

# **Spatial Leftovers and Their Role in the Everyday Use of Open Spaces: Types, Characteristics, and Meanings in the Case of Skopje's Central City Area**

*The term “spatial leftovers” has become established in urban studies as a concept used to describe parts of cities that are underused, abandoned, or otherwise marginalized within the urban fabric. The growing interest of urban disciplines in the causes, character, and functional definition of these types of spaces remains ambiguous, with inconsistent definitions and interpretations across different scholarly fields. Through a critical re-examination of the term “spatial leftovers,” this research investigates its theoretical evolution and contributes to a clearer conceptual definition. The paper proposes an understanding of spatial leftovers in the city through the examination of spaces that have emerged as a result of breaks, displacements, or incomplete implementations of planned urban intentions stemming from conceptually discontinuous planning processes or other forms of disruption. In many cases, these leftovers are defined or described by their exclusion from the active life of the city, their lack of clear functional purpose, and their potential to reflect broader urban inequalities and deficiencies in planning. The research focuses on the city of Skopje, which exhibits significant spatial leftovers as a result of its multilayered historical development characterized by periods of reconstruction, ideological change, and accelerated urban growth. The paper presents different examples of “spatial leftovers” located within the central urban area of Skopje, using case studies from different stages of the city’s planning history. The case studies include vacant and underused spaces that emerged from post-earthquake reconstruction phases, areas where intended planning functions were only partially implemented over subsequent decades, as well as development gaps resulting from later revisions and redirections of urban planning visions in the central city area. These examples demonstrate how successive, conceptually discontinuous planning approaches have generated ruptures within the urban fabric and produced “spatial leftovers” in the contemporary city. The research employs mapping techniques to classify “spatial leftovers” into different categories that illustrate the diverse forces that have shaped urban development. The methodology combines a study of Skopje’s urban history with spatial analysis of “spatial leftovers.” A methodological approach based on mapping spatial leftovers is applied, offering a spatial overview that connects physical characteristics with the historical and socio-political factors that have shaped their current conditions. In this way, patterns of neglect, fragmentation, and exclusion among these spaces are identified, with particular emphasis on the role of urban plans, land use and management, as well as policies and decision-making in the creation and maintenance of these “residual” (or neglected) urban zones. The paper’s central argument is that this “neglected” spatial tissue represents locations with strong potential for urban transformation, offering possibilities for renewal and for the development of alternative forms of spatial organization. Through processes of mapping and analysis, it is demonstrated that these spaces need to be recognized as key components in future urban planning and development. This research segment problematizes dominant urban narratives that overlook marginalized spaces, emphasizing*

1 *their potential as essential factors in shaping more inclusive and sustainable*  
 2 *cities.*

3  
 4 **Keywords:** *spatial leftovers, in-between spaces/interstitial spaces,*  
 5 *transformation of the urban fabric, categorization of urban spaces / urban*  
 6 *space typology, valorization of urban leftovers*

## 9 **Theoretical Foundations and Concepts**

10  
 11 The study of spatial leftovers has attracted growing interest within urban  
 12 planning and architectural research, focusing on spaces that have long remained  
 13 unnoticed or insufficiently explored. These spaces, previously regarded as  
 14 marginal, residual, or unintended by-products of urban planning and large-scale  
 15 infrastructural developments, are increasingly recognized as significant  
 16 indicators of broader processes related to urban transformation and the  
 17 inclusiveness or marginalization embedded within socio-political dynamics.  
 18 This chapter highlights the cultural preconditions, theoretical and terminological  
 19 definitions, and methodological tendencies that form the foundation of this field  
 20 of inquiry. In doing so, it identifies existing theoretical gaps and points to  
 21 potential directions for further research, particularly within contexts that remain  
 22 underexplored.

23 Even without the use of the contemporary concept, early urban theorists  
 24 began to formulate arguments for understanding the phenomena that are today  
 25 referred to as “spatial leftovers.” Kevin Lynch criticized the form and legibility  
 26 of the urban structure while simultaneously reflecting on the existence of spaces  
 27 of an ambiguous nature—areas that fulfill no clearly defined purpose and disrupt  
 28 the order of the planned urban landscape shaped through human intervention.  
 29 These ideas provide a foundation for further exploration of the possibilities that  
 30 exist beyond the boundaries of formally planned urban spaces.

31 As part of a broader conceptual shift, Henri Lefebvre developed the notion  
 32 of space as a social product, inextricably linked to power relations, capital, and  
 33 ideology. His work subsequently influenced the understanding of urban voids as  
 34 spaces shaped by processes of political and economic exclusion. In this  
 35 perspective, voids within the urban fabric are not merely physical absences but  
 36 rather the outcome of spatialized processes of uneven development and socio-  
 37 spatial inequalities.

38 Perhaps one of the most influential theoretical contributions comes from  
 39 Ignasi de Solà-Morales, who introduced the term *terrain vague* to describe vacant  
 40 or indeterminate spaces within the urban context. These spaces are not simply  
 41 neglected or abandoned; they also possess symbolic and affective dimensions.  
 42 De Solà-Morales rejects the interpretation of *terrain vague* as merely residual or  
 43 economically defined space, instead emphasizing its potential as a site of  
 44 resistance, creativity, and disruption of dominant urban structures. This perspective  
 45 resonated strongly with architects and urban planners seeking to move beyond  
 46 the restrictive frameworks of prescriptive urbanism.

1 Ali Madanipour developed the term interstitial spaces to describe spatial  
2 zones situated between more clearly defined categories of space, such as public  
3 and private, or built and unbuilt environments. His work explicitly addresses the  
4 ambiguities associated with the governance, ownership, and use of these spaces,  
5 helping to reveal the often-hidden social negotiations that take place within and  
6 around them. Through this perspective, spatial leftovers are understood not  
7 merely as physical gaps within the urban fabric, but as arenas where competing  
8 interests, practices, and meanings intersect.

9 Christopher Trancik explored the practical dimension of urban leftovers,  
10 treating them as interstitial zones capable of enhancing the coherence, legibility,  
11 and functionality of the urban structure. He identifies spatial leftovers as critical  
12 elements of urban planning, as they are frequently overlooked or insufficiently  
13 integrated despite their potential to generate public spaces, improve accessibility,  
14 and accommodate adaptive or creative uses. Trancik links the physical configuration  
15 of these spaces to their social and functional dimensions, proposing concrete  
16 strategies for their incorporation into the planned urban context. His work  
17 highlights the importance of recognizing and activating residual spaces as  
18 valuable components of a more integrated and responsive urban environment.

19 The concept of loose space, developed by Frank and Stevens, employs a  
20 relational understanding of urban space to highlight ambiguous and  
21 indeterminate environments, defining them as settings that enable informal,  
22 adaptive, and temporary urban uses. In contrast to highly regulated urban  
23 environments, loose spaces allow for a degree of openness and spontaneity that  
24 supports grassroots initiatives, performative urban practices, and alternative  
25 forms of appropriation. This shift in thinking contributes to the repositioning of  
26 spatial leftovers, viewing them not merely as indicators of urban failure, but also  
27 as spaces of opportunity and potential.

28 Matthew Carmona focuses on public and open spaces, articulating the value  
29 of place through three interconnected dimensions: morphological (spatial) value,  
30 experiential (perceptual) value, and institutional (social and planning-related)  
31 value. He argues that places are produced through a place-shaping continuum-a  
32 cyclical process in which planning and design, construction, use, and  
33 management continuously interact and influence one another. From this  
34 perspective, the quality and longevity of a place depend not only on the initial  
35 planning and design interventions but also on long-term management practices  
36 and on the ways users appropriate, maintain, and care for the space over time.

37 Carmona's model connects the visible, tangible, and measurable aspects of  
38 urban form-such as spatial layout, connectivity, and modularity-with the  
39 intangible yet equally significant dimensions of experience and governance,  
40 including attachment, perception, stewardship, and management. From the  
41 perspective of resilience, this suggests that spatial form is meaningful and  
42 capable of sustaining its adaptive capacity only insofar as it enables or constrains  
43 the social and institutional processes that unfold within it.

44 Contemporary socio-anthropological perspectives further expand this  
45 framework. Michel de Certeau explores the everyday use of urban spaces,  
46 emphasizing how users appropriate and reinterpret their environments beyond the

1 intentions and regulations established through formal planning. Margaret Crawford  
2 and John Chase highlight the importance of everyday, informal, and adaptive  
3 practices that animate and transform indeterminate urban spaces. Stavrides and  
4 Ostrom further enrich the social dimension by conceptualizing spatial leftovers as  
5 potential urban commons, where collective forms of governance and social practices  
6 generate spaces that are both culturally meaningful and functionally productive.

7 Within sociological and anthropological discourse, spatial leftovers have  
8 become the subject of analyses that explore the interaction between people and  
9 their environment, with particular emphasis on social dynamics, power relations,  
10 and cultural practices. These spaces function as sites of social negotiation and  
11 interaction through which practices of use and appropriation are formed,  
12 contested, and expressed, while simultaneously shaping perceptions and  
13 meanings associated with the spaces themselves. From a phenomenological  
14 perspective, spatial leftovers reveal the experiential dimension of urban life by  
15 highlighting how people perceive, use, and represent these spaces, and how the  
16 very ambiguity or indeterminacy of such environments creates opportunities for  
17 innovative, informal, and context-sensitive urban activities. These socio-  
18 phenomenological perspectives underscore the capacity of spatial leftovers to  
19 resist dominant planning paradigms and demonstrate that they are culturally and  
20 socially productive spaces rather than merely passive or marginalized voids.

21 The integration of architectural, urban planning, sociological, and  
22 phenomenological perspectives enables a more comprehensive understanding of  
23 spatial leftovers as complex and multilayered phenomena. They are  
24 simultaneously physical, social, and symbolic in nature and can be regarded as  
25 valuable resources for innovation, adaptive practices, and forms of urban  
26 resilience and resistance.

### 27 28 29 **Definition and Terminology of “Spatial Leftovers”**

30  
31 There are numerous imprecise and overlapping terms used to describe the  
32 same spatial phenomena-urban voids, liminal spaces, interstitial spaces, non-  
33 places, residual spaces, heterotopias. Each of these terms highlights a different  
34 aspect of spatial marginality-material, symbolic, legal, or perceptual.

35 López-Piñero offers one of the most structured approaches to organizing  
36 this terminology. His lexicon of urban voids categorizes these spaces according  
37 to morphological characteristics, time (permanent, transitional, and ephemeral),  
38 and functional status (used, unused, and misused). This also reveals the difficulty  
39 of attempting to impose order on a category of space defined by indeterminacy.

40 On this basis, space is also examined from the perspective of everyday use  
41 and its incorporation into people’s lived experience. Spatial leftovers can be  
42 identified as micro-nodes, urban pockets, thresholds, courtyards, or gardens  
43 which, although not formally part of the planned urban system, enable intensive  
44 and contextually adapted activities. This approach highlights the complex  
45 interaction between formal and informal planning, as well as the interest of

1 anthropology in the immaterial appropriation of these spaces-namely, the ways  
2 in which people appropriate, adapt, and cultivate spaces in everyday life.

3 Such an expanded perspective emphasizes the multidimensional nature of  
4 “spatial leftovers”: they are physical, social, cultural, and symbolic, and their value  
5 is not measured solely through formal criteria, but also through the practices,  
6 meanings, and interactions that activate these spaces. This provides a foundation for  
7 integrating architectural, urbanistic, sociological, and phenomenological  
8 perspectives in the analysis of these complex and multilayered phenomena.

9 Zimmerman and Patterson use the concept of liminality to denote spaces of  
10 transition, ambiguity, and thresholds. Within the context of “residuality,” these  
11 spaces are not only physically neglected but also remain suspended in a symbolic  
12 and experiential sense; they actively resist integration into dominant spatially  
13 oriented narratives. Christiansen, building on Foucault’s notion of heterotopia,  
14 advances the argument that every “undefined space” is significant not only in  
15 relation to its physical form, but also in relation to locally specific meanings that  
16 are historically, culturally, and politically constructed. Therefore, “undefined  
17 spaces” function both as sites of marginalization and as potential futures.

18 At the same time, the inconsistency of terminology depends on the  
19 discursive framework within which different disciplines-or even subfields within  
20 the same discipline-address these research concerns. As noted in previous  
21 reviews, many contributions in the field of undefined spaces are approached  
22 from diverse (and often conflicting and incompatible) disciplinary perspectives  
23 (e.g., urban morphology, landscape theory, critical geography, cultural studies,  
24 etc.), resulting in a developed yet fragmented field in which some core concepts  
25 are not only “loosely” defined but are also used in an inconsistent and  
26 unpredictable manner.

27  
28 **Table 1.** “*Spatial Leftovers*”: *theoretical concepts and definition*

Time frame	Term	Definition/ Concept	Author(s)	Source
1960	Public Space	Open, accessible spaces that encourage social interaction and urban diversity	Kevin Lynch, Henri Lefebvre	The Image of the City (1960); The Production of Space (1974)
1960–1970	Liminal Space	Transitional spaces that blur the boundaries between two states or domains	Victor Turner	The Ritual Process (1969)
1980–1990	In-Between Space	Spaces between defined urban elements that function as connectors	Herman Hertzberger	Lessons for Students in Architecture (1991)
2000	Loose Space	Spaces appropriated for non-intentional and unpredictable activities	Karen Franck & Quentin Stevens	Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life (2007)
2000	Urban Leftover Spaces	Unused and unplanned urban spaces with undefined identity	various authors	various sources

Time frame	Term	Definition/ Concept	Author(s)	Source
	Spatial Leftovers	Empty, impersonal, and isolated urban spaces detached from their surroundings	Alanyali Aral	Redefining Leftover Space (2011)
	Distemic Space	Impersonal spaces dominated by abstract relations rather than cultural significance	Wallin	Contemporary Urban Sociology
2010 -	Marginalized Spaces	Spaces associated with deviation, degradation, and social exclusion	Burgers	Urban Typologies
	Exposed Space	Spaces used for contemplation and symbolic idealization	Burgers	Urban Typologies
	Every day Public Space; Urban Management of Public Space	Public space understood through its shaping, governance, use, and valuation	Matthew Carmona	Public Places, Urban Spaces; Re-theorizing Contemporary Public Space; The Value of Public Space

1  
2 Lefebvre and Lynch lay the foundations of a theory of space as a social  
3 construct, emphasizing the role of historical and political factors in the formation  
4 of different types of residual spaces. Their ideas extend Foucault's theory,  
5 particularly his concept of heterotopia, which demonstrates how space can  
6 function as an isolated or "other" space while simultaneously remaining  
7 complementary to Burgers, who focuses on the social and political  
8 marginalization of space. Turner and Hertzberger continue this line of thought  
9 through the concept of "thresholds" or in-between spaces, describing spaces that  
10 are not fully integrated and linking their analysis back to Foucault and to  
11 Lefebvre/Lynch.

12 Franck and Stevens build on this theoretical framework by exploring the  
13 potential for temporary and creative interventions in marginalized spaces, and  
14 their approach is complemented by Aral, who treats urban leftovers as active  
15 resources capable of acquiring new functions. Aral further develops the work of  
16 Franck and Stevens and connects it with Wallin's analysis, which emphasizes  
17 the dysfunctionality of these spaces as a result of broader urban processes.  
18 Wallin, in turn, complements Burgers' socio-functional analysis, while Burgers  
19 simultaneously aligns with Foucault and Lefebvre/Lynch, as he investigates the  
20 social and political exposure of space. Finally, Dines and Cattell extend the work  
21 of Franck, Stevens, and Aral through an approach that reactivates space via  
22 everyday activities and local practices, offering a more inclusive and localized  
23 understanding of urban residual spaces.

1       The approach of this research builds on an already established theoretical  
2 framework, focusing on the analysis of “spatial leftovers” in the central urban  
3 area of Skopje. It relies particularly on Lefebvre’s and Lynch’s ideas of space as  
4 a social construct, as well as on Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, emphasizing  
5 the historical, social, and political embeddedness of space, which is essential for  
6 subsequent analyses. In addition, it applies Burgers’ conceptualization of social  
7 and political marginalization, and Turner’s and Hertzberger’s notion of  
8 “thresholds” or in-between spaces-ideas that enable an understanding of spaces  
9 that are not fully integrated into the urban structure.

10       Regarding spatial activation, the approach draws on Franck, Stevens, and  
11 Aral, who emphasize the potential for temporary and creative interventions,  
12 while Dines and Cattell propose a localized and inclusive approach grounded in  
13 everyday practices.

14       The position of this research is closest to Lefebvre, Foucault, and Aral,  
15 whose concepts most directly articulate the relationship between historical  
16 transformations, functional disintegration, and the potential for new functions of  
17 spatial leftovers.

18       From the typological table of public spaces (Table 1), the basis for defining  
19 the research subject is established. “Spatial leftovers” are differentiated  
20 according to their origin and status—from formally planned and integrated urban  
21 elements to autonomous and informally produced spaces that emerge through  
22 improvised interventions or user-driven adaptations.

23       The analysis investigates the interaction between formal planning and  
24 everyday use, whereby these spaces function as sites of social negotiation and  
25 interaction, where practices of appropriation, adaptation, and governance of the  
26 urban environment are formed and continuously renegotiated. Micro-spatial  
27 forms such as micro-nodes, urban pockets, thresholds, courtyards, and gardens  
28 illustrate the complex dynamics of everyday practices and their relationship to  
29 both formal and informal structures.

30       From a sociological and anthropological perspective, these spaces reveal the  
31 social and cultural embeddedness of the urban environment, as well as the  
32 immaterial forms of spatial appropriation. From a phenomenological perspective,  
33 they express the experiential dimension of urban life and the potential of space  
34 for innovation, creative interventions, and localized forms of governance.

35       This approach enables the establishment of a theoretical framework for the  
36 further analysis of “spatial leftovers” as multidimensional phenomena that are  
37 simultaneously physical, social, and symbolic, and it provides the basis for  
38 examining their functions, transformations, and potentials for new urban  
39 practices in the central urban area of Skopje.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 1 **Spatial Leftovers in the City of Skopje from the Late 20th and Early 21st** 2 **Century**

3  
4 The development of Skopje is marked by a series of urban plans grounded  
5 in mutually incompatible conceptual frameworks, resulting in a lack of  
6 alignment between successive planning visions and their material realizations.  
7 Rather than continuity, the city is frequently treated as a space “from the  
8 beginning” (ad nihilum)-where each new phase is legitimized through a radically  
9 new conception of urban development. This repeated reconfiguration produces  
10 fragmentation, unfinished structures, and “spatial leftovers.”

11 Early regulatory interventions from the late 19th and early 20th century,  
12 within the Ottoman and early Yugoslav context, were based on a gradual  
13 rationalization of the existing urban fabric, without a complete or radical  
14 reconfiguration of the city. Following the Second World War, new general urban  
15 plans were introduced, among which the 1948 General Urban Plan is particularly  
16 significant. With it, the city was conceptualized through clearly defined  
17 functional zoning, an expanded transport network, and precisely articulated  
18 public spaces and urban cores.

19 The 1963 earthquake represents a radical urban turning point in the  
20 development of Skopje. In 1964–1965, an international competition for the  
21 reconstruction of the city was organized, with the first prize shared by the team  
22 of Kenzo Tange and the Polish team led by Adolf Ciborowski. Based on the  
23 competition proposals, the final Reconstruction Plan for Skopje (1965) was  
24 developed, representing a synthesis of the submitted concepts. This plan marked  
25 a discontinuity with the previous urban matrix and established a new modernist  
26 spatial structure based on megastructural principles, a new system of urban  
27 centers, and the reorganization of public spaces.

28 Subsequent revisions and general plans from the 1970s and 1980s  
29 represented attempts to adapt and further elaborate the post-earthquake vision.  
30 However, they were often only partially implemented, leaving behind  
31 incomplete spatial and infrastructural units. After the 1990s, urban planning  
32 became further complicated by changes in property relations, new regulatory  
33 frameworks, and interventions related to the symbolic reconfiguration of the  
34 central urban area, which built upon already unfinished trajectories from earlier  
35 periods.

36 Within this chronological sequence, each new plan largely treats the city as  
37 if it is starting anew, often without sufficient regard for the previously  
38 constructed urban structure. This repeated “self-rewriting” of the city through  
39 successive planning visions produces a discontinuity between planning and  
40 implementation and results in the accumulation of spatial leftovers: unfinished  
41 blocks, interrupted axes, transformed squares, transitional voids between  
42 buildings, and remnants of infrastructural systems.

43 A significant limitation in the existing literature is its geographical and  
44 cultural bias. A large body of research on “spatial leftovers” originates from  
45 studies of Western European, North American, or East Asian cities, where these

1 phenomena are often associated with deindustrialization, suburban urbanization,  
2 or neoliberal urbanism.

3 Skopje, however, demonstrates an overlap of multiple urban logics:  
4 Ottoman, socialist, post-earthquake modernist, and nationalist, leaving behind  
5 discontinuous developmental phases.

## 8 **Methodological Approaches and Their Influence on Urban Practices**

9  
10 Due to the complex nature of “spatial leftovers,” a broad spectrum of  
11 methodological approaches is employed—ethnography, participatory mapping,  
12 GIS analysis, visual studies, speculative design, and spatial typology. This  
13 methodological pluralism enables a deeper understanding of which “spatial  
14 leftovers” are produced, how they are used, and how they are represented. At the  
15 same time, it highlights a methodological instability when conducting  
16 comparative analyses based on different analytical frameworks and scales of  
17 observation that are not easily comparable.

18 More recent case studies have expanded the available methodological  
19 repertoire. Jonas and Rahman document previously overlooked micro-spaces in  
20 highly dense urban districts and map and theorize them as potential sites of cultural  
21 creativity. The “Urban Rooms of Sarajevo” project examines participatory  
22 processes and investigates how temporary uses of vacant sites can renew civic  
23 discourse and community engagement. Each of these approaches confirms that both  
24 analytical and performative methods are relevant for the study of “spatial leftovers,”  
25 not only as objects of analysis but also as sites of intervention.

26 Additionally, new concepts in urban planning increasingly recognize  
27 “indeterminacy” or underutilized spaces as potential catalysts for processes of  
28 sustainability and resilience. These spaces, which traditional planning often  
29 treats as “voids,” are reinterpreted as significant components of adaptive and  
30 flexible urban development. They provide opportunities for temporary or  
31 innovative forms of use, including green infrastructures, multifunctional public  
32 spaces, and collective initiatives that strengthen the social and environmental  
33 capacity of the city. Integrating these indeterminate spaces into broader  
34 frameworks of urban resilience and sustainability transforms them from  
35 marginal or neglected zones into strategic points of potential innovation,  
36 adaptation, and contextually relevant urban planning.

37 Kovata and Ikalović link residual spatiality with ecologically oriented urban  
38 thinking, framing these spaces as absorptive zones for social, climatic, or  
39 infrastructural fluctuations. Landman calls for the recognition of the actual  
40 legacy of “spatial leftovers” and their integration into urban policy as prototypes  
41 for low-risk and flexible design interventions, such as public spaces in rapidly  
42 urbanizing contexts and environments with limited economic resources.

43 The concept of integrating “spatial leftovers” into urban processes comes  
44 with its own set of challenges. Many local authorities perceive these spaces as  
45 nuisances rather than resources or priorities, and any attempt at collective or  
46 spontaneous engagement with “spatial leftovers” in such contexts is often

1 obstructed by policy frameworks or regulatory constraints. Any meaningful  
2 integration of “spatial leftovers” therefore requires not only spatial re-  
3 imagination strategies but also institutional change.

4 Furthermore, there remain many unresolved questions regarding the  
5 development of frameworks that not only identify or interpret different “spatial  
6 leftovers,” but also enable initial steps toward their reintegration into the urban  
7 systems of memory of the city-without compromising their openness,  
8 informality, or capacity for creative programmatic use.

## 11 **Research Subject**

13 This doctoral research focuses on the critical analysis and spatial  
14 identification of the phenomenon of “spatial leftovers” within the urban context  
15 of Skopje. These spaces, generally defined through marginality, partial  
16 utilization, or ambiguous interpretation, represent unintended residues produced  
17 by complex urban factors, including historical discontinuities, political  
18 interventions, economic conditions, and infrastructural development. The study  
19 is situated within the central urban area of Skopje, specifically the “Mali Ring”  
20 (Small Ring), as a representative spatial entity where multiple layers of urban  
21 transformation have left visible traces of fragmented spatiality.

22 In scholarly discourse, the concept of “spatial leftovers” remains  
23 insufficiently defined and terminologically inconsistent. A range of overlapping  
24 concepts exists, such as urban voids, terrain vague, liminal spaces, “in-between”  
25 spaces, everyday spaces, micro-public spaces, micro-pockets, fragments, and  
26 thresholds. These terms are employed across urban planning, architecture, and  
27 urban sociology, yet rarely contribute to a unified and operational analytical  
28 framework. This research aims to address part of this conceptual ambiguity by  
29 proposing a more precise definition and typology of spatial leftovers, grounded  
30 in a comprehensive literature review and a typology contextualized through the  
31 empirical case of Skopje.

32 This study starts from the perspective that spatial leftovers represent urban  
33 spaces that emerge unintentionally as a result of fragmented or incomplete  
34 planning processes, or as spaces produced through conceptually discontinuous  
35 plans, infrastructural interventions, political or ideological projects, or socio-  
36 economic disruptions. These spaces are characterized by their detachment from  
37 the dominant urban flow, the absence of a clearly defined functional purpose,  
38 limited representation within official planning narratives, and an ambiguous  
39 social or spatial role. Their use is not formally prescribed; instead, they remain  
40 residual, excluded, detached, and removed from the formal context, while  
41 remaining open to informal use and appropriation. Although often perceived as  
42 neglected, underutilized, or irrelevant, they in fact constitute complex urban  
43 residues that reflect broader structural conditions and historical discontinuities  
44 in the city’s development.

45 The foundation of this research lies in the analysis of socio-spatial processes  
46 that enable the production, persistence, and interpretation of spatial leftovers

1 within continuously transforming urban environments. In the case of Skopje,  
2 various political and developmental processes simultaneously generate  
3 abandoned or detached fragments of the city, or spaces that exist outside formal  
4 planning procedures, or lack a specific functional designation, while there is also  
5 a lack of understanding of their role and significance within the urban fabric. In  
6 contrast, these spaces persist as a form of latent functionality for reconfiguration,  
7 adaptation, and reintegration within the evolving city.

## 10 **Research Aims**

12 The main focus of this research is the study and conceptualization of the  
13 phenomenon of spatial leftovers in urban environments undergoing transitional  
14 processes, with Skopje as a case study. The research concentrates on the  
15 diachronic dimension of urban transformations and their impact on the  
16 production and persistence of spatial leftovers, based on periodic shifts in urban  
17 planning paradigms and the application of different planning instruments.

18 In order to understand spatial leftovers, they will be mapped, classified, and  
19 typologically analyzed to establish a chronology of their historical emergence,  
20 spatial structure, and the socio-political conditions that have led to their  
21 formation and persistence. The research aims to develop a new understanding of  
22 these often-neglected urban spaces-not as voids or manifestations of planning  
23 failure, but as urban palimpsests with latent potential.

24 The ultimate objective is to reposition spatial leftovers as meaningful  
25 components of the contemporary city-as resources capable of contributing to  
26 context-sensitive, inclusive, and sustainable urban renewal or transformation, as  
27 well as to foster a shift in the official disciplinary discourse of urban planning,  
28 particularly within administrative and legal frameworks governing the treatment,  
29 integration, management, and maintenance of such spaces.

## 32 **Justification of Working Hypotheses and Thesis**

34 In order to address the persistent conceptual ambiguity surrounding the term  
35 “spatial leftovers” and to highlight its relevance for understanding urban  
36 transformation-particularly in post-socialist and transitional contexts such as  
37 Skopje-the research is structured around three main dimensions: theoretical,  
38 empirical, and normative.

### 40 *Theoretical Justification*

42 Although urban literature increasingly addresses neglected, underutilized,  
43 or “leftover” spaces-using a variety of overlapping terms-there is still no  
44 unambiguous or systematically grounded theoretical justification for the use of  
45 the concept of “spatial leftovers.” Instead, the field is characterized by a  
46 multiplicity of descriptive approaches and definitions, derived from the

1 inherently kaleidoscopic ways in which these spaces are used and appropriated  
 2 in practice. The existing analysis reveals significant variation in how different  
 3 terms are applied across academic works, often without sufficient consideration  
 4 of their disciplinary, cultural, or spatial contexts. These inconsistencies can lead  
 5 to conceptual ambiguity within the literature and methodological uncertainty in  
 6 research approaches.

7 Based on this, the following is proposed:

### 8 9 **Hypothesis 1**

10  
11 The concept of “spatial leftovers” is analytically distinct from other related  
 12 terms and can be explicitly defined through a set of shared characteristics,  
 13 namely: spatial marginality, functional disintegration, historical layering, and  
 14 socio-political neglect.

15 This hypothesis is grounded in existing definitions and terminological  
 16 distinctions, which emphasize the need for a precise conceptualization of “spatial  
 17 leftovers” and highlight their differentiation from related terms such as “unused  
 18 spaces,” “voids,” or “marginal spaces.” In doing so, it enables analytical clarity  
 19 and systematic characterization of their defining properties.

20 Additionally, the hypothesis is grounded in the following conceptual  
 21 frameworks:

- 22
- 23 - Spatial leftover as urban residue (Aral): treats urban leftovers as a distinct
- 24 category of space with specific forms and functions, thereby supporting
- 25 the need for terminological explicitness
- 26 - Systemically dysfunctional and marginalized space (Wallin): emphasizes
- 27 the dysfunctional nature of these spaces as a result of broader urban
- 28 processes, reinforcing the argument of functional disintegration
- 29 - Marginalized/exposed space (Burgers): highlights the social and political
- 30 marginalization of space, supporting the dimension of socio-political
- 31 neglect
- 32

33 In order to more precisely define the notion of “spatial leftovers,” it is  
 34 necessary to retain it as a signifying term that allows contextual flexibility across  
 35 different urban conditions, while simultaneously conceptualizing it within a  
 36 unified theoretical framework that integrates spatial form and socio-political  
 37 meaning.

### 38 39 *Empirical Justification*

40  
41 Skopje is a particularly relevant case for the study of spatial leftovers, as the  
 42 city has undergone multiple cycles of destruction, reconstruction, ideological  
 43 planning, and even forms of urban nationalism. Each of these cycles has produced  
 44 spatial discontinuities, unused areas, and urban voids with highly ambiguous  
 45 conditions. These forms still persist today in different manifestations-from

1 fragmented remnants of socialist planning to monumental yet disconnected  
2 landscapes produced through imposed ideological and semantic redefinitions.  
3 This empirical richness enables the formulation of the following:  
4

## 5 **Hypothesis 2**

6

7 Spatial leftovers in the central area of Skopje can be classified into a  
8 typology that reflects distinct historical and political processes, where each  
9 process generates different spatial forms and patterns of exclusion.

10 This hypothesis is linked to historical conceptualizations of urban “spatial  
11 leftovers,” in which the analysis of successive urban transformations  
12 demonstrates how different epochs produce distinct physical and social residues.

13 Additionally, this hypothesis is grounded in the following conceptual  
14 frameworks:

- 15
- 16 - Space as a social construct (Lefebvre, Lynch): emphasizes that space is  
17 produced through social practices and processes, thereby supporting the  
18 idea that historical and political factors generate different types of spatial  
19 residues
- 20 - Heterotopia (Foucault): demonstrates that space can function as distinct,  
21 isolated, or “other” space, helping to explain the existence of  
22 disconnected and marginalized urban segments
- 23 - “Threshold” (Turner and Hertzberger): the concept of space as  
24 transitional or liminal explains the phenomenon of spaces that are not  
25 fully integrated, but rather exist as in-between zones produced by specific  
26 historical and social processes
- 27

28 This typology serves as a key starting point for the development of  
29 theoretical concepts grounded in the reading of empirical spatial conditions,  
30 offering a comparative framework that can be applied to other cities  
31 experiencing similar urban transformations.

32 At the same time, understanding the role and significance of these spaces  
33 may transform how they are valued, protected, and incorporated into formal  
34 institutional and disciplinary frameworks, recognizing their importance in  
35 fostering inclusivity, resilience, sociability, and alternative functional  
36 differentiation within the broader designated uses of open urban space.

### 37 *Normative Justification*

38

39

40 The marginalization of “spatial leftovers” within urban discourse and  
41 planning practice reflects a broader exclusionary logic that prioritizes economic  
42 optimization and aesthetic coherence at the expense of social and spatial  
43 inclusivity. However, emerging approaches in urbanism-particularly temporary  
44 urbanism and sustainable planning-suggest that “spatial leftovers” can be  
45 reinterpreted and repositioned as sites of experimentation, collectivity,  
46 ecological integration, and cultural production of space.

1 **Table 2.** *Periodization of Spatial Leftovers: Characteristics, Generative Processes,*  
 2 *and Urban Meanings*

Period	Characteristics of Spatial Leftovers	Generative Processes	Urban and Social Meanings
<b>Post-war period</b>	Fragmented parcels; temporary or unfinished spaces; weak infrastructural provision	Emergency reconstruction; lack of resources; prioritization of functionality over spatial quality	Urban marginalization; social inequality; temporary use as a permanent condition
<b>Post-earthquake period</b>	Large open areas without a clear function; interrupted urban continuity; spatial voids between new structures	Radical urban reconfiguration; modernist planning interventions; phased construction	Symbol of rupture and new beginning; institutionalized void; space for experimentation
<b>Post-transition period</b>	Un-started or abandoned construction sites; privatized vacant parcels; fragmented public space	Privatization; deregulation; market-driven development	Urban fragmentation; social exclusion; conflict of interests

3

4

5 In this sense, the third hypothesis of this research assumes that:

6

### 7 **Hypothesis 3**

8

9 Spatial leftovers are not stagnant or valueless; on the contrary, they acquire  
 10 significance within transformative urban processes when reinterpreted through  
 11 inclusive and localized planning practices.

12 This hypothesis is grounded in the following conceptual frameworks:

13

- 14 - Space as creative informality (Franck and Stevens): this approach  
 15 emphasizes the capacity of leftover spaces to support creative and temporary  
 16 interventions, thereby reinforcing the idea of their transformative potential
- 17 - Urban leftover (Aral): highlights the possibility of activating these spaces  
 18 and assigning them new functions, supporting the argument of their latent  
 19 potential for reprogramming

20

21 Additionally:

22

- 23 - Everyday space (Dines and Cattell): demonstrates how everyday activities  
 24 and local practices can reshape and re-activate space, reinforcing an  
 25 inclusive and localized approach to planning

26

27 In this way, the research challenges dominant urban planning paradigms and  
 28 proposes new strategies for re-conceptualizing spatial leftovers as opportunities  
 29 for reflection, experimentation, and latent urban potential.

30

31

32

1 **Scientific Methods to be Applied**

2  
3 The research will be based on an interdisciplinary approach combining  
4 qualitative, spatial, and visual-analytical methods. The main methods to be  
5 applied are:

- 6  
7 - Qualitative analysis – critical analysis of urban planning documents,  
8 strategic plans, and other relevant sources in order to understand the  
9 processes and policies that have influenced the emergence and  
10 transformation of spatial leftovers  
11 - Spatial-analytical methods - application of visualization and geospatial  
12 tools for the identification, categorization, and analysis of spatial  
13 leftovers in the central urban area of Skopje, including overlays of urban  
14 plans, density analysis, and spatial sequencing  
15 - Historical-genealogical approach - tracing the evolution of urban  
16 transformations through the analysis of urban plans and spatial  
17 interventions from different periods, with the aim of reconstructing the  
18 history of spatial leftover formation  
19 - Cartographic production - development of thematic maps, diagrams, and  
20 visual representations of spatial structure and the dynamics of residual  
21 spaces as both analytical and communicative tools  
22 - Semantic and symbolic analysis - investigation of the cultural, symbolic,  
23 and political meanings associated with spatial leftovers through the  
24 analysis of their visual, historical, and urban context  
25 - Visual analysis and photographic documentation - field documentation  
26 of spaces through photography and systematic recording of their physical  
27 condition, materiality, use, and surroundings, in order to build a visual  
28 database for further analysis  
29  
30

31 **Expected Scientific Contribution**

32  
33 This research, focusing on the concept of “spatial leftovers” within the central  
34 urban area of Skopje, analyzes the emergence and characteristics of spatial leftovers,  
35 as well as their potential trajectories through the identification of their defining  
36 properties. Understanding spatial leftovers as products of historical, political, and  
37 economic forces within cities is achieved through their identification and  
38 typological classification. Drawing on investigations into how spatial leftovers  
39 evolve within socio-political, economic, and cultural contexts, the research  
40 demonstrates their complex roles in urban environments, challenging traditional  
41 paradigms of urban planning and opening pathways toward new perspectives on the  
42 adaptive reuse of underutilized areas.

43 The scientific contribution of the research can be considered across several  
44 domains:  
45

- 1 - Conceptual and terminological precision: development of a clear definition
- 2 of “spatial leftovers,” distinguishing it from related concepts such as terrain
- 3 vague, liminal spaces, and in-between spaces. Formulation of a theoretical
- 4 framework that situates these spaces within the context of urban
- 5 discontinuities, ideological ruptures, post-earthquake reconstruction,
- 6 socialist urban formation, post-socialist transformation, and unsustainable
- 7 planning interventions in the post-transition period
- 8 - New typology for analyzing urban voids: creation of a typology of spatial
- 9 leftovers based on empirical field analysis in Skopje, systematized
- 10 according to origin, morphology, and context. This proposes an analytical
- 11 model that may also be applied to other transitional urban environments
- 12 - Cartographic and visual documentation: production of a spatial map of
- 13 spatial leftovers in the central urban area of Skopje, including graphical
- 14 analysis and overlays of different urban development phases, as well as a
- 15 visual archive based on photographic and morphological documentation
- 16

17 The conclusions of this research emphasize the transformative potential of  
 18 spatial leftovers, highlighting how these spaces-initially perceived as urban  
 19 voids-can evolve into significant components of sustainable, inclusive, and  
 20 resilient urban regeneration strategies.

## 21

## 22

## 23 **Application of Research Results**

## 24

25 This research leads to the development of a context-sensitive theoretical  
 26 framework for understanding “spatial leftovers” as a complex urban  
 27 phenomenon. Rather than being treated as physical voids lacking value, these  
 28 spaces are analyzed as layered constructs of meaning emerging from urban  
 29 discontinuities, ideological ruptures, and inflexible planning practices.

30 The results of the research have multiple and interdisciplinary applications,  
 31 both within urban theory and in the practice of urban planning, spatial  
 32 organization, cultural development, regulatory frameworks, and citizen  
 33 participation in the shaping, use, and protection of public space. The developed  
 34 typology of spatial leftovers, together with a comprehensive analysis of their  
 35 physical, functional, symbolic, socio-spatial, ecological, and historical  
 36 characteristics, enables the formulation of new analytical and planning  
 37 approaches for addressing “residual” spaces in cities. In practical terms, this  
 38 framework can be applied in the revision of urban plans, particularly through the  
 39 integration of spaces that have traditionally been excluded or overlooked in  
 40 planning processes.

41 Within the context of urban planning and everyday use of public space,  
 42 spatial leftovers represent a specific category of spaces which, although not  
 43 explicitly articulated in formal planning documents, actively participate in  
 44 shaping everyday spatial practices. Their emergence highlights discrepancies  
 45 between formal planning concepts and the dynamic ways in which space is used  
 46 in everyday life, without reducing the discussion to an evaluation of specific

1 institutional practices. As spaces with an underdefined status, spatial leftovers  
2 enable the emergence of temporary, informal, or adaptive uses through which  
3 broader socio-spatial processes become visible. In this sense, their inclusion  
4 within analytical and planning frameworks contributes to a deeper understanding  
5 of public space as a process rather than solely a formally designed structure,  
6 positioning spatial leftovers as a relevant, albeit often marginalized, segment of  
7 urban reality.

8 The developed methodological framework and the contextual analysis of  
9 Skopje provide a basis for comparative studies in other urban environments  
10 where “spatial leftovers” emerge as indicators of deeper socio-spatial and socio-  
11 political processes. Beyond offering an interpretative perspective on spatial  
12 leftovers in Skopje, the research also contributes to a broader discourse on the  
13 role of residual spaces in the “production” of urban space and collective memory.  
14

## 15 16 **Conclusion**

17  
18 This research has examined “spatial leftovers” in the central urban area of  
19 Skopje as structurally produced urban phenomena arising from successive cycles  
20 of planning, reconstruction, and socio-political transformation. Rather than  
21 being understood as residual or accidental voids, these spaces are conceptualized  
22 as integral components of the urban fabric, shaped by historical discontinuities  
23 and competing planning paradigms.

24 The study demonstrates that spatial leftovers emerge from overlapping  
25 urban regimes, including post-war reconstruction, post-earthquake modernist  
26 planning, and post-transition neoliberal restructuring. These processes have  
27 produced fragmented, underdefined, and often marginalized spatial conditions  
28 such as unfinished structures, interrupted urban continuities, and residual open  
29 spaces embedded within the city’s core.

30 Through the development of a typological framework, the research provides  
31 a systematic way of identifying and interpreting spatial leftovers according to  
32 their origin, morphology, and socio-political context. This contributes to  
33 addressing the existing conceptual fragmentation in the literature, where  
34 multiple overlapping terms are used without a unified analytical structure.

35 The findings confirm that spatial leftovers are not static or obsolete spaces, but  
36 dynamic urban conditions that reflect broader socio-spatial processes. They  
37 simultaneously express urban fragmentation and hold potential for alternative forms  
38 of use, adaptation, and reactivation. In this sense, they challenge conventional  
39 planning approaches that prioritize formal coherence and functional optimization.

40 Ultimately, the research positions spatial leftovers as analytically significant  
41 and conceptually productive elements of contemporary urbanism. Their  
42 recognition enables a more nuanced understanding of urban transformation  
43 processes in Skopje and supports the development of more inclusive, context-  
44 sensitive approaches to urban planning and spatial governance.  
45  
46

1 **References**

- 2
- 3 Ansari, A. (2016) *Rethinking urban voids: Innovative ways to revitalize lost spaces*.  
 4 Thesis report, CEPT University.
- 5 Aral, E.A. (2009) ‘Redefining leftover space: Value and potentiality for the city’, *ITU*  
 6 *A|Z Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 6(2), pp. 74–84.
- 7 Azhar, J., Gjerde, M., Vale, B. and Asif, M. (2022) ‘Perception of urban leftover spaces:  
 8 A comparative study of built environment and non-built environment participants’,  
 9 *Architecture*, 2(2), pp. 231–244. doi:10.3390/architecture2020013.
- 10 Bakalchev, M. and Hadzhi-Pulja, M. (2006) *City of Possible Worlds*. National Pavilion  
 11 of the Republic of North Macedonia, 10th International Architecture Exhibition,  
 12 Venice Biennale, Venice.
- 13 Balkoski, D., Lalović, K., Stupar, A., Mihajlov, V. and Penčić, D. (2023) ‘Opportunities  
 14 for the Transformation of Border Towns into Sustainable Systems in the Republic  
 15 of North Macedonia by Applying the Integral Theory’, *Sustainability*, 15(17),  
 16 12713.
- 17 Brsakoska, J. (2021) ‘Public space transformation in the case of “Skopje 2014”’,  
 18 *Urbana - Urban Affairs & Public Policy*, XXII(2021), pp. 1–20. doi:10.47785/  
 19 urbana.4.2021.
- 20 Carmona, M. (2013) ‘The Place-shaping Continuum: A Theory of Urban Design  
 21 Process’, *Journal of Urban Design*, 19(1), pp. 2–36. doi:10.1080/13574809.2013.  
 22 854695.
- 23 Carmona, M. (2021) *Public places, urban spaces: The dimensions of urban design*. 3rd  
 24 edn. London: Routledge.
- 25 Chase, J., Crawford, M. and Kaliski, J. (2009) *Everyday urbanism*. New York:  
 26 Monacelli Press.
- 27 Crawford, M. (1999) *Blurring the Boundaries: Public Spaces and Private Life*.
- 28 Dahlberg, J. (2021) *Pretty boring: Void spaces in cities*. Stockholm: Dokument Press.
- 29 de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California  
 30 Press.
- 31 Dehaene, M. and De Cauter, L. (eds.) (2008) *Heterotopia and the city: Public space in*  
 32 *a postcivil society*. London: Routledge.
- 33 Fracasso, S. (2015) *Urban voids unpacked* [Master’s thesis]. Available at: [https://issuu.com/simone\\_fracasso/docs/yosi\\_urban\\_voids\\_unpacked\\_master](https://issuu.com/simone_fracasso/docs/yosi_urban_voids_unpacked_master).
- 34 Franck, K.A. and Stevens, Q. (eds.) (2006) *Loose space: Possibility and diversity in*  
 35 *urban life*. London: Routledge.
- 36 Grcheva, L. (2019) ‘The birth of a nationalistic planning doctrine: the “Skopje 2014”  
 37 project’, *International Planning Studies*, 24(2), pp. 140–155. doi:10.1080/13563  
 38 475.2018.1523712.
- 39 Hoogkammer, S.S. (2020) *Rethinking the transition space* [PhD thesis]. Delft: Delft  
 40 University of Technology.
- 41 Korobar, V.P. and Siljanoska, J. (2023) ‘The Skopje City Wall Housing Complex’,  
 42 *Docomomo Journal*, (68), pp. 90–97. doi:10.52200/docomomo.68.09.
- 43 Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1974]) *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 44 Lozanovska, M. and Martek, I. (2018) ‘Skopje Resurgent: the international confusions  
 45 of post-earthquake planning, 1963–1967’, *Planning Perspectives*, 34(3), pp. 497–  
 46 513. doi:10.1080/02665433.2018.1423636.
- 47 Lynch, K. (1984) *Good city form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 48 Madanipour, A. (2003) *Public and private spaces of the city*. London: Routledge.
- 49 Mano Velevska, M., Veleviski, S. and Marina, O. (2014) *Urban voids: A creative*  
 50

- 1 *strategy and spatial challenge for the cities in transition*. Available at:  
2 [https://www.academia.edu/81610701/Urban\\_Voids\\_A\\_Creative\\_Strategy\\_and\\_S](https://www.academia.edu/81610701/Urban_Voids_A_Creative_Strategy_and_Spatial_Challenge_for_the_Cities_in_Transition)  
3 [patial\\_Challenge\\_for\\_the\\_Cities\\_in\\_Transition](https://www.academia.edu/81610701/Urban_Voids_A_Creative_Strategy_and_Spatial_Challenge_for_the_Cities_in_Transition).
- 4 Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 5 Paddison, R. and Sharp, J. (2007) 'Questioning the end of public space: Reclaiming  
6 control of local banal spaces', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 123(2), pp. 87–106.  
7 doi:10.1080/14702540701228007.
- 8 Patterson, M. (2011) *In between public and private: Emerging spaces in cities* [Master's  
9 thesis]. Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo.
- 10 Siljanoska, J. (1992) *Dijakronijska studija glavnog gradskog trga Skoplja i utjecaji*  
11 *konceptijskog diskontinuiteta grada*. Doktorska disertacija. Sveučilište u Zagrebu,  
12 Arhitektonski fakultet, Zagreb.
- 13 Solà-Morales, I. de (2002) 'Terrain vague', in Davidson, C. (ed.) *Anyplace*. Cambridge,  
14 MA: MIT Press, pp. 118–123.
- 15 Stavrides, S. (2016) *Common Space: The City as Commons*. London: Zed Books.
- 16 Stefanovska, J. and Koželj, J. (2012) 'The challenges of post-socialist urban  
17 development: The case of Skopje', *Urbani izziv*, 23(1), pp. 22–36. doi:10.5379/  
18 urbani-izziv-en-2012-23-01-002.
- 19 Trancik, R. (1986) *Finding Lost Space: Theories of Urban Design*. New York: John  
20 Wiley & Sons.
- 21 URBEGO (2015) 'Urban pockets: Reclaiming the public in left-over open spaces'.  
22 Available at: [https://urbego.org/urban-pockets-reclaiming-the-public-in-left-over-](https://urbego.org/urban-pockets-reclaiming-the-public-in-left-over-open-spaces/)  
23 [open-spaces/](https://urbego.org/urban-pockets-reclaiming-the-public-in-left-over-open-spaces/).
- 24 Zimmerman, P.T. (2008) *Liminal space in architecture: Threshold and transition*.  
25 Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.
- 26 Ивановски, J. (2013) *Постсоцијалистичка транзиција на примерот на Скопје – новите*  
27 *урбани прототипови и новиот пејзаж на домот*. Докторска дисертација.  
28 Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Архитектонски факултет, Скопје.
- 29 Пенчиќ, Д. (2011) *Влијанието на урбанистичките планови врз дисконтинуираната*  
30 *просторна транзиција на градот Скопје во дваесеттиот век*. Докторска  
31 дисертација. Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Архитектонски факултет,  
32 Скопје.  
33