within the integral approach to spatial planning certainly exerts significant influence on unsustainable combination of “2D” and “3D” terminology, being two rather different concepts, which leads to the lack of synergistic operation of the system as a complex 3D unite, not 2D image, within both the planning process and life and survival of local communities and urban residence.

In this way, whoever participates in the process of planning urban settlements, deals with the problems of the building environment in sectoral manner. In other words – nobody is concerned about its unity, which means that the balance between human and physical structures within the urban residence, as well as its connection and balanced relationship with the living environment. Therefore, the planner is only a designer or author of two-dimensional plans including some three-dimensional conception. “An architect can only be given a piece of land and build something there, without having any responsibility for the urban space that the mentioned built structure together with other structures form, because the architects can always blame the urban planner, construction standards or behavior of neighbors.” (Doxiadis, K., 1982, 23)

Thus, everyday changes within urban environment are visible. *Значи, свакодневне промене у градској средини данас су веома изражене.* The waves of influence do not come from one direction only – from the power of center, as in small static towns of our distant and recent past. Such influential waves are getting stronger and more complex today, since the urban areas consist of numerous centers, that is - incessant changes are usual and expected. These are often chaotic influences connected with a rather great number of causes provoking the mentioned numerous changes. Their influence is oriented in different ways and provokes variety of changes, or in other words – leads to the increasing degradation of modern cities as urban-environmental residence. This is the reason why it so difficult to understand and solve as well as harmonize such complex urban structures. All the above mentioned facts create the impression that the current condition of relations and urban organization is getting out of control.

The situation in our urban areas has not improved for decades. On the contrary – it is getting worse, which is provoked by: their growing negative ecological heritage, their increasing influence on initiating and harmful consequence of green-house negative effects, visible sub-standardization of both parts and wholeness of urban areas. Thus, it provoked local and global climate changes (Stojkov, B., 1997, 206-207). Constantinos Doxiadis carried out ekistical analyses of various urban areas during the 1970s; he noticed that the situation was getting worse and more complicated in those urban areas (Doxiadis, K., 1982, 148-151) “due to the increase in the population number and constant additional pressure coming from external and internal areas“. The mentioned facts made him conclude that “man is moving from chaos toward complete disaster“.

It is also visible in the Delos Declaration made in 1968. Namely, apart from the Athens Declaration in 1933 (Le Corbusier, 1998, 21-112), the Delos Declaration was among the first to call attention to the problems of the modern cities and the troubles surrounding them. Thanks to the great scientist and urbanist Constantinos Doxiadis and his intellectual associates and followers from all over the world in the fields of science, culture, art and urban administration, there were Delos symposiums organized once a year in order to analyze and define in detail all the problems the modern cities are facing with. These

activities led to the creation of the Delos Declaration, which emphasized the urban and environmental problematic issues as part of general problems confronting humanity. Therefore, the Declaration points out that it is necessary to find such a world order that would eliminate wars, prevent the population explosion, provide enough food, prevent famine, stop the environmental pollution by taking proper measures in order to solve the existing imbalance between the possibilities and aspirations in numerous countries of the world. All the mentioned goals listed in the Declaration are still present.

### **Contamination of urban residence**

Such problematic state was being accumulated throughout the 20th century, provoked by not only other non-selective and one-sided interests and activities within the built (residence) and living (residence) environment, but also by professional state and local institutions dealing with urban planning and carrying out the urban planning documents, related laws, regulations, decrees and decisions. These institutions used the doctrine principles and powers of 2D urban and regional spatial planning in order to provide the idealized image of better life. Therefore, they kept on marginalizing the problems of increasing negative ecological heritage (Stojkov, B., 2000, 87-99), which are closely related to sustainable survival and development of smaller and larger settlements, towns and local communities. This is the reason why the issue of urban diversity was neglected for such a long period of time, which means that the towns used to be treated as plates for urban ranting, due to the technology of 2D terminology and sectoral planning. (Stojkov, B., 2000, 184)

However, today in Serbia there is a dominant and formalist approach to spatial planning, and the plan is often considered to be “a legal obligation (meeting the elementary legislative frameworks and meeting the deadlines specified by the Law) or an opportunity to verify and plan the investments that usually have short-term effects or reduced interest in relation to the overall benefit of society“ (Secerov, V., Filipovic, D., 2010, 197).

As for these influential events and circumstances, the effects of contaminating pseudo-urban, speculative and quasi-entrepreneurial activities are getting more dominant and problematic. These activities are usually connected to location usurpation, consequent reduction, degradation or demolition of 3D structures or landscape-urban units, wholeness and systems. Planning and zoning regulations of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are very useful for them, because of the powerful but inaccurate, quasi-professional and magically patented and applied 2D terminology. Those are basic reasons generating various unsustainable versions and sub-versions of events and reduction cases, usurpation, degradation, pseudo-urbanization, discontinuity, sub-urbanization and contamination of urban unities.

Even today, at the end of the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, when humanity is recognizing threatening dangers of increasing negative ecological heritage as well as negative effects of green-house gases (Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2010, 300-309), and when the United Nations has been emphasizing the importance of concepts and principles of sustainable development, city construction is still based on unsustainable sectoral principles of two-dimensional (2D) planning of rural and urban forms of built environment, as different but relevant forms of human environmental existence within living residence.

Previous articulation of eco-urban issues, supported by the existing legal regulations and applied mimicry in form of 2D terminology, indicates that improvements regarding sustainable design and eco-urban development of towns significantly depend on finding a proper way out of the maze of terminology traps, which directly or indirectly initiate and legalize the forms of sub-urbanization and pseudo-urbanization, in both Belgrade and broader regional relations. And the mentioned path that leads us out of 2D wasteland is

inevitable, because 3D landscape and architectural urban structures within construction and urban history possess immanent but still marginalized urban place, role and significance in relation to relevant ecological, environmental, functional, social, cultural, esthetical and construction needs, potentials and urban-historical development including all subsequent endeavors, aspirations and achievements (Milosevic, V.P., Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2010, 47-70).

### **Quasy-professional 2D terminology**

The rule of applied and accepted power of unsustainable 2D terminology is particularly expressive and visible when it comes to relationship with structures and buildings of landscape architecture. Thus, only urban structures and artifacts of landscape architecture in the existing zoning documents are in the form of 2D free public green area (Stojkov, B., 1997, 22, 51, 77, 172) or free and green space (Toskovic, D., 2006, 218, 302, 347, 348), but in reality of urban and rural residence they are and must be designed, planned and built in the form of 3D structures. This cannot be applied to the case of structures and artifacts of construction (housing), since they are not documented as 2D structures in the urban and legal documents. On the contrary, we can say that they are exclusive and unique example of 3D structures, in rural and urban environment as well as in the mentioned urban and other planning documents.

Still, decades of quasi-professional 2D concept and treatment of urban structures and artifacts of landscape architecture are not considered to be a coincidence found in legislative, urban or other planning documents (Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2006, 161 – 168). Actually, this is the case of the applied and legalized urban “patent” used to provide the impossible and non-existing double (parallel) life. One is real, which means that all these structural, environmental, landscape, eco-urban, cultural, spiritual, inspirational and recreational facilities present unsustainably marginalized, insufficiently occupied and disproportionately available individual and systematic physical (3D) structures in relation to predominant capacity of 3D facilities built in construction and civil engineering manners within the built environment. The other one is 2D planner or urban, which means that those real physical (3D) structures and facilities of landscape architecture within the built environment are unsustainably reduced to non-existing or 2D green and other non-structures, gaps and areas (Cerimovic, Lj. V., 2008, 71-94).

Such unsustainable planner and urban patent has been legalized for speculative reasons, since identification, marking and archiving of 3D park facilities as 2D green or other surfaces, if necessary, provide the possibility of unsustainable and unpunishable demolition of such 3D structure. This was the case with “Peti parkic” (“The Fifth Little Park”) in Belgrade in 2005 ([www.petipark.bravehost.com/](http://www.petipark.bravehost.com/)): it was found out that the existing 3D facility is not a planned, designed and built urban facility, since the planning urban documents recorded it in quasi-professional manner as a so-called 2D green space. Therefore, as for the mentioned park, there was no demolishing of the 3D facility – Peti parkic, because it was registered in the accepted regulatory plan as 2D green area. Or in other words – 2D green area is not at all a 3D facility and it should be given the 3D purpose and function as soon as possible, as planned by the amended regulatory plan including pseudo-urban objectives and activities for the mentioned, previously planned, designed and completely defined and built location. This means that the planned, marked 2D green area should be turned into a real unbuilt, open and free construction surface or land meant for pseudo-urban, non-ecological but profitable 3D residential and business facility.

One more example makes visible this broad, non-ecological, unsustainable and ambiguous 2D terminology that has been used for decades – the planned, designed, built, actual and inherited ancient Academic Park at the Students’ Square in Belgrade was taken as the example of the so-called green area (Milanovic, H, 2006, 167). It means that the

mentioned Academic Park in Belgrade or any other park or the facility of landscape architecture is identified as sort of an emptiness that disrupts the inherited urban continuity of the existing fullness of the immediate environment (Cerimovic, Lj. V., 2009, 188-205). The so-called fullness include only 3D residential, business and other construction facilities, which means that parks and other 3D facilities of landscape architecture present a disturbing factor of the inherited urban order and continuity, or the pivotal elements of unsustainable discontinuity on these ancient or older localities belonging to the park-cultural heritage.

Therefore, these locations defined in relation to their purpose, construction, urban objective and ecological function have become the facilities and elements of fictional created undesirable and unsustainable urban discontinuity, but also they are proper and suitable locations for pseudo-mending the inherited and urban matrix defined in a construction, urban and ecology manner. Thus, they are suitable for the creation of the so-called fullness – new 3D residential, business and other already mentioned facilities.

In this way, the 3D residential facilities turned out to be cut out for the process of using the actual 2D green area of the Academic park in Belgrade, being a real emptiness, non-facility, disrupting element of the existing undesirable and unsustainable discontinuity within the defined and inherited urban substance, in order to fulfill in a proper way and totally transform it into a new sustainable continuity consisting of residential and business facilities and fullness unities. Therefore, thanks to the power of unsustainable legislative and urban quasi-professional terminology and 2D urban design that is acceptable and applicable only in relation to design, planning and building the parks and other 3D facilities of landscape architecture, instead of the previous desirable, landscape, ecological and inherited and totally sustainable urban park continuity, there is a new, more suitable and totally unsustainable pseudo-urban continuity.

Thus, this example shows how the 3D park is a planned, designed, built, inherited and detailed sustainable urban park unity, eco-unity, and as a valuable part of the urban environment, context and continuity within the previously defined urban substance in Belgrade, in fact, by skilled usage and manipulation with the 2D quasi-professional terminology and legal regulations, may legally become the element of unsustainable discontinuity.

A completely new and unsustainable pseudo-urban continuity of residential, commercial and other construction fullness, can be legally applied and established as allegedly sustainable continuity.

Therefore, these new and totally pseudo-urban observations and reasons for quasi-professional and unsustainable principles of 2D urban design are used to initiate and affirm the demolishing power of sustainable, planned, designed, built and inherited urban parking fullness and landscape and eco-continuity, for the purpose of the new and completely unsustainable pseudo-urban continuity of the imaginary and necessary and the one and only relevant construction fullness, at the very place and location of the landscape and urban park facility or some other facility of landscape architecture. Of course, it is logical and justified because 3D landscape and urban park facility is presented and marked as 2D green and other areas, in a quasi-professional, unsustainable way without any restrictions (Cerimovic, Lj. V., 2006, 133-145).

Finally, such unsustainable actions of demolishing the planned, designed and built parks based on the legalized 2D terminology destroy the present, inherited and sustainable urban park, landscape and eco-continuity. Therefore, the existence of legalized quasi-professional 2D terminology means that all the valuable and ancient 3D facilities belonging to the cultural-park inheritance in Belgrade should be immediately demolished because they belong to the so-called unbuilt, open, green, free and so on areas (Green Regulation of Belgrade, Project, 2003, I (3-19), II (1-22), emptiness, non-facilities and similar.

It is a real opportunity to establish pseudo instead of real urban continuity and order regarding sustainable principles of eco-urban balance between landscape physical structures and construction and civil engineering structures. This unsustainable pseudo-continuity and pseudo-urban order has been existing for decades provoking harmful effects on the facilities of landscape architecture as well as relevant environmental and eco-urban structures and resources. This is a real example of the power of unsustainable and legalized quasy-professional terminology and 2D urban planning that produces unsustainable pseudo-urban continuity, instead of the desirable landscape, ecological, inherited and sustainable urban-park and other landscape fullness, the already created, inherited, real, immanent and sustainable eco-urban order and continuity.

### **Urban, legislative and educational 2D patents**

Such chaotic and harmful situation is provoked by the legalized quasy-professional 2D terminology as a kind of planning and urban patent systems and administrative – managerial trickology as a doctrine 2D disorder and anti-system, especially in case of defining the parks or other 3D facilities and landscape structures within the urban 3D landscape-architectural system (Cerimovic, Lj.V., 2008, 233-247). The problems are not only the mutual relations and connections within urban landscape structures, but also sustainable connections, relations and eco-balance between the urban landscape, construction and civil engineering facilities within an urban environmental residence. Also, it is very important to articulate and establish the immanent individual, group or total capacities regarding the sustainable urban 3D system of facilities and unities of landscape architecture, that are to be the base of environmental, aesthetic, landscape and ecological values of goods and resources in all types of rural or urban type of environmental residence.

It is important to point out the embarrassing situation regarding the program of education at universities where there is no such topics and subjects and landscape-architectural construction, culture, art and cultural-park inheritance. Also, there is no designing, planning and construction of such three-dimensional, sustainable, landscape, environmental, urban, recreational, inspirational, cultural and ecological unities. Such approach to education during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century provoked some unsustainable forms – 2D is equal to 3D and vice versa. Or in other words – one-sided and quasy-professional combination of 2D nonsense and 3D exact urban environmental structures, identifying landscape architecture as horticulture and planting – which led to consequent legalization of speculative-mimicry of 2D terminology. The educated people provided with such principles regard the physical 3D structures of landscape architecture to be 2D so-called green areas having neither construction nor cultural identity. A numerous harmful consequences were provoked and they are visible within the situation of local and global climate changes. Eco-reciprocity is one of the neglected systems, then usurpation, pseudo-usurpation, reduction, discontinuity of 3D structures of landscape architecture facilities within both inherited or built urban substance.

Apart for the mentioned facts and examples, there are also some urban so-called green areas marked with green color in the old and recent zoning and urban documents. Such areas surround the buildings and do not possess any characteristic of parks or gardens (Pegan, S, 2007, 14), they represent «green deserts» meant for people but the people are not aware of them because of the lack of construction and style identity (Obad Scitaroci, M., Bojanic – Obad Scitaroci B., 1996, 80).

These are some of the reasons that prevented the establishment of immanent eco-reciprocity and exact planning standards and construction standards of 3D systems of park and other facilities of landscape architecture in most cases of rural and urban residences (towns and settlements). It exerted harmful influence on the condition of eco-urban quality

in rural and urban settlements. Contra-productive and unsustainable 2D patents in planning and design the facilities in artificial environment is followed by the increase of negative ecological inheritance.

Instead of exact planning, design, evaluation, construction and maintenance of parks and other 3D facilities and structures of landscape architectural construction, creation, music, art and cultural-park inheritance we face with the lump-sum approach and concept. The dominance of 2D green-area planning is embodied in a virtual two-dimensional planning the patches of green spots, instead of immanent and sustainable, as well as environmental and eco-urban 3D park or other artifacts of landscape architecture.

Virtual and unsustainable elimination of the third dimension in parks and other urban eco-resources and facilities of landscape architecture is the function of taking away the planned, designed, built and physical as well as urban, landscape and ecological legality, identity and subjectivity, which leads to creating a space for speculative possibilities and aspirations of local speculators destroying all the principles of sustainable urban order and continuity, as well as urban environment and living environment balance (Cerimovic, Lj. V., 2006, 112-122). This so-called green-surface land in the built environment related to the actual 2D urban and legislative theory and practice, is accepted and understood as temporarily unintended, functionally undefined, empty, free, open and unbuilt.

However, it is always a speculative volume and location that will be rearranged for other purposes, in accordance with the influence of local mighty persons, and will be given the function of undesirable and unsustainable discontinuity and pseudo-spatial capacity for pseudo-compaction or reconstruction (new construction) of the previously defined urban substance. Therefore, there is no coincidence in the ekistical statement of Constantinos Doxiadis: "all of us perform crimes in architecture". He even said: "I consider myself to be one of those people and being like than I admit the following: we do not do our best in order to admit those crimes, we do not try to find the reasons for these crimes, we do not search for the causes of these crimes, we do not resist the alarming rate of their growth" (Doxiadis, K., 1982, 152-161).

Consequently, since we know that 2D is not the same as 3D, we also know that 2D does represent a surface that does not have and cannot have an identity, subjectivity and characteristics of 3D facility. Still, there is no coincidence in the fact that 2D green and other kinds of surfaces are regarded, understood and treated in ambiguous way. It means that the building environment (residence) containing 2D green or other surfaces is known to have the hidden objectives defined by the speculators dealing with construction sites and land. This legalized and quasi-professional 2D approach is used for the purpose of speculative calculations applied to additional construction locations of city land. Thus, there is a legal way to affirm potential possibilities and corruptive activities of numerous quasi-entrepreneurs and their representatives taking part in the process of construction of illegal or other pseudo-urban facilities in both rural and urban environment.

Based on this, 2D green surfaces and other locations are seen as terra incognita, or the empty plot or available location where there is no real facility, since, in accordance with the 2D standards, a green area is not and cannot be a planned, designed or built park or some other 3D facility of landscape architecture. Or in other words – 2D construction area (location) is not and cannot be a planned, designed residential, business or some other construction 3D facility (Cerimovic, Lj. V., 2009, 87-106).

Since it is impossible for towns to have unbuilt construction land, and taking into consideration the fact that not a single empty space in the world, especially 2D area or empty plot, is planned, designed and built, but is seen as location or registry land unit used for building a 3D landscape architectural facility having a defined purpose, all the speculatively marked 2D green areas represent rather concrete locations of civil construction land, that can be used in order to be in accordance with the actual needs and planned,

designed and built facilities of 3D structure. So, instead of 2D virtual park placed on the green surface or park zone in a legal way, there are new necessary prerequisites needed for potential new construction, instead of landscape, environmental, ecological, urban 3D structures of the park or some other facility of landscape architecture.

Therefore, the parks and other facilities that are marked as 2D green spots or meaningless areas in the urban documents, do not possess the third dimension characteristic and cannot be given the status of 3D facility. Such situation has been going on throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century – the 2D green areas are turned into the places of undesirable and unsustainable urban chaos, pseudo-urbanization, discontinuity within the inherited as well as new built urban substance.

Also, in case of constructive tall buildings having lots of various types of walls and defined intentions and functions, all the physical performances and characteristics are understood a priori. This means that such unplanned buildings, as unsustainable pseudo-property, possess a permanent character instead of the planned, designed and built landscape, environmental, eco-urban and sustainable 3D facility of landscape architecture.

In relation to 3D facility of landscape architecture, the mentioned pseudo-urban construction facility is not an empty space, is not an unbuilt, free, open or other surface. Certainly, such pseudo-structure does not disturb quasy-entrepreneurs and quasy-professionals because those people are aware of their personal, financial and profitable interests connected to the mentioned facility. But the structure does disturb the local community. As Constantinos Doxiadis noticed – the local community will probably be forced to put up with such imposed and unsustainable crime for decades.

The mentioned notions (unbuilt, free, open) are currently applied to the landscape architectural structures, but they can also be applied to all other types of the planned and pseudo-construction structures. For example, all spatial shapes and volumes in any object defined by walls can be seen as emptiness – or unbuilt facility. They can also be seen as open, since they possess doors, windows and other window frames. They can be seen as free, as well, because they have various visions toward the skies through numerous openings from everywhere.

Therefore, the use of the conceptual terms having a wide coverage in urban and spatial planning makes everything possible. But, these conceptual terms are not related to the buildings, in accordance with the Law, but are related to the parks and other facilities of landscape architecture. For instance, the Law on Planning and Construction (72/09, art. 2) and Green Regulation of Belgrade (art. 4, p. 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 43, 55, 56, 57, 62, and p.3-19) – there is no construction site, but the definitions of the used conceptual terms in these documents provide an explanation regarding the way they are to be understood and analyzed, or in other words – unsustainable green surface can only be applied and is related to the facilities of landscape architecture. Thus, both old and recent Law on Planning and Construction affirm and legalize the old and outdated solutions, or in other words – it is the way to leave the already patented slogans and possibilities for pseudo-urbanization and sub-urbanization of the previously defined urban units.

In such a situation, Constantinos Doxiadis points out that home education and further education should provide proper knowledge, and then the experts and professionals are obliged to observe and define all the construction errors and damage as well as to “search for their cause and teach the people how to face the problems provoked by the above mentioned situation in order to find solutions”. Furthermore, Doxiadis described six biggest construction crimes: housing, dispersed location of buildings, monumental buildings, physically and spatially dispersed and unconnected buildings, the lack of human scale and inhuman city. Also, he emphasized eight significant causes that he had noticed while analyzing their origin and harmful effects on local and global communities and environment as well. Finally, he points out that “our task is not to wait patiently for natural death of these



shells, our task is to strive for destroying them (Doxiadis, K., 1982, 152-161). According to him it can be achieved in three ways:

- «use your mind, develop an objective scientific approach in order to apply adequate solutions using intellectual and moral bravery;
- “contact some psychiatrists for those unable to follow the first rule
- “pray for those who cannot understand the first way and cannot accept the second one”.

I do believe that the first way can function in majority of cases and among many people.“ (Doxiadis, K. 1982, 161).

### **Conclusion**

Problematic aspects and the ways to finding solutions to the mentioned problems (issues) are very interesting because of the unfinished and unresolved urban crises that kept going on throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century, as well as social-historical turbulences and economic changes.

Since both capitalism and socialism used to be dominant systems of social development in great crisis during the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> and first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is obvious that such transitional state is manifested in the field of spatial planning. However, there is no excuse if the science cannot distinguish between quasy and proper principles of profession and science. Thus, science can emphasize the unsustainable identification of 2D as 3D terminology in both theory and practice. In other words – the science is to possess the initial strength in order to point out unsustainability of transitional form of spatial planning. It also has to prevent and stop unsustainable affirmation and legalization of quasy-professional forms that identify 2D plane to be the same as 3D facility.

Thus, deductive 2D quasy-principles destroy qualitative and relevant values of reciprocity and eco-urban continuity of the inherited or new built urban substances. Such condition is inevitable in the function of inspiring the increasing pseudo-urban transformation of the existing urban structures. In this way the towns experience morphological and social changes that are not connected with the positive ecological tendencies and needs.

Special problem is presented by new ecological demands regarding city construction that, in case of local and global climate changes, apart from initial positive implications of living environment, include sustainable ecological perception and vision regarding city planning. Certainly, instead of the recent ecological imperatives, there are some more positive measures, for example: implementing and integrating a new system for waste management, frequent usage of renewable energetic resources, solving the problems of light illumination in towns and cities.

However, within the context of construction planning and housing, the most dominant demands include the ones regarding the bio-climatic architectural facilities. Still, there hasn't been any changes in unsustainable quasy-professional 2D in relation to the necessary establishment of eco-balance between the urban 3D facilities and other structures of landscape architecture.

All the mentioned facts lead to the conclusion that further transformation of the towns themselves are expected to happen in Serbia. Therefore, the answers to the questions and probably visible and clear.

- a new methodological approach to integrative and sustainable eco-urban planning, and also the sustainable eco-balance and continuity as well as unsustainable sub-standard urban unit and unsustainable discontinuity in the inherited and new-built urban substances in the built environment;
- implementation of 3D instead of the recent unsustainable 2D legislative frameworks in the function of city development;

- planning, designing, construction and establishment of sustainable eco-urban, landscape and visual identity of a city that has to be in function with sustainable, social, financial, cultural, urban and micro-climatic repercussion.

### **References**

See References (Literatura) on page 139.

## Literatura

- \*\*\* (1968). *Deloska deklaracija*, Nastala na međunarodnom skupu posvećenom temi: Čovek i njegova naselja, Delos. <http://www.zaprokul.org.rs/Media/Document/CasopisKultura/1514.pdf>
- Doksijadis, K. (1982). *Čovek i grad*. Beograd: Nolit.
- \*\*\* (2009). *Zakon o planiranju i izgradnji*, Službeni glasnik RS, 72/09.
- Le Korbizje (1998). *Atinska povelja*. Beograd: Klub mladih arhitekata.
- Milanović, H. (2006). *Zelenilo Beograda*. Beograd: JKP „Zelenilo – Beograd“.
- Milošević, V.P., Čerimović, L.J.V. (2009). Eco-city Belgrade. U Abstract ID number 27. Istanbul: *Congress E- Book, ECOCITY – 2009 - Ecocity world summit*. 220-235
- Milošević, V.P., Čerimović, L.J.V. (2010). Eko-grad Beograd – kontinuitet sistemskih ogrješenja o održivost. *Izgradnja*, God. LXIV, (1-2 Januar-Februar), 47-70
- Obad Šćitaroci, M., Bojanić-Obad Šćitaroci, B., (1996). Parkovna arhitektura kao element slike grada, *Prostor*, 4 (1), 80.
- Pegan, S., (2007). *Urbanizam*, Zagreb: Arhitektonski fakultet.
- \*\*\* (2003). *Projekat zelena regulativa Beograda*. Beograd: JUP Urbanistički zavod Beograda.
- Stojkov, B. (1997). *Urbografija*. Beograd: Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije.
- Stojkov, B. (2000). *Metode prostornog planiranja*. Beograd: Geografski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Tošković, D. (2006). *Uvod u prostorno i urbanističko planiranje*. Beograd: Akademska misao.
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2006). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe. *Ecologica*, Posebno tematsko izdanje, God. XIII, (12), 161-168
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2006). Planski dokumenti, terminologija, legislativa i kulturno-parkovno nasleđe. U *Rekonstrukcija i revitalizacija grada*. Beograd: Društvo urbanista Beograda. 133-145
- Čerimović, L.J.V., Vetmić, M. (2008). Pseudourbanizacija ugrožava kvalitet vazduha u gradovima i naseljima Srbije. *Zbornik radova „Kvalitet zaštite vazduha 2008“*. Beograd: Privredna komora Srbije – Odbor za zaštitu životne sredine i održivi razvoj. 233-247
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2006). Kulturno-parkovno nasleđe Srbije kao vredan graditeljsko-urbani i ekoturistički resurs. *Zbornik radova „Perspektive razvoja ekoturizma“* (1. kongres ekoturizma Srbije). Sremska Mitrovica: Ekološki pokret Sremska Mitrovica – Centar za razvoj eko i ruralnog turizma. 111-22
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2008). Plansko-urbanistička i zakonodavna terminologija u funkciji pseudourbanizacije. U *Nova urbanost – integracija-dezintegracija*. Beograd: Društvo urbanista Beograda. 71-94
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2009). Očuvanje i zaštita postojećeg – danas još nepoznatog kulturno-parkovnog nasleđa u uslovima globalnih promena. *Zbornik Druge i Treće konferencije o integrativnoj zaštiti*, Banjaluka: Republički zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog nasleđa Republike Srpske. 293-326
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2009). Neprikladna stručna terminologija u knjigama i zakonskoj regulativi, *Izgradnja*, God. LXIII, (3-4 Mart – April), 87-106
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2009). Savremena urbanost i kulturno-parkovno nasleđe u uslovima lokalnih i globalnih promena. U *Proceedings part I. „The space in European architecture - tradition and innovation“*, Balchik, Bulgaria: Ministry of culture – Republic Bulgaria, State Cultural Institute „The palace“ – the town of Balchik, Varna Free University „Chernorizets Hrabar“ Faculty of Architecture. 188-205
- Čerimović, L.J.V. (2010). Održivost, građena sredina i klimatske promene. *Zbornik „Zaštita životne sredine u energetici, rudarstvu, i pratećoj industriji“*. Divčibare: Univerzitet Union - Nikola Tesla Beograd, Fakultet za ekologiju i zaštitu životne sredine i Asocijacija geofizičara Srbije. 300-309
- Šećerov, V., Filipović, D. (2010). Iskustva i problemi u implementaciji prostornih planova opština, *Glasnik srpskog geografskog društva*, 90 (1), 197-214
- \*\*\* [www.petipark.bravehost.com/](http://www.petipark.bravehost.com/)