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Abstract

The structures and the functions of a city, its morphology, numerous elements of created places have an identity recognisable in the past, present and future. This identity is visible and noticeable. It is remembered and its represents the picture of a city at any chosen time and space. It is present and repeatable both in real time and space and in our imagined world. It represents a sum of chosen pictures of space in a certain time. The subjective experience of the city (place) is thus equalled with the discontinuity of processes and flows of the city development and what a city is and what it should be. Spatially – time continuity of the development of the city is much more complicated and complex picture that, unfortunately, is not visible and memorised enough unless based on deeper analytical procedure and supported by technical – technological systems of contemporary simulation and modelling of space and time. The city is a continuous creation where only the part of its reality and our experience is visible. The other part consists of invisible processes that maintain this continuity and that need not be clearly visible and familiar. They are obtained by mentioned analyses of integrated space and time (space-time) and represent a sort of balance to the visible state of a city structure. The architects and urbanists, but also other participants in the creation and maintenance of city content need that balance in the process of giving thought out procedures and guidelines for planning and design where the knowledge on the relation of causes and consequences is inevitable.

Introduction

City development course is continuous and steady. In a complex process of the change of the structure, function and all other parameters of the construction of urban space in time, visible and invisible processes can be noticed. It is hard to differ between them due to mutual frictions of those influences that in certain time or space we consider visible and important and vice versa. The continuity of city development is based also on the search of those development formulas that either was not discovered fully or was not discovered at all and some of the most complex controversies in the history of architecture and urbanism were led around them. Even the existence of such patterns and formulas was questionable, especially in the periods when architecture and urbanism were experienced primarily as an intuitive, impulsive, aesthetical and incalculable category, distant from complex approaches of thought and analysis. As a city was necessarily showed as multiple combinations of different segments and as a product of multidisciplinary activities, so did the approach to architecture and urbanism, especially to urbanism, change.

The spectre of different influences, classified by the quantitative and qualitative hierarchy that have shaped the city, starting from theological and philosophical principles over biological-social factors, political economy, legal systems, always existing supporting technology technique to the contemporary occurrences of IT, cybernetics and artificial intelligence, have necessarily brought to the expected result. To the limitation of a dominant influence of subjective understanding and decision based on a psychological element of separation and non-consistency of the relation of the world of human mind and the world of outer happenings. This, of course, does not lead to insurmountable division and creation of some new neo-subjective and neo-objective philosophical direction of perceiving the reality but speaks of necessary questioning of the interrelation of these two, apparently, separated worlds and their merging where the contemporary science considers that special. The city is simply an ideal field for such re-questioning. Since cognitive science uses the scientific method, in more modern period simulation
and modelling supported by computing technology, the analogy is inevitable. The city is both conscious and unconscious model and simulation, or, as many prefer to call it, the output of human needs and behaviour and here is the connection with cognitive psychology. It remains to be determined in which ways and at what levels this connection is achieved and what the nature of this interdependent process is.

**The Visibility of City Continuity**

City continuity is, in principle, a clear, visible and accepted category. It is experienced in at least three ways. As a sphere of real, existing urban and architectonic structure that exists and lasts past us and identifies itself with space and time of the past the present and to some extent even future. It is further experienced as a sphere related to different forms of planning procedures (planning) where it would be our relation towards the future and future city-state. In addition, urban structure exists as a series of unrelated images and impressions (“cognitive maps”) we create when we (un)intentionally daily meet different shapes of urban reality around us and in it. It could be said that there are three cognitive spheres of urban world around us and in us where the continuity is, unfortunately, the least noticeable, understood and accepted dimension. Through the analysis and scientific research, we learn about reality continuity. We are trying to connect the same research with future activities of our planning and we use the inevitable perceptions of the urban world (which carry the greatest impression of discontinuity) as an incentive moment on the way of the research of urban structure. Encyclopaedic definitions of such a relation are known, so we can find on Google (2016, p.1) [1]: “Cognitive science is a large field, and covers a wide array of topics on cognition. However, it should be recognised that cognitive science has not always been equally concerned with every topic that might bear relevance to the nature and operation of minds.”

All three cognitive spheres of the city, if we can call them like that, are related and comply a simple circle of mutual action. The least (but apparently the most important) they can do is to set a matrix of city development on which to determine the possible course of its development.

Regarding this, Benevolo says (2004, pp.274-275) [2]: “In world perspective, three patterns of urban planning created in Europe after the Middle Ages – a geometrical networks for new settlements achieved from XVI century onwards and two procedures for the transformation of industrial cities introduced in the second half of XIX century and the first third of XX century – exist in parallel in any part of the world. The first pattern remains predominant where the original intention of the land is still in force, while the other two are more closely related to the transformations of denser areas. The event which we talked about is essentially avoided, for example, in the USA; the disputes have a mutual goal of a parallel existence of different degrees of projection and fitting of alternative preferences into a comprehensive, rational draft, entrusted to public administration. The most wondrous world urban landscape of industrial ambience is mitigated by the multiplicity of open possibilities in a vast space and existence of the areas intended to the most heterogeneous public intention. From a general point of view, the pattern on Manhattan arises from the competition of numerous different creations that, starting from a uniform planimetrical network conceived in 1811, differ in the third dimension; this is the ultimate most sensational product of imperfect search, which is the very essence of European urban tradition, and apparently, expressed in this way, inseparable from democratic cohabitation. In order for Aristotle idea of a city to have its continuation, a man can only take the path of open, gradual, uncompleted, prone to polishing mediation.”

A rational relation towards the first sphere of urban, the sphere of reality, must compensate for the emptiness created by the size of that world lost both in the past and present and that inexorably imposes the impression of incoherence. This rationality creates differences in points of view but also awareness on the fact that urban world is not a subjective projection. Nadja Kurtovic – Folic (2011, p.2) [3] says: “The basic assumption is that behind human architecture there are universal and eternal laws, mutual for all of us as humans and as if there is no absolute truth about what beauty and living comfort is. It is, therefore, necessary to conceive an approach as well as a specific process that starts from the fact that in a surrounding there are already determined creations that generate and buildings and projects this general spiritual experience through which people passed, passed, no matter where and which culture they come from.... The holistic-organic approach, which in other sciences has for many years been the leading one, is implemented in architectonic researchers especially regarding the social and physical surrounding as well as systems or dynamic wholes, whose existence depends on constant, variable relations between the parts and the system. All that is made of parts or dependent on the conditions and causes is not permanent and is temporary. These are the things that do not last forever, but continually disintegrate.”

**Invisible Processes and Influences of Continual City Development**

Invisible processes and influences of continual city development are not just what we do not see or do
not want to see in a continuous evolutionary course of causes and effect of urban transformations, but also the processes that we forget or minimize when we think, make decisions, visions and deal with the second sphere – the sphere of planning and managing future development. On this still open question and principles to which it is set on, Stojanovic (2015, pp.68-69) [4] says: “That paradox is based on the fact that the law creates a structure and the structure created the law. The city is still perceived as a disrupted system where there is no order of events and where future advancement cannot find a sustainable relationship with the past”.

Mutual Relatedness of Cognitive Spheres and Continuity of a City

Mutual relatedness of cognitive spheres and city continuity is inevitable without the mentioned third sphere of periodical, intentional or accidental viewing of city wholes and sub-wholes we all do every day in time and space. This, apparently insignificant creation of ‘personal cognitive maps that have a purpose’ is a valuable source of data which is, soon or later, incorporated in our activities. Many authors emphasised the significance of such behaviour. Firstly, Lynch says (1960, p.6) [5]: “Since the emphasis here will be on the physical environment as the independent variable, this study will look for physical qualities which relate to the attributes of identity and structure in the mental image. This leads to the definition of what might be called imageability: that quality in a physical object which gives it a high probability of evoking a strong image in any given observer. It is that shape, colour, or arrangement which facilitates the making vividly identified powerfully structured, highly useful mental images of the environment. It might also be called legibility, or perhaps visibility in heightened sense, where objects are not only able to be seen, but are presented sharply and intensely to the senses.”

Social-psychological conditions of the construction and the experience (or vice versa) of social ambiences are treated by Swedish explorer Karimnia (2014, p.287) in the following manner [6]: “Life on public spaces in micro scale is facing threats of shrinking due to a transformation of social values. Our future public spaces are shaped by trends such as privatisation and communication revolution. The integration of urban form and social values are concerns for contemporary urban design in creating livable and safe places that promote further interactions. Meanwhile, for most of the modern public spaces, the concern is environmental perception and sense of lost amenities as well as fear.”

In our condition, time change of relations that, maybe not directly to the city and urban reality, but through economic-technical factors influence the integration of cognitive parts of the urban world which is less perceived and partially built and left to isolated interventions is noticeable. In his article, Prodanovic (2012, pp. 2-3) writes [7]: “It is a basic characteristic of new pulsations related to processes present already in Fordism from the phase of the heyday of this production and they can be seen today as early anticipations of later decisive turn to new economics, with very intensive requirements regarding the cognitive ad cultural work. While classic Fordism is established on electro-mechanical technologies of a large-scale capitalism is today minted on the basis of digital technologies (methods of calculation, communication, reproduction and memorization), with diffuse and sophisticated impacts on the organisation of production and work but also on the culture and models of living of both communities and individuals. These technologies replace, supplement and encourage many forms of non-routine tasks; the encourage a vast expansion of tasks that require also new different cognitive and cultural capabilities or both workers and consumers,

In a cognitive relation towards the city, different influences intertwine, considering the city itself is a heterogeneous structure made of a series of values classified by a hierarchy of quantity and quality of meaning. The topical concern for energy conservation in many sectors where it must be taken care of, apparently not so simple technological things such as analyses of vertical communication, leads to the fact that n Google we can read (2010, p.1) [8]: “Elevators are one of the many technologies that had to be developed before buildings could get taller than a few stories, but until now, there was no information available on how much electricity you by taking a ride in one…”

On the other hand, there are eternal and inevitable questions of the relation of past (historical) and contemporary (modern), and a justified worry about their confrontation are expressed. That is why, for example, Krstic (2010, p.21) says [9]: “Architectonic heritage is the future of the past. Architectonic heritage is never only the architecture of the past. It has always
been a role model and an incentive in construction in present and obtaining legally permanent protection it was provided with incentive and criterion in the future... Architectonic heritage, as a recognised value of the past, should be a corrective factor of construction in the present and an anticipating factor in construction in the future."

Precisely this range of thinking and discussion is the proof that cognitive relation towards a city is a continuous process as the city itself is a continuous phenomenon. Visible and invisible processes in city continuity, together with our daily experience of a city constantly give an algorithm of the confrontation of three cognitive spheres of urban and the result arising from them.

In conclusion, the continuity of a city and a cognitive relation towards it is a dynamic puzzle in urban time-space, to which we belong. Taking into consideration the achievement of cognitive psychology, its relation to both traditional psychological approaches, which is important for noticing the place of a man as a factor of city construction, and contemporary movements – a relation towards the city itself is established, defining in it wide areas of research, perception and creative action. The city is not and cannot be an incoherent image of accident happenings and this is the reason why terms ‘visible, ‘invisible’ and ‘experiential’ are only the elements of one both working and cultural pattern by which we want to create and shape city space and the environment.
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