

ROLE OF BUILT HERITAGE IN 20TH C PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN AREAS IN SERBIA

UDC 72.025(497.11)“19“

711.4(497.11)“19“

Nataša Živaljević Luxor¹, Nadja Kurtović Folić², Petar Mitković³

¹Urban Planning Institute Niš, Serbia

²University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

³University of Niš, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *Establishing of built heritage preservation and town and regional planning on scientific bases lasted most of 20th century. The two scientific disciplines had early application in Serbia aligned with the development in wider Eurocentric area, until the political and economic turmoil in 1990s. The role of built heritage in town and city planning has essentially changed in that time worldwide. That is partly explained by developing of scientific methodology of each of the disciplines, and partly by global changes and subsequently emerging challenges. In this paper we focused on development in Serbia, which partly reflected changes in both East and West of Eurocentric area.*

Key words: *built heritage, town and regional planning, sustainability, socio-economic development, Serbia*

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper explores how architectural heritage protection influenced the planning and development of urban areas in Serbia and obtained results in the first two decades of 21st c. The research is carried out through a brief historical review of the evolutionary approximation of the preservation of built heritage and urban planning, the consideration of the legal frameworks in which this connection was conducted within the framework of international and national experience, the results obtained and the discussion on the basis of which the conclusion is drawn.

Received December 2, 2017 / Accepted December 23, 2020

Corresponding author: Nataša Živaljević Luxor

Urban Planning Institute Niš, Serbia

E-mail: nluxor@gmail.com

The link between conservation and planning principles has a long history and its development is deeply reliant on experiences that are accepted by European countries, which happens sometimes quicker and sometimes slower. The protection of the cultural built heritage has gradually evolved and it is finally officially integrated into the planning of space in the 21st century. Such a conclusion can be derived from a number of theoretical papers, international documents and successful practical examples in the world. However, there are still certain doubts which are obstacles for full acceptance of the role of the architectural heritage in planning, incl. confirming the initial principle of the conservation movement "there is no future without the past." [1] This process is limited by the Eurocentric space – meaning, which includes countries in Europe or dominantly under the European cultural influence. This paper starts from the historically determined fact – time of emerging of legal protection and legal planning in certain countries of Europe. The main reason for such decision is the following - due to the work of UNESCO, in the international documents of the 21st century, variety of approaches emerged with different grounding (e.g. in the USA protection of cultural heritage started long after protection of natural heritage, which is completely opposite from European countries). The study of the introduction of scientific methodologies in urban planning and conservation of architectural heritage in the wider Eurocentric space shows that the development of the protection of architectural heritage as an internationally accepted discipline could have emerged in the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century (see Table 1, 2 3 and 4). Social development, hence the development of urban planning in the West and Russia, took place in various manners. After the WWI and in particularly after the WWII, the crises that emerged were resolved differently in the East and the West, but on both sides, they are explainable, in simplified manner, by issue of public interest and who represented it.

Table 1 Important dates for Serbian cultural heritage protection in 19th and 20th c [2]

1844.	Founded Commission for maintenance and restoration of church and monastery buildings
1844.	Decree on banning the destruction of old towns and their ruins was adopted
1844.	Museum Serbian, today's National Museum, was founded
1932.	founded Archaeological Commission of Banovina (province)
1932. et 1934.	Law on Museums and Antiquities Protection
1946.	Law on the Protection of Cultural Monuments and Natural Rarities
1947.	Founded the Institute for the Protection and Scientific Study of Cultural Monuments of the People's Republic of Serbia
1947.	Founded Archaeological Institute in Belgrade, at SANU the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
1972.	Yugoslavian Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments merged Republic Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments
1990.	Law on Cultural Property, revised 1992/1994 Law on Cultural Property, currently in use

Table 2 Historical overview of urban planning legislation in Serbia until 1985 [3, 4, 5]

1349	Dušan's Law
1772	Main instructions for inhabiting of Banat
1837	Decree on arranging the lanes in Serbia
1865	Law on towns
1885	Revised Law of towns, Regulations of cities and towns in Serbia
1894	Building law for city of Belgrade and other cities and towns
1895	Building law for city of Belgrade (known as Prince Miloš's law), revised 1898, 1900,19001,1905,1922
1900 et 1905	Royal Order of construction of designated streets in Belgrade [5]
1904	Building regulation of province Bács-Bodrog County
1913	Order on construction profession in liberated and joined territories in Kingdom SCS
1925	Guidelines for creating regulation and Plans for leveling out of cities and towns in Kingdom SCS
1931	Building law of Kingdom of Yugoslavia
1932	General instructions on creating building guidelines and orders on execution of regulation plans
1935	Building manual for city of Belgrade
1936	General guidelines for arrangement of villages
1938	Building manual for city of Novi Sad
1949	Basic order on General urban plan of Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia
1955	General law on arrangement of municipalities and counties
1961	Law on urban and regional spatial planning of Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, revised 1965
1967	Resolution of basis of policy of urbanization of Socialist Republic of Serbia
1974	Law on planning and arrangement in space of Socialist Republic of Serbia, revised 1985
1989	Law on planning and arrangement in space, and on Spatial plan of Socialist Republic of Serbia

Table 3 Emerging of protection of built heritage regulation in Eurocentric space [2]

Europe	TERMINUS POST QUEM	TERMINUS ANTES QUEM
England	1745	?
France	1789	1887
Italy	Renaissance	1883
Germany	1843	
Portugal	1721	revised 1802
Spain	1884	1865
Switzerland	1886	1887
Belgium/Netherlands	1823	
Denmark	1830s	
Norway	1842	1870s
Finland	1870	
Greece	?	1814
North America	1850s	1949
Russia	?	1874
Serbia	1844	1912

Table 4 Chronological overview of urban planning emerging as scientific discipline in Eurocentric space [5,6,7]

Territory	TERMINUS POST QUEM	TERMINUS ANTE QUEM	Events
Europe	1840s	1928	
North America	1890s	1909	
Russia	1703	1917	Foundation of Sankt Petersburg
Serbia	1867	1931	The first urban plan for Dorćol/The First urban plan for Belgrade

Not only that “power” **could** have become “a litmus test of a planning theory”, but at the end of the 20th century, in practice the power **did** become the litmus test of a planning as a rule (“**power**” should be understood broadly, from financial to social, from the power of individuals to the power of the community).

During the same time, through 19th and 20th century, collaborative planning has shifted from the theory of humanities to urban planning, then to the preservation of architectural heritage as a logical response to social changes. Many have pointed to the crisis of (scientific) legitimacy of urban planning, whose methods have been compromised by bureaucratic manipulations in practice [2]. The town and regional planning, as well as preservation of built heritage in **Serbia** developed in the authentic manner, yet with good awareness of the development in the wider region, in the East and the West. [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] As an example, the first urban plan for Belgrade dated only a little bit over a decade after Hausmann's plan for Paris, but in the second part of 20th century, urban planning was centralized, similar as in Russia. [4,5,7]

This research follows our paper “Role of built heritage in 20th c planning of urban areas and Eurocentric development” which provides an historic overview of development in the wider region relevant for Serbia. In this paper we focused on historic development and interdisciplinary impacts of built heritage preservation and planning of urban areas in 20th-century Serbia.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF CONTEMPORARY BUILT HERITAGE PRESERVATION IN SERBIA

In Serbia, contemporary heritage preservation as scientific discipline started developing in the first half of the 19th century, following the liberation of its territories from Ottoman Empire occupation. The ruler of Serbia at the time, Prince Milos Obrenovic, announced Order of inventory of churches and monasteries of Principality of Serbia in 1832, and in 1844 Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjevic established the institution that is nowadays the National Museum in Belgrade. Prince Milos Obrenovic also founded Commission for maintenance and restoration of church and monastery buildings and adopted The Regulation of prohibition of demolishing old cities and their ruins. During 19th century, and at the beginning of 20th century until the First World War, heritage protection was, conceptually, substantially under Austrian influence. Nevertheless, it is noticed that the researches of the past in Serbia since the end of the 19th century were conducted most actively by architects, while in the countries under Austro-Hungarian rule most active researchers were art historians. This important difference reflected primarily on the technical side of conservation of individual cultural monuments, but also indirectly, on

link to urban planning. Between the World Wars, there were several attempts to define and adopt adequate law (in 1922, 1932 and 1934) [6]. Also, the new inventory commission, established in 1922, focused for the first time not only on sacral, but on “all monuments”. [7]. In years after that, the excavation works started on several locations: Stobi near Skoplje (1931), Mediana (1933) and Humska Cuka (important prehistoric archaeological site from eneolithic period), both near Nish, as well as in the fortress of Belgrade and many others. [8] Further development of legislation in all European countries was very slow, and sometimes in Serbia even slower, followed by theoretically established general understanding of significance of integral preservation, which meant that measures and instruments for heritage protection were defined and announced in all planning documents [2].

Legal protection of cultural monuments is the basis for all actions related to the status of a cultural property, its technical protection, presentation and use. Most European countries have laws and other legal acts derived from relying on international documents, national doctrine and long-standing practical experience. Once brought, these national documents do not change essentially throughout time, but only improve and conform to changes that accompany the development of social consciousness, in such a way that only some articles or sections of the law or other documents are altered or partially rewritten. It is even more important that they are followed by fast harmonization with other laws with which they are closely related and mutually dependent. For example, when the law on preventive archeology in France passed in 2001, articles 11, 12 and 13 included amendments to the Urban Planning Act, the Environmental Act and the Building Heritage Act of 1941. [9]

After the Second World War, the former Yugoslavia, incl. Serbia as a member of federation, adopted important legal acts in the field of cultural heritage protection (Table 2): Decision on the Protection and Preservation of Cultural Monuments and Antiques (the first general legal act in the field of protection of cultural heritage in the newly formed Socialist Yugoslavia) and the Act on the Protection of Monuments of Culture and Natural Rarities of the Democratic Federative Yugoslavia, 1946. A year later, the first institution of protection in Serbia – Institute for the Protection and Scientific Research of Cultural Monuments of the People's Republic of Serbia was established in Belgrade. This institute, in cooperation with the Archaeological Institute in Belgrade, started collecting data on cultural heritage, listing sites into the Register of Protected Cultural Property and more [10].

As it has been stated, the monument law, also called the monumental legislation, is a special branch of the law (legal system) of a state and special legal discipline. It includes a set of legal norms governing social relations which are relevant for monuments of culture, architecture, art, history, which are defined in our actual law as immovable and movable cultural goods. The authority that a certain monument has, on the basis of the norms of an objective monument right, does or does not do something, or it requires some action or omission of it in connection with immovable or movable cultural goods (which is a subjective monument right). Monument law is a branch of public law, because it regulates social relations in which at least one party is the bearer of public or state power. It is estimated as one of the oldest legal branches in Serbia.

It is the fact that contemporary form of law is the result of work and development since mid-19th century. By 1975, the science of monument law was an integral part of administrative, civil, criminal, and international law. But, in modern terms this law is divided into domestic and international, and regarding this division into two schools, a monistic and dualistic. The monistic school accepts the unity of the monument law and the gives primacy of international law as its backbone. Serbian monumental law is

closely linked with constitutional law, the law of public administration, civil law, criminal law, international law and international public and private law. But, a general monumental law in Serbia is still not sufficient because the main instruments, security and equality, could be interpreted differently and often subjectively. Safety is important because it is brought in advance, and the legal subjects know how to behave. Equality has also a significant role, because it contains general rules that have to be allied to all cases of the same type, which are solved in the same way, so that all subjects are placed in the same position [11, 12]. The Republic of Serbia does not yet have its own general act, and applies Act on the Cultural Properties of Yugoslavia from 1994. This act has been outdated in a number of the articles; it cannot respond to contemporary attitudes on the protection of cultural assets and is not in line with the act of spatial and urban planning and act of natural heritage protection. From this incompatibility, a series of difficulties arises in the integration of the preservation of built heritage and the planning of urban areas still now, in the 21st century. The care for cultural heritage from the Second World War has improved the overall awareness of the preservation of cultural assets among the common people. The shift from the protection of individual monuments of culture, to the protection of the value of archaeological sites and ambient units, special historical-cultural wholes and significant sites in the period after the Second World War had an overall positive impact on the care for heritage.



Fig. 1 Main Square in Kraljevo [13]

In period immediately after World War II, there was a lot of work in Serbia for conservators and urban planners, but the interaction was almost negligible. Considering the devastation that the country experienced during the war in urban areas, as a rule, large parts of city units were cleansed and removed; in these areas there was a significant urban reconstruction, that is, a new spatial arrangement and the construction of buildings that we call today “socialist buildings”. In many cities of Serbia, incl. Belgrade, a number of buildings, entire streets and blocks with low-rise houses (on which elements of the Balkan-Oriental forms were visible) were the prime subject of urban reconstruction. By the 1960s in some international circles, the factor of the age of the building or the whole, still played a significant role in the evaluation of the architectural heritage, and the same happened in Serbia. That is why the conservation profession focused on important individual monuments of the Middle Ages and antiquity, and there it achieved excellent results. During this time, urban planners have largely removed the urban heritage of modern times, especially heritage of 19th century and they changed the image of many

cities. In some cases, the realization of urban reconstruction has not been fully achieved, and we can witness now the past evolution of the exclusion and the inclusion of the built heritage protection in the planning documents (Fig. 1 [13]) Part of square border is occupied with old buildings and another part with the building from 1960s and 1970s which is an example of unfinished reconstruction. When a larger area of urban fabric has already been remodeled by newly planned constructions, it opens the issue of endangering of the wider area, which should to be additionally protected then from losing its identity [14]. Spatial and urban plans unfortunately did not contain the integrated form of planned protection, presentation and use of the built heritage throughout the second half of the 20th c [15]. According to spatial and urban acts and other legislation, the study on cultural heritage was done apart of the plan and as such it was associated with a certain plan, but as an accompanying document. [16]

Nowadays, in Serbia, protection of cultural heritage is under jurisdiction of one national and 11 local institute, depending on significance of heritage, as well as Central Institute for Conservation (CIK). The law regarding cultural monuments (Act on cultural properties, 1992/1994 and 2011) has defined preservation of single buildings, but also included protection of wider areas and elements of urban heritage and landscape, and it was well accepted in practice. Yugoslavia was one of the founders of the United Nations, as the signatory of a charter for its foundation in 1945. After the World War II, it was the one of the founders of several international bodies whose conventions, declarations, charters and other documents, generated on the basis of theoretical and practical experience, which now serve as guidelines in the field of World Heritage. By the disintegration of Yugoslavia, several states emerged, incl. Serbia. Therefore, Serbia, as a part of the former state, and now as independent state, is involved indirectly and directly in creating international conservation doctrine from its origin, namely Venice Charter and other subsequently adopted UNESCO documents, as well as numerous European conventions and recommendations by Council of Europe [17, 18, 19]

3. DEVELOPMENT OF CONTEMPORARY TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING IN SERBIA

In the territory of Serbia, the legislative and institutional strengthening of urban planning has occurred especially between the two World Wars and after the Second WW, creating the basis for future scientific development, which successfully continued until the end of the 20th century. Urban development planning as scientific discipline, in Serbia, started developing in the middle of 19th century. Planning urban areas on the territory of nowadays Serbia emerged unevenly. With the planned development of the cities in the area of nowadays Vojvodina, which was under the rule of the Habsburg's Monarchy, began in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. For the date which would symbolically mark the beginning of the establishment of a new discipline in Serbia, suitably can serve: adoption of the first urban plan for Belgrade in 1867, or regulation of the main street of Belgrade the Knez Mihailo's street in 1868 (according to the planning designs of Emilijan Joksimovic, nominally the first Serbian urban planner), the Building Act which came in 1931 the first urban plan of Belgrade adopted in 1923, the first normative act regulating the construction of towns and vineyards in Yugoslavia or the adoption of the Ordinance on the General Urban Plan in 1949. [2]

Urban planning, applying new philosophy of space and built arrangement, started developing in designated part of the World, including in Serbia, approximately at the same time. In 20th-century Serbia, there are both western influences in urban planning, as well as the similarity with the development in Russia in accordance with the dynamics of social development in the 20th century. [20] In the course of the century, the development of ideas in Serbia was predominantly influenced by Western values. The Russian cultural influence began to intensify between two wars, with engagement in Serbia of several architects and other visual artists of Russian origin, who emigrated after the World War I, but that influence was the imperial-Russian, not communist-Russian. However, after the World War II, the socialist state order encouraged development similar to that in Russia, in terms of standardization, planned settlements and supporting infrastructure, financing of housing construction from the state budget, etc., but only to certain stage and not “all the way” like in Russia. Housing construction can be stated as indicative example: in Serbia it has never been acquired in the rigid form as it had been done in Russia, and wider, throughout the eastern bloc, because the open and free real-estate market never completely ceased to exist. [21]

After 1960s heritage protection and spatial/ urban planning in Serbia, despite the acts on planning and construction and other documents, represents a mix of different doctrines, with different European, as well as American and global influences on the entire generations of conservators and urban planners. That is why it is impossible to define the ultimate trend in planning region and towns, but rather agree there were several subsequent and overlapping trends, similar to other countries within Eurocentric influence. The main issues in this period referred to problems due to non-harmonized sector planning and dominance of physical planning, first being very dangerous for heritage protection, and second being even beneficial for it. In addition, after 1980s major political, social and economic turbulences emerged, which inevitably reflected to planning, and especially, to its implementation. There was a very specific form of various pressures that directed urban planning into non-legal flows and encouraged non-planned urbanization, which was undoubtedly most dangerous and destructive for heritage, in practice. In this way, there was a discontinuity in the reconstruction of cities, which contributed overall entropy. [21, 22]

4. DISCUSSION ON EUROCENTRIC IMPACT ON THE ROLE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN URBAN PLANNING DEVELOPMENT IN SERBIA IN 21ST CENTURY

In the transition period, especially during the wars in the Balkans, institutions have been weakened, but they did not ceased to exist, and the most significant consequence were demographic changes caused by the armed conflicts in 1990s. The influence of the West did not end in the previous, socialist period, and in the 1990s it was additionally updated, in order to adapt to the dominantly market economy. Through the 20th century, in Serbia there was always a will to keep urban acts in line with the needs of society and other laws and regulations, including those related to cultural heritage. In general, strengthening of the state lasted until 1985 and continued again, after 1996. Urban planning in Serbia did not lose contact with the local community, which has actively participated in decision-making, and began nominally to develop as collaborative after the act which was adopted in the 1995; physical planning has been definitely abandoned by the law from 2003, towards the gradual adoption of strategic and action planning, not

excluding any other known model. These changes are very significant, reflecting the fluctuation of the influence of the state and the business sector and re-examining the effects of the established balance in practice, regarding the development of urban areas. Officially, urban acts have taken into account the architectural heritage as an acquired urban obligation, and treated the area as protected in accordance with the current understanding of the concepts of protection. In practice, this urban obligation was often subjected to various pressures and there are not a small number of cases in which parts of the already adopted plans concerning the status of the architectural heritage were subsequently changed, as a rule, to the detriment of the built heritage. That is, most often, justified by the social and economic goals, so the protection service had a difficult task to persuade the future survival of cultural heritage. In this period, the best cooperation was achieved in the plans for the renovation of the old town centers. This is undoubtedly the result of not only international documents of UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCOM, but especially the impact of European recommendations, documents by Council Of Europe, Europa Nostra, and successful examples of the revitalization of old city centers in European countries. There are certain differences in approaches in Serbia's revitalization plans, depending on the principles and conservationists' inclination toward certain European attitudes. They move from the advocacy of new classical architecture and new urbanism (significant reliance, even replication of historical areas and buildings) to the exploration of the possibility of the old and new coexistence. [23, 24] Town and regional planning has eloped a transition period without much difficulty due to the Act adopted in 2003. The urban development that was very intensive ever since the Second World War has mitigated since 1990s, interest in rural development is nowadays on the rise, at the same time density in urban areas is decreasing contrary to the international trend. Negative demographic trends have slowed down need for urban planning along with urbanization, but it has not stopped. In the entire period after 2003, the principle of integrative planning was proclaimed.

Development of international doctrine of preservation and theoretical discourse was closely followed and participated even at the beginning of the 21st century. Serbia had its representatives in international conferences and continues active participation in the development of international doctrine. Serbian experts made efforts to take part in the international discourse regarding sustainable development of urban areas based on cultural heritage, despite political and economic problems [25, 26]. In Serbia at that time, new trend in international doctrine was largely accepted, the one which gave a significant place to topics which could be classified in three categories: **cultural tourism**, **economy** and **conservation** and **management of historical towns** [27]. New concepts of understanding heritage emerged, which required adoption of new phrases *e.g.* cultural landscape and historical urban landscape. Such innovations were acknowledged by experts, but application of such knowledge in practice has been mostly thwarted [28].

The significant change in the role of cultural heritage in urban planning begins to the greatest extent with the change in the methodology for the development of The Spatial Plan for the Republic of Serbia, which was adopted in 2010. In order to achieve this shift it was necessary to change a certain established procedure in the treatment of cultural heritage in spatial and urban plans. A comprehensive analysis of international documentation has noted that the status of the architectural heritage has significantly improved and is increasingly treated as a non-renewable resource. This view is accepted in Serbia, so this can be considered as the greatest progress by which the architectural heritage has become a strong potential for the sustainable development of the community. Cultural heritage is articulated as

developmental resource, protected, managed, presented and used in a way that contributes to the establishment of regional and local identity in accordance with European standards of protection. A plan is dynamic category which changes according to contextual changes. An example for it is the institution of guidelines as "lighter", a more flexible form of set of rules for individual segments and territories. [29]

However, this promising shift in the role of architectural heritage in planning cannot be fully implemented, as there are still a whole series of obstacles. One of the basic is the lack of harmonization of legislation in the areas of protection of cultural goods and urban planning. The Act on Cultural Property has not been changed since 1994, and the legal regulation of urban planning has experienced constant changes with articles which are in conflict with the basic principles of protecting the architectural heritage. The recently adopted cultural strategy of Serbia suffers from significant remarks, so it is difficult to expect the adoption of a new, modern Act on cultural property. Even if it is brought until end of 2020, it will take a while until it begins to apply in a full scale, as well as to establish a harmonious connection with planning. In the meantime, the Eurocentric impact on the renewal of the architectural heritage continues in the circles of domestic experts moving between the new classical architecture and the new urbanism and the increasingly boldly interventions that arise by linking and conveying existing and newly designed urban areas, which means that no consensus has been reached on the role of the architectural heritage in urban planning. [29, 30]

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Built heritage in 21st century is strategically treated as a resource which can be used by different participants in the society. The fact is that the cultural heritage is not just a cultural resource in the regional countries, but it is also used for achieving different political and economic goals. As this opinion is imported in our environment on the basis of similar or identical treatment in other European countries, the cultural heritage can no longer be considered only as the sum of preserved historical buildings or artifacts in some area. On one hand it has a symbolic dimension, connected to the interpretation of the heritage as sacrum, but on the other hand, heritage has become a profitable market field. The difference between these two aspects is usually hazy and it very much depends on the priorities formed on the state and society level, which in Serbia are still elusive.

In the framework of the very sensitive and difficult area which combines protection, regulation and use of cultural heritage and creation of regional identities, strategic priorities defining and the way of their implementation is process itself with a number of unknown facts. Because of that, the realization of strategic priorities, which are presented and defined here, is stipulated by the number on factors, which are formed in wide spectrum of social, governmental, cultural, economic and other boundaries. Quality and speed of accomplishing proposed strategic priorities depend on the speed of removing these boundaries.

Implementation of strategic priorities does not comprise all actual priorities and some of them should be left out due to the objective overview of the current place of cultural heritage which it takes in development politics in most of the regional countries.

No doubt, the effect of global crisis has to be taken into account, although the status of built property has been, even without the crisis, in great measure put aside in the

process of carrying out planned spatial transformations in Serbia. With this proposition, priority domain is defined in the areas of protection, promotion and usage of cultural heritage and creating the regional identity adapted to the current state in the area of cultural heritage, but with the possibility of further promotion, actually, if the country as a whole and society stabilize and go forward for the recovery, actually if they succeed to achieve development on the principles of sustainability.

REFERENCES

1. Glendinning, M. *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation*, London Routledge, 2013.
2. Vučenović, S. *Urbana i arhitektonska konzervacija*. Beograd : Društvo konzervatora Srbije, 2004. Vol. 1.
3. Maksimovic, B. *Idejni razvoj srpskog urbanizma*, Beograd, 1978.
4. Macura, V. *Urbano planiranje u Srbiji 19. i 20. veka*, Beograd, Beograd project-Centar za planiranje urbanog razvoja, 1983.
5. *Osnovne strategije urbane obnove u Srbiji i Rusiji*, (B.Stojkov, V.Belousov, eds.), Beograd, IAUS and Ruska akademija arhitekture i građevinskih nauka, 1998.
6. Boskovic, Dj. *Spomenici prošlosti i njihovo obezbeđivanje – Pravne odredbe i organizacija*, Srpski književni glasnik, Nova serija, knj.XXXVIII, br.5, Beograd, 1933, pp.373-380.
7. Boskovic, Dj. *Komisija za cuvanje starih spomenika*, Jugoslovenski istorijski casopis, god.V, sv. 1-2, Beograd, 1939, pp.366-371.
8. Stojakovic, A. *Obnova spomenika arhitekture izmedju dva rata*, Raska bastina 2, Zavod za zastitu spomenika culture, Kraljevo, 1981, pp. 259-266+9pages with photos.
9. Author, 2013.
10. Tomic, S. *Pravna zastita spomenika u Jugoslaviji*, Beograd, 1958.
11. Brguljan, V. *Izvori spomenickog prava u Jugoslaviji*, Beograd, Sluzbeni glasnik, 2000.
12. Brguljan, V. *Spomenicko pravo*, Beograd, Republicki zavod za zastitu spomenika culture, 2006.
13. <http://mondo.rs/a916412/Info/Srbija/>
14. Maksin-Micic, M. *Koriscenje i zastita prostora*, Izgradnja br. 3, Mart 2002, pp. 55-56.
15. Jakšić, M.: *Ka metodologiji obrade aspekta zaštite kulturnih dobara u okviru izrade detaljnih urbanističkih planova*, Urbanizam Beograda 62, Beograd 1981, pp.8-14.
16. *Metodološki pristupi GUP-u*, Društvo urbanista Beograda, (R. Bogdanović, ed.), Beograd, 1996.
17. https://ec.europa.eu/culture/library_en (approached March 2018)
18. *Evropske konvencije i preporuke u oblasti kulturnog nasljedja*, EXPEDITIO, Kotor 2005.
19. Смоляр, И. *Городское планирование в РФ: актуальные проблемы*, Жилищное строительство, бр.3 1998.
20. *Unapređenje stanovanja i stambene izgradnje: Makroprojekt*, (M. Kojović, ed.), Beograd, Poslovna zajednica INPROS, 1981.
21. *Obnova gradova u Srbiji-Temeljne odrednice*, (B.Stojkov, ed.), IAUS, Beograd, 1996.
22. Djordjevic, D. *Privatna obnova glavnog gradskog centra – Konceptualna osnova i stanje u Srbiji*, Izgradnja (B.Bojovic, ed.), br.6, Jun 1996, pp. 371-378.
23. Krier, L. *Architecture & Urban Design 1967-1992*, Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, 1993. (Paundbury masterplan at the Prince Charles request in 1989)
24. Bajić-Brković, M. *Urban heritage between historic preservation and development: planners perspective..* FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 1997, Vol. 1 (D.Ilic, D.Velickovic, eds.), University of Nis, pp. 483-492.
25. <https://unhabitat.org> (approached March 2018)
26. <https://isocarp.org> (approached March 2018)
27. Republic of Serbia. *Act on Cultural Property*. Article 2, paragraph 3, Official Gazette 71/1994, 52/2011 : s.n., 1994.
28. Pajović, D, Macura, V, Medvedev, M, Ferenčak, M, Savić, M. and Stojkov, B. *Ka urbanističkom zakonu*. Beograd : Udruženje urbanista Srbije, 1993.
29. Venice Charter. *ICOMOS*. [Online] 1964. http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf.
30. Author, 1995.

ULOGA GRADITELJSKOG NASLEĐA U PLANIRANJU I RAZVOJU URBANIH PODRUČJA U SRBIJI U 20. VEKU

Razvoj očuvanja graditeljske baštine i urbanističkog i prostornog planiranja na naučnim osnovama trajalo je kroz veći deo 20. veka. U Srbiji se rano krenulo sa primenom ove dve naučne discipline, u korak sa njihovim razvojem u širem evrocentričnom području, sve do političkih i ekonomskih previranja devedesetih. Uloga graditeljske baštine u urbanističkom i prostornom planiranju suštinski se promenila u to vreme širom sveta, što se delimično objašnjava razvojem naučne metodologije svake od disciplina, a delimično globalnim promenama i kasnijim izazovima. U ovom radu smo se usredsredili na razvoj u Srbiji, koji je delimično odraz promena i na istoku i na zapadu evrocentričnog područja.

Ključne reči: graditeljska baština, urbanističko planiranje, prostorno planiranje, održivost, društveno-ekonomski razvoj, Srbija