

2nd

**International
Scientific
Conference**

1-3 June, 2017

Vrnjačka Banja, Serbia

2

0

1

7

**TOURISM
IN FUNCTION OF DEVELOPMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA**

**Tourism product as a factor of competitiveness of
the Serbian economy and experiences of other countries**



**THEMATIC
PROCEEDINGS**

I



**UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC
FACULTY OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT
AND TOURISM IN VRNJAČKA BANJA**



SPATIAL PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM AND PROTECTED MOUNTAIN AREAS IN SERBIA

Marija Maksin¹; Vladica Ristić²;

Abstract

The trend of integrated natural heritage protection and land-use zoning for mountain tourism destinations (MTD) at protected areas (MTD-PA) as practiced in many countries, in Serbia is achieved through the spatial planning process – the spatial plans for special purpose areas (SPSPA). The aim of this paper is to identify the key problems and methodological innovations in the spatial planning process for achieving sustainable development of MTD-PAs. Based on the comparative analysis, the nature protection zoning systems and SPSPA for MTDs in national parks in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia have been compared and lessons learned on the key problems in the Serbian planning practice for sustainable development of MTD-PAs. The innovative methodological approach for relativizing the conflicts between the tourism and the protection of natural heritage and socioeconomic development of local communities has been developed in the SPSPA for Kopaonik MTD-PA and discussed in the paper.

Key Words: *spatial planning, mountain tourism destinations, protected areas, nature heritage protection zoning, integrated zoning, methodological innovations*

JEL classification: O2, O3

Introduction

The mountain regions of Serbia cover about 34% of its territory. By their specific potentials for the mountain tourism development, the high-mountain regions (above 1500 m a.s.l., covering an area of 5,389 km², or

1 Marija Maksin, PhD, Prof, Scientific Counselor, Institute of Architecture and Urban & Spatial Planning of Serbia, Bulevar kralja Aleksandra 73/II, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia +381 11 3207335, micic70a@yahoo.com

2 Vladica Ristić, PhD, Project Studio "Our apartment", Kašikovićeve 1, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia +381 11 2833420, vladicar011@gmail.com

1.7% of the territory of Serbia) stand out with their immediate hilly-mountainous and physical and functional (mid-mountain) surroundings (1000-1500 m a.s.l.) covering the total area of 9,680km² (or 11% of the territory of Serbia). All high-mountain areas and a part of their immediate hilly-mountainous surroundings are located in the natural heritage protected areas.

The available potentials for tourism development in mountain regions in Serbia have been only partly activated in the previous development of mountain tourism destinations (MTD) and mountain tourism centres (MTC), which have developed under the influence of trends in the mountain tourism development in the European countries, particularly in the Alps.

The first organized types of tourism (urban and spa tourism) emerged in Serbia at the end of the first decade of the 20th century under the direct influence of the overall and tourism development of Europe, while organized development of mountain winter tourism began in the seventies of the 20th century. The planned development of MTCs in Serbia began in the eighties of the 20th century, starting from the experiences in developing the MTCs in Switzerland and France. After having initiated the development of the existing and new mid-mountain and low mountain tourism areas (Zlatibor, Tara, Vlasina, etc.), the first high-mountain MTCs were formed - Brezovica on the Sar-planina Mountain and Suvo Rudište on Kopaonik (Mitrović, 1983; Dabić, 1996; Dabić, Milijić, 1998; Milijić, 2005; Maksin et al., 2011; Maksin & Milijić, 2013; Milijić, 2015; Ristić et al., 2016). This was at the same time the beginning of the use of concept of sustainable development of MTCs and MTDs, particularly from the environmental aspect, but also partly from the aspect of socioeconomic acceptability for local communities and population. In the period 1968-1990, the state had a determinant role in the planning guidance and management of the development of MTCs and MTDs - completely built through the cooperation of the state funds and the funds of large (state) trading enterprises. In this period, by its turnover the mountain tourism was included immediately after the cities and spas, with the fastest increase in visitors and overnight stays (Dabić & Milijić, 1998). The crisis in the development began in 1990 when the system of the planning guidance of the development of MTDs and MTCs was abandoned, and their development was left to the influences and interests of spontaneous and uncontrolled market operation. The stagnation, imbalanced and uncontrolled development of MTDs has taken place.

Sustainability of MTD is challenged as the economic interests of tourism industry for intensive construction of tourism facilities and their spatial concentration prevail. Proposed development can cause negative impacts on the environment, as well as on the social and economic development of local communities (Maksin & Milijić, 2013; Nenковиć-Riznić et al., 2015). A gradual recovery tentatively began in 2007 when the state intensified the investments in the formation of public ski resorts, capital infrastructure development, etc., but still without sufficiently harmonized spatial development of tourism with the protection of mountain areas (Dabić et al., 2009).

The aim of this paper is to identify the key problems and methodological innovations in the spatial planning process for achieving sustainable development of MTD-PA. The possible answers are offered at the example of spatial planning for the Kopaonik National Park, where the innovative methodological approach for relativizing the conflicts between the tourism and the protection of natural heritage and socioeconomic development of local communities has been developed in the Spatial plan for special purpose area for Kopaonik MTD-PA.

Natural heritage protection zoning in the protected areas – comparative analysis of the zoning practice in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia

The central issue of PA management is to establish a balance between the natural heritage protection and sustainable area development – the economic, environmental and social dimensions of sustainability (Naughton-Treves et al., 2005). A balance between the natural heritage protection and the social, economic, but also the anthropospatial and cultural development in PAs and their immediate surroundings, should be striven for. It is considered that the controlled or limited interaction or a selective valorization of the PA economic, social and cultural values is possible and that options are desirable, along with an appropriate management and innovations in the process of protecting and using these areas. In this context, the holistic, participatory and adaptive approaches are being increasingly widely applied in the planning and management of PAs, particularly MTD-PAs, where the spatial planning and the integrated projects for the protection and sustainable development are becoming the key instruments (Gurung, 2010; Naughton-Treves et al., 2005).

The zoning is one of the instruments of strategic, spatial and sectoral planning and managing the PAs and MTDs located in the PAs. The PA protection zoning was initiated by the UNSECO in 1974 for the biosphere reserves (MaB Program) as an instrument for the adaptation to the manifold ecosystem functions of the reserves in a specific area. A theoretical biosphere reserve zoning model was established with: the PA core zone, inner protection zone around the core zone up to the borders between the PA and the outer protection zone or transition zone around the PA. The Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (1995) established in more detail the functions and spatial coverage of PA zoning:

- Core area – one or more core zones for the biodiversity protection, with the unchanged or minimally changed ecosystems in which the activities to be taken are limited to the activities that have a minimal impact on the protected ecosystem (research and education);
- Buffer zone – surrounding or bordering the core zone, in which eco-friendly activities and activities complementary to the ecosystem protection in the core zone can be taken (such as education, recreation, ecotourism, research);
- Transition area – envisaged for sustainable development and cooperation with the surroundings, which is flexible relative to the coverage and purpose (settlements, agriculture, etc.) (Bennett & Mulongoy, 2006).

None of the PA systems can realize its full potential in case these areas become isolated fragments of the ecosystem surrounded by the incompatible or conflicting ways of using the land. Such attitude is reflected in the definitions of some authors who link the functional and spatial boundary determination of PAs relative to their surroundings to the limitations of the development of incompatible uses of the area around the PAs (Sandwith & Lockwood, 2006). The reason for this lies in a rapid growth of population, settlements and intensive land use around many PAs in the world. For this reason, and in addition to the protection zone in the PAs, the transition zone, or zone of cooperation – mutual impact zone – zone of multipurpose use around the PA (Naughton-Treves et al., 2005), are increasingly gaining importance.

The trend in the world and European countries is an integrated protection zoning for the PAs and land-use zoning for PAs and their surroundings. The integrated zoning facilitates the meeting of often conflicting demands for strengthening the protection of natural heritage, cultural heritage and

natural resources, on the one hand, and for developing the tourism and other activities and improving the quality of life of local residents, on the other hand (Naughton-Treves et al., 2005; Maksin et al., 2014).

The Nature Conservation Act (1999) in *Slovenia* differentiates protected areas into large (national, regional and landscape parks) and small (natural monuments, strict nature reserves and nature reserves) protected areas. Large areas are those covering the area of over 1 km² and which are over 1 km long. In the large protected areas, it is possible by law to:

- Form a number of small protected areas/strict protection zones, that is, a minimum of two of these zones in a national park;
- Protect the natural heritage, ecosystems and biodiversity in the major portion of the PA;
- Develop the local communities and tourism in the smaller part of the PA that are consistent with the goals of protecting valuable natural features;
- Establish a zone of influence around the protected area.

The law does not determine the objectives for the protection and management of the PA. The zones and regimes of protecting the space in PAs are not determined either, but rather the activities that can be forbidden or limited in the PA. The zoning and regimes of protection and the use of space for each national park are established by special laws, and elaborated by their management plan.

The Nature Protection Act (2013) in *Croatia* categorizes PAs into: strict reserves, national parks, special reserves, nature parks, regional parks, nature monuments, important landscapes, forest parks and horticultural monuments. The law does not determine the objectives for the protection and management of PAs. The zones and regimes of protection for the space are not determined, instead there are 10 activities forbidden in all PAs. It was determined that protection should be implemented on the basis of the spatial plan for areas of special features and the management plan for the PA. These planning documents establish zoning and protection regimes for the area on an expert basis that are prepared by the relevant authority responsible for the protection of nature. National parks are declared by means of a special law that determines their scope, boundaries and administration.

In *Serbia*, the Nature Protection Act (2009) establishes the following categories of PAs: strict nature reserves, special nature reserves, national

parks, nature monuments, protected habitats, landscapes of exceptional features and nature parks. The management objectives for the PA are not established directly, but instead, based on the purpose for which they are categorized and for which they gain the protected status. The purpose of the sustainable economic and social development of the area's communities is not mentioned. The law does not establish protection zones, but rather a three-level protection regime. The obligation of establishing a buffer zone around PAs that was established by previous laws has been removed. The law does not envisage another transitional regime of protection around a PA – a zone of influence, or a zone of sustainable development. The zones with different regimes of protection are determined by the legal act, declaring the protection of PAs on the basis of scientific and expert studies by the relevant authority responsible for the nature protection. The protection zones and land use are further elaborated in the spatial plans for special purpose areas intended for PA. It is established that PAs are protected on the basis of the spatial plans for special purpose areas and the management plans. The three-level protection regime established by the law and the Regulation on Protection Regimes (2012) can be compared with the IUCN categorization: level I protection regime (strict protection) corresponds to category Ia; level II protection regime (active protection) corresponds to category Ib; level III protection regime (proactive protection) corresponds to category V and VI (Ristić, 2016).

Spatial planning for sustainable development of tourism and protected mountain areas

Comparative analysis of the spatial planning practice for the MTD-PA in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia

In *Slovenia*, the SPSPA for PAs are not adopted. An example for Slovenia is the Triglav National Park, which was established in 1924 and has international status as a Natura 2000 area and a Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO-MaB). The NP covers an area of 839.8 km², with 37 settlements (21 of which are entirely in the NP) and about 25,000 tourist beds in its immediate vicinity, making it possible to achieve annual visits of about 2.5 million tourists. The Law on the Triglav National Park (2010) identifies three protection zones with different protection regimes:

- Zone 1 – zone of strict protection (use of natural resources prohibited, with the exception of traditional cattle grazing, limited controlled visits and limited sustainable tourist accommodation);

- Zone 2 – zone of less strict protection (sustainable forestry and traditional agriculture, controlled visits and sustainable tourist accommodation); and
- Zone 3 – buffer zone (sustainable development and sustainable construction are allowed).

The zones 1 and 2 represent the core area and correspond to the category II of the IUCN classification, and the zone 3 corresponds to the category V. The area covered, regime of protection and the use of space in the legally determined zones are developed in detail in the Management Plan for the Triglav National Park 2016-2025 (2016). Several ski runs and limited accommodation capacity (smaller hotels, boarding houses, camps and mountain houses) are located in the zone 3. The intensive tourism development takes place in the National Park immediate surroundings and it is defined by the spatial plans of municipalities.

In the guidelines for developing a management plan for a PA (Viskanic, 2005) in *Croatia*, the Appendix 5 is dedicated to zoning as one of the key steps in the development of the plan. It proposes a model with three basic zones based on the natural and other features of parts of the protected area, and includes its objectives and the necessary intensity of management. The zones of strict protection include the areas of high natural value and little necessity for management. The zones of active protection include the areas that require a special type of management that will maintain a certain status of protection. The usage zones include the areas with fewer natural features and higher requirements for management. They can be divided into sub-zones:

- Zone of strict protection – the areas with minimal human intervention, and areas where scientific research is allowed and visitor access is limited, which corresponds to IUCN categories Ia and Ib, and they can cover a significant area of the NP;
- Zone of active protection – the areas that have an impact on habitats (conservation, rehabilitation) and the areas that affect species (protection, removal of invasive species), which should not exceed 30% of the NP;
- Usage zone – a type of compromise between protection and sustainable development which must be aligned with the primary aims of the conservation of protected areas. They can be classified according to their type and planned use into different sub-zones: inhabited or urban zones, traditional agricultural zones and the recreation and tourist infrastructure zones. According to IUCN

guidelines, this zone can only cover small parts of the NP. One of the aims of managing a NP should be to reduce them in the park and transfer them to a buffer zone;

- Buffer zone – in addition to these three zones, a buffer zone is also proposed around the PA or between the different zones in the NP.

An example is the Plitvice Lakes National Park, the oldest NP in Croatia (from 1949), and the last law passed on the declaration of Plitvice was in 1997. It has had international UNESCO world heritage status since 1979 and is a Natura 2000 site. The national park covers an area of 297.2 km², with 27 settlements (of which 20 are entirely within the NP) and approximately 1,600 tourist beds, and it is visited annually by about 850,000 tourists. In accordance with guidelines from 2005, the Spatial Plan for Special Purpose Areas for the Plitvice Lakes National Park (2014) was established, dividing the space into three zones with sub-zones. In the defined zones, the regimes and land use were established. For the zone 3 – the usage zone, which encompasses only 4.15% of the PA area, the sustainable development of tourism is allowed, with sub-zones 3a (settlement zone – all villages and hamlets in which sustainable construction is permitted for the needs of the residents and for tourism) and 3b (recreation and tourism zone – sustainable development is permitted and the construction of tourist accommodation and facilities, including ski resort Mukinje).

In *Serbia*, the integrated zoning is made through the process of spatial planning. From the eighties of the 20th century, the elements of contemporary holistic and problem approaches have been introduced in the practice of spatial planning for mountain tourism areas in Serbia under the influence of European experiences, particularly influences of Alpine countries (Milijić, 2005; Maksin et al., 2011; Dabić et al., 2009; Milijić, 2015). The spatial plans for special purpose areas (SPSPA) have been adopted for the mountain tourism areas. The special purposes for which the SPSPA are developed are dominant and can be a source of significant environmental impacts and impacts on the quality of life of local residents, but also a cause of conflicts both between the natural heritage protection and tourism and between the natural heritage protection and tourism in relation to the development of local communities. For this reason, the existing and potential conflicts between the special purposes relative to all other purposes and activities have been identified and minimized in the process of developing the SPSPA for MTDs and in strategic impact assessment, which enables the selection of planning

solutions that contribute to sustainable territorial development of MTDs and protected areas. The protection zoning is used for the parts of the MTD-PA in the protected areas in accordance with the legal bases, declaration of protected areas and management plans for the PAs. The land-use zoning for tourism development is integrated with the three-level protection regime in PA.

Key problems in realizing the coordinating role of spatial planning in sustainable development of MTD-PA in Serbia

The problem lies in the PA management system in Serbia that has developed independently of good practice and IUCN guidelines. The protection and development management of PAs is disintegrated. There is a pronounced insufficient coordination or absence of coordination between the sectoral planning and PA management and different sectors (sectors of tourism, other economic activities, infrastructure systems) and the development of local communities. New problems occurred with the change of legal basis in the nature protection sector in the period 2009–2015. The introduction of stricter protection regimes in Serbia, particularly the level II protection regime, resulted in more intensive manifestation and more difficult overcoming of conflicting interests between the PA protection and tourism development in the process of spatial planning for MTD-PA. This was particularly pronounced in the MTD-PA planned for all-year-round tourism (Kopaonik, Stara Planina Mountain, Šar-planina Mountain, etc.) (Ristić et al., 2016).

From 2009, the problem of coordinating the spatial with the sector planning framework is most pronounced in the tourism sector in the current Serbian strategic planning practice. The 2009 Law on Tourism is retrogressive relative to the previous laws because it does no longer mention the integrated planning, but reduces the planning of tourism development only to the sectoral planning that is not adequately linked to other types of planning. This Law establishes that the Tourism Development Strategy is elaborated through the tourism development master plans and that these sectoral plans are the starting point for drawing up the spatial, urban and other plans for tourism destinations. Due to the used market-driven approach and partial overview of the tourism destination development, the substantial negative effects of tourism on the natural heritage, resources and the environment, as well as on the local community development and the quality of life of local residents, can manifest themselves in the implementation of master plans

for the MTDs in the Stara Planina, Golija and Kopaonik mountains. None of these master plans have been completely aligned with the declaration of protected areas, management plans and current spatial plans for the Kopaonik National Park, Golija-Studenica Biosphere Reserve and Stara Planina Mountain Nature Park. After the adoption of tourism development master plans for the mentioned MTDs, a significant problem has occurred in developing new SPSPA for these areas. Without previous verification and without achieving the spatial, environmental, social and economic sustainability, the concepts and solutions based exclusively on the sector (economic) approach in tourism development master plans jeopardize the planning concepts and solutions based on the holistic approach in the SPSPA (Dabić et al., 2009; Maksin et al., 2011; Milijić, 2015).

The absence of coordination between the sectoral planning in tourism and spatial and environmental planning, as well as insufficient support in the implementation of the planning documents and domination of political and stealthily influence of investors in decision making, have resulted in predominantly uncontrolled development of MTDs starting from 1990 and in marginalization of the role and implementation of spatial planning in the development of these areas (Maksin & Milijić, 2010; Maksin et al., 2014).

Methodological innovations for improving the role of spatial planning in sustainable development of MTD-PA in Serbia – example of Kopaonik National Park

The innovations for improving the role of spatial planning in achieving a coordinating role relative to the legal and planning bases in the nature protection and tourism development sectors were analysed at the example of the Spatial Plan for Special Purpose Area for the MTD-PA Kopaonik National Park, adopted at the end of 2016.

The attitudes towards the development of MTDs in Serbia have, generally, always been linked to the experiences in developing the MTD-PA Kopaonik National Park. The norms and standards used in the tourism development in the Kopaonik MTD-PA have relied on the European norms and experiences, primarily those of France and Switzerland, along with checking of and adjusting to the conditions in Serbia. The tourism development in Kopaonik began already in the thirties of the 20th century, to become a leading economic activity in the area of the National

Park and its surroundings in the first half of the eighties of the 20th century. Suvo Rudište in the Kopaonik National Park is an example of a relatively successful development of mountain tourism in the period 1968-1990. After this period, it represents an example of escalation of problems and conflicts, uncontrolled construction and non-observance of rules of the SPSPA, absence of any kind of management of the MTD-PA development, etc. Relative to the other MTDs in Serbia, this area has the longest tradition in developing the SPSPA – the first one was adopted in 1989, the second in 2009, and the third in 2016.

The area covered by the Spatial Plan for the Special Purpose Area of the Kopaonik National Park (SPSPA Kopaonik) encompasses the mountain area of the National Park (covering an area of 120.79 km²) and the sub-mountain area outside the National Park (covering an area of 204.05 km²) (SPSPA Kopaonik, 2016). The Kopaonik National Park encompasses the northern part of the Kopaonik mountain massif and the central part of the Kopaonik MTD. Most of its part extends over a relatively slightly dissected mountain plateau (called Ravni Kopaonik), average altitude of about 1700 m, with the highest peaks up to 2017 m.

The innovative methodological approach is based on the combined use of integrated and participatory approaches in the process of developing the SPSPA Kopaonik 2016.

The problems in the previous environmental and natural heritage and natural resources protection, as well as in the achieved development of tourism, other economic activities and infrastructure systems and in the improvement of the quality of life of local residents, were identified in the first step in the process of developing the spatial plan for the special purpose area of the MTD-PA.

In the next methodological step, and based on the analysed problems, it was possible to identify the key conflicts in the protection and in sustainable development of MTD-PA and its local and regional surroundings (local communities in and around the protected area, tourism destinations of national or regional importance, sources of regional water supply systems, etc.). Several conflicts were identified, out of which the key ones included the conflicts between the tourism and the natural heritage protection. Further mountain tourism development within the National Park depends to a great extent on the overcoming of current conflicts regarding the protection of nature and natural heritage in the

most suitable terrains for Alpine skiing under the level II protection regime and within the tourism complexes/resorts under the level III protection regime with intense and unplanned construction. Main causes of these conflicts are the following:

1. The new Decree on the Protection Regimes (2012) denied the previous possibility of limited locating of tourism infrastructure—primarily locating of ski infrastructure in the zones under the level II protection regime, thereby endangering the solutions from the first and second SPSPA Kopaonik for connecting certain sectors of ski resort through the zones of the level II protection regime in cases when there were no other possibilities. The changes of the Law on National Parks (2015) exacerbated the problem because of the changes that occurred in the coverage of zones under the levels I and II protection regimes in the Kopaonik National Park, thus bringing into question parts of the existing ski resorts, their planned completion and connecting of four out of ten sectors of the ski resort into a single spatial and functional entity. Namely, the study for the protection of this National Park, which was the basis for a legal document, did not take into account the planning solutions for ski resorts from the current SPSPA Kopaonik 2009. In such conditions, the conveniences that the National Park Management Plan has not been adopted and that it will be prepared after adopting the SPSPA Kopaonik 2016.

The conflict was exacerbated by the acceptance of the Master Plan for the Kopaonik tourism destination (Master plan, 2009) by the ministry responsible for tourism, as well as by the adoption of urban plans for three sub-resorts in the National Park by local communities (municipalities). These plans were not aligned with the SPSPA Kopaonik 2009, this being contrary to the Law on Planning and Construction. The Master Plan was not aligned with the SPSPA 2009 in relation to: the total capacity of the space of the National Park; capacity and position of ski infrastructure in relation to the zones under the level I and II of protection regimes. The adopted urban plans were not aligned with the position of routes of all planned ski lifts and ski runs from the SPSPA Kopaonik 2009 because certain accommodation capacities are located on the runs connecting three sectors of the ski resort. According to the experiences of the Alpine countries, the best terrains for Alpine skiing and localities for developing the ski resorts, as the key resources for the mountain tourism, are by a rule excluded from more strict regimes of the natural heritage protection. That is why it is of key importance for the tourism

development in Kopaonik to allow an optimum use of otherwise limited terrains suitable for Alpine skiing, along with an adequate mountain nature protection.

2. In the overall development of the MTD-PA so far, the development of tourism facilities is mainly concentrated in Suvo Rudište, although a balanced distribution of tourism contents between the mountain areas and sub-mountain areas has been insisted upon in all planning documents since the beginning of tourism development in Kopaonik (starting from 1968). Out of 30,000 tourist beds envisaged by the SPSPA Kopaonik 1989, approximately 15,000 beds were planned in the mountain within the National Park, while 15,000 beds in the sub-mountain areas outside the National Park. According to the SPSPA Kopaonik 2009, and upon request of the nature protection service, the number of tourist beds in the National Park was reduced to 12,500, while the number of beds outside the National Park was increased to 30,000. Relative to the beds planned by the SPSPA Kopaonik 2009, approximately 11,000 tourist beds have been provided in the area of the National Park, however, not according to the planned distribution per sub-resorts, but predominantly in Suvo Rudište (approx. 10,250, instead of the planned 8,000). Approximately 12,500 beds out of the planned 30,000 beds have been provided in two out of 21 tourism settlements in the area outside the National Park - approximately 10,000 beds in the unplanned weekend and tourism settlement of Lisina near Suvo Rudište and its ski resorts, and approximately 2,500 out of the planned 4,500 beds in Brzeće (SPSPA Kopaonik, 2016). From 2009, the problem has exacerbated by the acceptance of the Master Plan for the Kopaonik tourism destination, as well as by the adoption of urban plans for three sub-resorts in the National Park. The Master plan has not been aligned with the SPSPA 2009 concerning the total accommodation capacity (the planned approx. 17,000 beds in two sub-resorts) and their position relative to the zones under the levels I and II protection regimes. By adopting the urban plans, the accommodation capacities have been increased relative to the SPSPA 2009 by another 2,000 beds (or by 16% out of the total planned capacities). The greatest excess in accommodation capacity relative to the accommodation capacity from the SPSPA Kopaonik (1,500 beds) was made through the urban plan for Srebrnac sub-resort (3000 beds more).

A set of thematic maps with all spatially identified mismatches in relation to the planning solutions from the SPSPA Kopaonik 2009 and in relation to the approximately determined new boundaries of the National Park and

zones under the three-level protection regime from the new Law on National Parks, were produced using the GIS tools.

Based on the identified conflicts, the principles and strategic commitments for their relativization were established. They served in the next methodological step for checking the sustainability and harmonizing the conflicting sectoral decisions on zoning for protected areas (from the Law on National Parks and the Decree on the Protection Regimes) and on zoning for tourism development (from the Master Plan for the Kopaonik Mountain Destination and from the urban plans for the sub-resorts in the National Park and tourism settlements located at its boundaries).

The participation of local residents and the public interested in the spatial planning process was ensured through an early public insight into the SPSPA Kopaonik 2016, i.e. into the proposal for the principles of and strategic commitments for solving the identified conflicts and for amending and supplementing the planning solutions from the previous SPSPA Kopaonik. The suggestions and comments obtained during the early public insight were included in the preparation of scenario for the differentiation of zoning in the next methodological step.

Starting from good practices of European countries, particularly good practices of the MTD-PA in the Alps, several scenarios for the differentiation between the protection zones and the zones with terrains suitable of Alpine skiing and localities for mountain resort development were offered— with a radical shift away from the previous practice in zoning for the PAs in Serbia (dividing the area of the National Park into several most valuable entities with the three-level protection regimes and separating the zones for the development of tourism centres and ski resorts outside its coverage) and with more or less compromise options for the protection and sustainable development of MTD-PA.

For achieving the coordination and relativization of conflicts, it was necessary to use the participatory approach in a way to also include, besides the protected area managers, the key actors in the environmental and natural heritage protection, tourism and spatial planning into the process of considering the offered scenarios and decision making on the selection of the most suitable scenario, both at national and at local levels of management. Several preparatory thematic workshops were held, particularly with actors involved in the natural heritage and environmental protection, and with the actors involved in the development of ski resorts

and tourism in particular. This enabled several workshops to be held with all actors with whom the offered scenarios were considered, but also to negotiate on certain solutions using the prepared set of maps and through direct interventions on the maps, until the final solution was agreed and selected.

A compromise solution was selected for harmonizing the zones of tourism and recreational infrastructure with stricter regimes for the natural heritage protection (I and II level protection regimes). Based on this solution, minor corrections of the coverage of the zones with level I protection regime (one zone with the existing ski infrastructure) and with level II of the protection regime were made, the number of ski runs was reduced and the capacity of ski runs was increased, the position of ski infrastructure was corrected, as well as connecting the parts of the ski resorts into a single entity was enabled. The solutions from the Master Plan for the Kopaonik tourism destination under the level III protection regime were corrected and reduced, thereby enabling the preservation of all compact forest enclaves and habitats of endemic species in the pasture areas. The concept of developing the resorts and capacities of the stationed users in the altitude zones of the MTD-PA in accordance with the new approaches and decisions of international financial institutions on investments into mountain areas was examined, while the “rehabilitation” through the development of communal infrastructure and highly-commercialized contents was envisaged where the construction was realized. The sustainable spatial development of tourism was supported by several options (concerning the accommodation and other contents) for redirecting the focus of tourism offer development from the tourism resorts in the National Park to the tourism settlements in its immediate surrounding which will be well connected with vertical transport systems. Due to an increase in the accommodation capacities relative to the previous SPSPA Kopaonik, the option with 18,000 beds in the National Park and 30,000 beds outside the National Park was selected. The selected planning solutions enabled an adequate natural heritage protection and sustainable use of limited resources for all-year-round tourism development (particularly winter tourism), but also the sustainable development of local communities in the immediate and wider surroundings of the MTD-PA.

Starting from the key problems and conflicts identified in the process of developing the SPSPA, it was recommended that the national level of governance should realize its more active role in the process of

sustainable development of MTD-PA through an integrated control of the destination planning and development processes. For this reason, the commitment that prevailed was that the detailed elaboration of urban plans for all tourism contents in PMA should be carried out exclusively within the SPSPA and that the previous practice in elaborating the SPSPA through urban plans should be continued outside the PA boundaries.

Conclusions

The effects of changes in the new methodological approach are that the changes enable an integrated planning of the natural heritage protection and sustainable spatial development of MTD-PA through the coordination between the spatial and sectoral planning (of the nature and cultural heritage protection, tourism, water resource management, transport, energy, etc.) and participation of key actors, local residents and the public in making the planning decisions.

For an integrated strategic planning and decision making in managing the MTD-PA development, it is necessary to achieve: the coordination among different sectoral plans and programs through the spatial planning process, primarily the coordination among the nature protection and tourism development sectors; multi-sectoral coordination among all competent development entities in the public sector; participatory planning process in spatial and sectoral planning; the establishment of complementary systems for monitoring the environment and natural heritage, construction, building land development and tourism offer development in the MTD-PA; as well as to establish partnerships among the key participants/actors in the decision making and implementation of the planning decisions.

References

1. Bennett, G., Mulongoy, K. (2006). *Review of experience with ecological networks, corridors and buffer zones*, No. 23, Montreal: Secretariat of CBD
2. Dabić, D. (1996). Teorijski, metodološki i planski okviri prostornog planiranja turističkih područja, in: *Prostorno planiranje, regionalni razvoj i zaštita životne sredine 2*, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd, 21-131.

3. Dabić, D., Milijić S. (1998). A contribution to the history of tourist development in Serbia. *SPATIUM International Review*, No 4, 27-34.
4. Dabić, D., Mitrović, S., Milijić, S. (2009). Strategic planning of the spatial development of sustainable tourism and its limits in Serbia, in: *Regional development, spatial planning and strategic governance*, Thematic Conference Proceedings, Institute of Architecture and Urban & Spatial Planning of Serbia, Belgrade, Vol. 1, 239-258.
5. Gurung, H.B. (2010). *Trends in Protected Areas*, Gold Coast, Australia: CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd.
6. Horwath HTL (2009). *Master plan za turističku destinaciju Kopaonik*. Finalni Izveštaj, Ministarstvo ekonomije i regionalnog razvoja, Beograd.
7. Javni zavod Triglavski narodni park (2016). *Načrt upravljanja Triglavskega narodnega parka 2016-2025*, Bled, Slovenija, http://www.pzs.si/javno/kvgn/tnp-nacrt_upravljanja_2015.pdf (19 December 2016)
8. Maksin, M., Milijić, S. (2010). Strategic planning for sustainable spatial, landscape and tourism development in Serbia. *SPATIUM International Review*, No. 23, 30-37.
9. Maksin, M., Milijić, S., Krunić, N., Ristić, V. (2014). Spatial and sectoral planning support to sustainable territorial and tourism development in protected mountain areas in Serbia. *SPATIUM International Review*, No. 32, 15-21.
10. Maksin, M., Milijić, S. (2013). Sustainable spatial development of the tourism destinations in times of crises in Serbia, in: Janković, S. and Smolčić Jurdana, D. (Eds.) *Tourism in Southern and Eastern Europe 2nd International Scientific Conference: Crisis – a challenge of sustainable tourism development*, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Opatija, Vol. 2, 185-200.
11. Maksin, M., Pucar, M., Milijić, S., Korać, M. (2011). *Održivi razvoj turizma u Evropskoj uniji i Srbiji*. Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd, Posebna izdanja, 67.

12. Milijić, S. (2005). *Strategija razvoja planinskih područja Srbije*, Doktorska teza, Geografski fakultet, Beograd.
13. Milijić, S. (2015). *Održivi razvoj planinskih područja Srbije*, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd, Posebna izdanja, 77.
14. Ministarstvo graditeljstva i prostornog uređenja Republike Hrvatske (2014). *Prostorni plan područja posebnih obilježja Nacionalnog parka Plitvička jezera*, http://www.mgipu.hr/doc/PPNPPlitvicka_jezera/00_PPPPO_NP_PJ_K1_ODLUKA_Odredbe_NKP.pdf (21 December 2016)
15. Mitrović, S. (1983). *Problemi izgradnje planinskih sportskih centara sa stanovišta zaštite prirode i turizma*, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije, Beograd, Posebna izdanja, 13.
16. Naughton-Treves, L., Holland, M.B., Brandon, K. (2005). The Role of Protected Areas in Conserving Biodiversity and Sustaining Local Livelihoods, *Annual Review of Environmental Resources*, No. 30, 219-252.
17. Nenković-Riznić, M., Maksin, M., Ristić, V. (2015): Advantages of combined application of SEA with ESIA in strategic planning for sustainable territorial development of tourism destinations, *SPATIUM International Review*, No. 34, 56-63.
18. *Prostorni plan područja posebne namene Nacionalnog parka "Kopaonik"* (2016). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 89.
19. Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia (1999). *Nature Conservation Act*, <http://www.faolex.fao.org/pdf/slv61725.pdf> (19 December 2016)
20. Ristić, V. (2016). *Pristup vrednovanju i izboru terena za održivu izgradnju na zaštićenim područjima na primeru Šar Planine*, Doktorska teza, Fakultet Futura, Univerzitet Singidunum, Beograd.
21. Ristić, V., Maksin, M., Basarić, J. (2016). Uloga zoniranja u strateškom planiranju zaštićenih područja u Srbiji: primer Nacionalnog parka Šar-planina. *Arhitektura i urbanizam*, No 43, 61-68.
22. Sandwith, T., Lockwood, M. (2006). Linking the Landscape. In: Lockwood, M. and Worboys, G. (Eds.). *Managing Protected Areas: A Global Guide*, Earthscan, London.

23. Skupština Republike Hrvatske (2013). *Zakon o zaštiti prirode*, <http://www.zakon.hr/z/403/Zakon-o-zastiti-prirode> (11 December 2016)
24. Skupština Republike Slovenije (2010). *Zakon o Triglavskem narodnem parku*, https://www.uradni-list.si/_pdf/2010/Ur/u2010052.pdf/u2010052-pdf (19 December 2016)
25. *Uredba o režimima zaštite* (2012). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 31.
26. Vidic, J. (Ed.). (2006). *Sistem varstva narave v Sloveniji*, Ministarstvo za okolje in prostor Republike Slovenije.
27. Viskanec, P. (Ed.). (2005). *Smjernice za izradu plana upravljanja*, Projekat očuvanja krških ekoloških sustava, Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske.
28. *Zakon o Prostornom planu Republike Srbije za period 2010-2020*. (2010). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 88.
29. *Zakon o zaštiti prirode* (2009). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 36.
30. *Zakon o nacionalnim parkovima* (2015). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 84.
31. *Zakon o turizmu* (2009). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, 36.
32. *Zakon o proglašenju Plitvičkih jezera nacionalnim parkom* (1997). Narodne novine, 13.