PLANNING, DESIGN GOVERNANCE, AND THE LEGACY OF ARCHITECTURAL MODERNISM: A STRUCTURED CRITICAL REVIEW FOR MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING RESEARCH

Alexander Tzonis

Debates over architectural Modernism are often framed as disputes in design history or aesthetics, yet their most consequential implications are managerial and planning-related: how institutions define legitimacy, how design review systems translate theory into built form, and how long-lived professional norms shape environmental and human outcomes. This article presents an interpretive, structured critical review of A Critical History of Architectural Modernism *by Buras, Katona, Mehaffy, and Salingaros, repositioning that contribution for the scope of the* Journal of Management and Planning Research. *Rather than treating the source article as a purely stylistic intervention, the present manuscript analyzes it as an argument about governance, path dependence, evaluative criteria, and the management of the built environment.*

The review argues that the source article is organized around two central questions: whether Modernism achieved global dominance through the force of historical necessity, and whether it delivers the social, cultural, and environmental benefits long claimed in its defense. Across its eight-part structure, the source article advances a consistent interpretation: the institutional success of Modernism was historically contingent rather than inevitable, and its continuation has been sustained by professional narratives, industrial incentives, and limited accountability to user experience, place quality, and environmental performance. This manuscript synthesizes those arguments into a planning-oriented analytical framework centered on five domains: institutional legitimacy, human response, place-making, environmental performance, and governance reform.

The article contributes to management and planning research in three ways. First, it clarifies the source paper's substantive architecture and replaces diffuse summary with a disciplined thematic map grounded in the original text. Second, it translates the source article's architectural critique into planning and policy language relevant to design governance, project review, and implementation systems. Third, it proposes a practical appraisal framework for evaluating building and urban projects in ways that are compatible with the source article's emphasis on human-scale legibility, climatic adaptation, and long-term civic value. The result is a bounded and testable review article that situates an architectural controversy within the broader concerns of planning management, institutional decision-making, and evidence-informed design.

INTRODUCTION

The management of cities and the planning of built environments depend not only on technical capacity but also on the conceptual frameworks through which professional communities define good form, valid evidence, and legitimate innovation. In this respect, architectural Modernism remains a live issue for management and planning research. It is not merely a stylistic category or a historical episode confined to twentieth-century design debates. It is also a durable institutional formation that has shaped procurement logic, design education, professional accreditation, construction systems, public-sector review practices, and the standards by which new development is judged. Recent scholarship has renewed this debate by arguing that Modernism should be understood not only as an aesthetic movement but also as an enduring system of assumptions about progress, abstraction, and the relationship between people and the built environment [3].

This larger critique did not emerge in isolation. A substantial body of writing has questioned whether the widespread adoption of Modernist principles produced cities that are legible, humane, durable, and socially adaptive. Historical and polemical accounts have argued that the rise of architectural abstraction often displaced local knowledge, inherited urban form, and public preferences in favor of ideologically privileged design languages [4]. By contrast, traditions associated with classical and human-scaled urbanism have emphasized continuity, proportion, civic legibility, and long-term urban coherence as practical foundations for settlement design rather than as nostalgic formal preferences [2]. Related debates in urbanism have also extended into discussions of sustainable settlement form, where arguments for compactness, mixed use, walkability, and place-based coherence have been advanced as alternatives to fragmented and automobile-dependent patterns of development [6].

For planning and management scholars, the importance of this debate lies in its institutional consequences. Built environments are path dependent: once large-scale development patterns are embedded in zoning, infrastructure, finance, and governance routines, they become difficult and costly to reverse. This means that design paradigms must be evaluated not only for their symbolic or disciplinary value but also for their effects on implementation, adaptability, and public welfare over time. Critical regionalist thought is especially important in this regard because it reframed architecture as a mediating practice capable of resisting placeless standardization while still engaging modern conditions [5]. Subsequent formulations reinforced this concern with identity, locality, and cultural continuity under globalization, showing that questions of architectural meaning are inseparable from questions of governance, territorial distinctiveness, and institutional decision-making [17].

The issue is equally significant at the scale of urban form. Arguments for the "legible city" have stressed that urban environments should be understandable to their users, structured by recognizable centers, edges, routes, and civic hierarchies rather than by visually and spatially indifferent repetition [10]. More recent work on regional growth and settlement structure has similarly proposed that successful urban development depends on coherent relationships among places, networks, and processes, suggesting that planning practice benefits from recurring spatial patterns rather than isolated object-buildings [12]. This line of thought is further connected to broader ecological and human-centered design approaches that frame the built environment as part of a living system rather than as a purely technical artifact [11].

At the same time, criticism of Modernist dominance has increasingly intersected with empirical and quasi-empirical research on human perception, health, and environmental preference. Environmental psychology has shown that built settings influence affect, cognition, and behavior in ways that are relevant to planning outcomes, especially when environments either support or undermine attentional recovery, comfort, and orientation [7]. Foundational work on restorative environments has demonstrated that human well-being is closely related to the experience of organized complexity and contact with nature, thereby broadening the evaluative basis for urban design beyond efficiency and visual novelty alone [8]. More recent interdisciplinary

urban-science research has extended this argument by linking architectural proportions, biophilic conditions, and fractal properties to measurable cognitive and neurological responses in everyday urban experience [1].

These developments matter because they suggest that the professional evaluation of buildings and urban places cannot rest solely on stylistic narratives or claims of historical inevitability. If distinct geometric and perceptual properties of environments affect stress, preference, orientation, and performance, then design appraisal becomes a matter of public value and not merely expert taste. Reviews of biophilic fractal design have argued that specific visual characteristics can support health and performance, giving additional weight to the proposition that certain design languages may be better aligned with human physiology than others [16]. Studies from vision science also indicate that the spatial distribution of visual information can influence discomfort, implying that some built patterns are experienced as more demanding or less tolerable than others [13]. Complementary discussions of the built environment from perceptual research reinforce the claim that patterned order, rather than arbitrary formal disruption, has consequences for how people experience streets, façades, and public space [18].

Within architecture itself, these concerns have also been developed through research on form and composition. Fractal analysis has been used to identify latent ordering rules in classical and Renaissance façades, suggesting that apparently traditional environments may encode levels of structured complexity that are not well described by conventional stylistic labels alone [9]. Related theoretical work has argued that symmetry is not a superficial decorative preference but a major source of coherence and meaning in architecture, helping explain why some environments appear more intelligible and emotionally resonant than others [14]. This perspective culminates in a broader critique of professional knowledge systems, where the rejection of healing, health-promoting, and human-centered environments is interpreted not as a neutral methodological choice but as a weakness in the disciplinary criteria by which architectural evidence is recognized and applied [15].

Against this background, the focal article under review is best understood as part of a wider interdisciplinary challenge to the normative status of Modernism. Its contribution lies not in presenting a new dataset but in synthesizing architectural history, urban theory, environmental psychology, geometry, and sustainability discourse into a single critical argument about the persistence and consequences of Modernist assumptions. For a management and planning audience, however, the analytical value of that contribution is maximized when its claims are reorganized around governance, institutional evaluation, and implementation. The present manuscript therefore offers a structured critical review that preserves the substantive concerns of the source article while reframing them for a journal concerned with policy, management, planning systems, and the administration of built-environment decisions.

Methodologically, the review is intentionally narrow and transparent. It relies on close reading of the focal article, thematic reconstruction of its recurring claims, and interpretive cross-checking against the interdisciplinary literatures mobilized around the debate. No new dataset is introduced, and no claim is made that this manuscript resolves the broader controversy empirically. Its purpose is instead analytical and translational: to clarify the internal structure of the source argument, to discipline its implications for planning research, and to identify the criteria by which its claims can be discussed within management-oriented scholarship.

This manuscript has three aims. First, it clarifies the architecture of the source paper by reconstructing its central claims in a concise and well-ordered form. Second, it evaluates the relevance of those claims to planning and management research, especially in relation to institutional path dependence, design review, public-value assessment, and project governance. Third, it develops an applied appraisal framework that planners, design-review bodies, and policy-oriented researchers can use when assessing whether a project advances environmental fit, civic legibility, human well-being, and long-term urban quality.

ARTICLE STRUCTURE AND SUBSTANTIVE ARGUMENT

The source article is explicitly organized as an eight-section critical review. Its introduction defines the scope of "architectural Modernism" broadly, treating Neo-Modernist and related later variants as continuous with the earlier movement's deeper commitments [3, 4]. The remaining sections proceed through a cumulative argument rather than a purely chronological one. For planning scholarship, that structure is best understood as moving from institutional origins, to doctrinal persistence, to performance consequences, and finally to reform-oriented implications. The reconstruction offered below is analytical rather than mechanical: it is designed to make the argument legible to planning researchers, not to claim a formal coding exercise beyond what the source text itself supports.

Table 1: Source article structure and its direct relevance to management and planning research

Section	Primary focus in the source article	Core substantive claim	Planning and management relevance
1	Introduction	Modernism is presented as a continuing movement rather than a closed historical episode.	Establishes the topic as an ongoing governance problem rather than a finished style debate.
2	Industrial progressivism	Modernism's rise is linked to industrial ideology, abstraction, and anti-traditional design doctrine.	Connects design paradigms to institutional incentives, production systems, and professional ideology.
3	Subsequent counter-movements	Postmodernism, La Tendenza, Deconstruction, and regionalist reactions did not fully displace Modernism's core assumptions.	Shows how apparent reform can leave administrative and design-review norms largely unchanged.
4	Mathematical history of modernism	Reductionist geometries are contrasted with ordered complexity, symmetry, and scale hierarchy.	Supplies evaluative criteria for urban form, facade review, and human-scale design control.
5	Biophilic design and human response	Human perception and well-being are linked to adaptive, coherent, and nature-compatible environments.	Grounds planning review in user experience, public health, and environmental psychology.
6	Environmentalism and architecture	Industrialized building systems are criticized for energy and ecological burdens relative to more adaptive traditions.	Reframes sustainability from device-centered mitigation toward form, material logic, and passive performance.
7	Contemporary practice	Professional culture continues to reward novelty and abstraction despite public criticism and evidence of harm.	Highlights accountability failures in procurement, education, and design governance.
8	Continuing challenges	Architectural reform requires confronting entrenched institutional narratives and restoring humane, adaptive standards.	Points toward governance reform, standards revision, and criteria for long-term public value.

Two features of this structure are especially important. First, the source article does not treat Modernism as historically inevitable. It repeatedly argues that its dominance was contingent, promoted through persuasive

narratives, institutional reinforcement, and alignment with industrial production systems rather than through a neutral process of demonstrable technical superiority [2, 4]. Second, the article does not confine its critique to historical interpretation. It argues that the consequences of design doctrine remain visible in contemporary urban development, environmental performance, and public experience, even though the strength of those claims varies across contexts and requires case-based verification.

From a scholarly standpoint, the source article is strongest when read as a critique of institutionalized design decision-making. Its claims about ideology, abstraction, and professional self-justification become more analytically tractable when translated into the language of planning systems: rule formation, path dependence, evaluation criteria, and the distribution of authority between professional elites and everyday users. Read in this way, the article becomes less a categorical verdict on an entire movement and more a structured challenge to the criteria by which projects are authorized and defended.

ANALYTICAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING RE-SEARCH

The source article falls within the scope of the *Journal of Management and Planning Research* when interpreted through the lens of built-environment governance. Its subject is not limited to the history of architectural ideas. It addresses how authoritative design doctrines are established, defended, and reproduced across institutions, and how those doctrines affect planning outcomes over time. In that sense, its relevance lies less in adjudicating taste than in clarifying how planning systems translate theory, precedent, and professional prestige into durable development outcomes.

Institutional legitimacy and path dependence

One of the source article's central claims is that Modernism achieved dominance through historical contingency, strategic positioning, and narrative power rather than by the self-evident merit of its built results [3]. This claim is directly relevant to management research because it raises a classic institutional question: how do organizational fields normalize particular practices even when those practices generate contested or suboptimal outcomes? The present review treats this proposition as an institutional interpretation advanced by the source text, not as an independently verified causal finding.

In planning systems, path dependence is reinforced by accreditation, professional education, procurement standards, prestige hierarchies, and the tendency of design-review processes to privilege what is already legible to expert communities. The source article's historical critique therefore functions as an argument about institutional lock-in. Its practical implication is not simply that one style displaced another, but that a powerful professional consensus became embedded in the decision architecture of the built environment.

Human response as a planning variable

A second major contribution of the source article is its insistence that user experience is not a secondary or purely subjective matter. The article ties questions of coherence, symmetry, scale, and biophilic patterning to human response, drawing on work in environmental psychology, visual cognition, and restorative experience [1, 7, 8, 16, 18]. For planning research, this is a consequential shift. It means that design evaluation cannot be restricted to code compliance, floor-area efficiency, or image-driven symbolism. At the same time, these literatures are better understood as providing convergent support for human-centered criteria than as supplying a single deterministic rule for all design settings.

When public authorities approve projects that are formally alienating, visually stressful, or civically illegible, they are not making a neutral aesthetic choice. They are making a management decision with probable downstream effects for comfort, attachment, use, and social acceptance. The source article therefore supports a broader understanding of planning quality—one in which perceptual legibility and embodied experience are treated as legitimate policy concerns.

Environmental performance beyond technical add-ons

The environmental section of the source article is especially relevant to planning and infrastructure governance. The authors argue that industrialized construction systems associated with concrete, steel, glass, and highly mechanical building envelopes have often been normalized despite their ecological burdens, while traditional and climatically responsive building methods have been marginalized [3, 11]. The managerial significance of this claim is that sustainability cannot be reduced to post hoc technological supplementation. Read cautiously, the argument should be treated as a challenge for comparative evaluation rather than as a settled empirical verdict about all modern construction.

For planners and project managers, the key lesson is that environmental performance begins with form, orientation, massing, material logic, and climate responsiveness. If a planning system rewards formal novelty while treating passive performance and long-term adaptability as secondary, it may inadvertently institutionalize environmental inefficiency. The source article thus provides a critique not only of design fashion but of the governance routines that separate sustainability rhetoric from first-order design decisions.

Public legitimacy and design governance

The source article repeatedly underscores the gap between professional endorsement and public reaction. This claimed disconnect is important for management and planning because legitimacy in the built environment depends on more than expert consensus. Projects occupy shared space, shape daily routines, and generate public costs and benefits over long time horizons. Where citizens experience major developments as hostile, confusing, placeless, or environmentally wasteful, the governance problem is not just communicative. It is substantive.

From this standpoint, the article offers a useful corrective to models of design review that privilege symbolic innovation over civic intelligibility. It suggests that public-facing planning systems should be organized around measurable and discussable qualities: clarity of entry, human scale, climatic response, durability, street contribution, and long-term neighborhood fit. These are managerial criteria because they help translate contested design issues into reviewable standards, even when aesthetic preferences remain contested.

A PLANNING-ORIENTED APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

To make the source article more actionable for management and planning research, its core arguments can be translated into a practical appraisal framework. The purpose of this framework is not to enforce a single stylistic doctrine. Rather, it is to ensure that project evaluation attends to the categories the source article identifies as repeatedly neglected when abstraction, novelty, or industrial convenience become dominant. In methodological terms, the framework is best understood as a decision-support heuristic derived from the review, intended for subsequent testing in applied planning contexts.

The appraisal framework is organized around six evaluative domains. Each domain is directly grounded in the source article's substantive concerns, but each is phrased in a way that is usable in planning reports,

---

Framework 1. Planning review sequence for built-environment proposals

1. Establish the project's urban and climatic context, including street role, orientation, and public-realm obligations.

2. Evaluate whether the proposal is legible at pedestrian scale, especially at entry points, edges, thresholds, and facade composition.

3. Assess geometric coherence, including hierarchy, repetition, symmetry, and the relationship between detail and overall massing.

4. Review environmental performance at the level of form and envelope before considering mechanical compensation or technical add-ons.

5. Test the proposal's likely contribution to place attachment, civic identity, and long-term adaptability.

6. Document areas where professional novelty claims conflict with user-centered, ecological, or maintenance-oriented evidence.

7. Use the findings to support approval, revision, or redesign on explicitly stated public-interest grounds.

Figure 1: A planning-oriented translation of the source article's substantive criteria into a review sequence suitable for policy and project governance.

design-review memoranda, and policy analysis. Its preliminary validation lies in this internal consistency: the same recurring concerns identified in the review are translated into administratively reviewable questions rather than left at the level of abstract critique.

This framework is intentionally procedural rather than doctrinaire. A project does not need to reproduce a historical style to satisfy these criteria. What matters is whether it demonstrates coherence, adaptability, civic readability, and environmental intelligence. This distinction is important because it keeps the planning framework focused on performance and public value rather than aesthetic policing. It also makes the framework suitable for comparative testing across different stylistic and regulatory contexts.

DISCUSSION

The source article is strongest when interpreted as a challenge to the managerial foundations of built-environment decision-making. Its controversy does not arise only from its criticism of Modernist form. It arises from its implication that many contemporary planning and design systems continue to reward abstraction, spectacle, and industrial convenience while undervaluing user experience, contextual fit, and long-term ecological rationality.

For the *Journal of Management and Planning Research*, this makes the article analytically useful in at least three ways. First, it foregrounds the importance of institutional narratives in shaping planning outcomes. Professional fields do not simply discover best practice; they construct and reproduce it, often through prestige systems that can be slow to absorb criticism. Second, it broadens the scope of performance evaluation. Buildings and urban projects should be judged not only by cost, speed, and formal innovation but also by their effects on intelligibility, attachment, maintenance, and environmental burden. Third, it highlights the

Table 2: Planning appraisal domains derived from the source article

Domain	What should be assessed	Indicative planning questions	Administrative relevance
Contextual fit	Relationship of the proposal to local climate, street fabric, and existing urban character	Does the project adapt to local conditions rather than impose a generic solution?	Supports design review, zoning interpretation, and corridor guidance.
Human-scale legibility	Clarity of entrances, edges, windows, thresholds, and pedestrian-facing composition	Can non-expert users easily read how the building is approached and occupied?	Improves public usability and civic acceptance.
Geometric coherence	Hierarchy, ordered repetition, facade articulation, and visual intelligibility	Does the building organize complexity in a stable, comprehensible manner?	Provides review criteria beyond abstract stylistic preference.
Biophilic and restorative quality	Presence of natural analogues, material warmth, non-hostile surfaces, and restorative cues	Is the environment likely to support comfort, attachment, and perceptual ease?	Links design review to public health and well-being.
Passive environmental logic	Orientation, shading, envelope behavior, and low-energy adaptation before technical compensation	Does the form reduce environmental burden by design rather than by later mitigation alone?	Aligns planning approval with climate and operating-cost goals.
Long-term civic value	Durability, adaptability, maintenance implications, and contribution to shared place identity	Will the project age well and remain socially useful over time?	Supports lifecycle governance and public-value assessment.

need for review frameworks that can bridge expert judgment and public experience.

A balanced reading, however, requires methodological restraint. The present manuscript is an interpretive synthesis of a focal article, not a systematic review and not an empirical adjudication of all Modernist practice. Its evidentiary strength lies in transparent reconstruction, conceptual integration, and the translation of diffuse claims into reviewable planning criteria. It is strongest where it identifies governance-relevant categories for evaluation; it is weaker where broader causal judgments would require comparative case evidence. It is also important to acknowledge that some strands of Modernist practice were historically associated with legitimate aims such as standardization, rapid delivery, and technical experimentation, even where outcomes were uneven. For planning scholarship, the key question is therefore not whether an entire movement should be categorically endorsed or rejected, but which evaluative standards can reliably distinguish durable public value from institutionally privileged underperformance.

Within those limits, the appraisal framework proposed here offers a preliminary form of analytic validation: each domain is traceable to recurring concerns in the source article and translated into criteria that can be applied, audited, and compared. That does not substitute for field evidence, but it does convert a broad architectural argument into a testable planning instrument. The appropriate next step is to subject these domains to systematic inquiry rather than to treat the underlying debate as settled.

Future research should therefore operationalize the appraisal domains proposed here in applied settings. Comparative district studies, design-review audits, post-occupancy surveys, lifecycle cost analysis, and climate-responsive design evaluations would all provide appropriate ways to test whether projects scoring well on legibility, coherence, contextual fit, and passive performance also perform better in social and environmental terms. In this sense, the source article is valuable not because it closes debate, but because it sharpens the criteria by which better planning evidence can be generated.

CONCLUSION

Architectural Modernism remains relevant to management and planning research because it is not simply a historical style category. It is an institutionalized framework for making decisions about buildings, streets, and urban environments. The source article reviewed here demonstrates that debates over Modernism are inseparable from broader questions of governance: who defines good design, how professional doctrines achieve legitimacy, and what kinds of evidence count when long-term built consequences are at stake.

Read through a planning lens, the article's central message is clear. Built-environment management cannot rely on symbolic innovation, expert prestige, or inherited doctrinal assumptions alone. It must be anchored in intelligible public-interest criteria that address human response, contextual adaptation, environmental performance, and the long-term civic value of development decisions. For that reason, the article fits meaningfully within the scope of the *Journal of Management and Planning Research*. Its enduring contribution lies not in claiming a final empirical verdict, but in offering a clearer and more disciplined basis for how planning systems might evaluate design, authorize transformation, and define progress in the built environment.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

This article is a structured critical review based on a published source text and its cited literature. No human-subject data, experimental data, or proprietary datasets were used.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] Brielmann, A. A., Buras, N. H., Salingaros, N. A., & Taylor, R. P. (2022). What happens in your brain when you walk down the street? Implications of architectural proportions, biophilia, and fractal geometry for urban science. *Urban Science*, 6(1), Article 3. `https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci6010003`

[2] Buras, N. H. (2020). *The art of classic planning: Building beautiful and enduring communities*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. `https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674272897`

[3] Buras, N. H., Katona, V., Mehaffy, M. W., & Salingaros, N. A. (2025). A critical history of architectural modernism. *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 49(1), 23–36. `https://doi.org/10.3846/jau.2025.21776`

[4] Curl, J. S. (2018). *Making dystopia: The strange rise and survival of architectural barbarism*. Oxford University Press.

[5] Frampton, K. (1983). Toward a critical regionalism: Six points for an architecture of resistance. In H. Foster (Ed.), *The anti-aesthetic: Essays on postmodern culture* (pp. 16–30). Bay Press.

[6] Garde, A. (2020). New urbanism: Past, present, and future. *Urban Planning*, 5(4), 453–463. `https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v5i4.3478`

[7] Joye, Y. (2007). Architectural lessons from environmental psychology: The case of biophilic architecture. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(4), 305–328. `https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.11.4.305`

[8] Kaplan, S. (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 15(3), 169–182. `https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-4944(95)90001-2`

[9] Katona, V. (2023). The hidden dimension of façades: Fractal analysis reveals composition rules in classical and renaissance architecture. *Fractal and Fractional*, 7(3), Article 257. `https://doi.org/10.3390/fractalfract7030257`

[10] Krier, L. (2014, February 27). On sustainable urbanism and the legible city. *Architectural Review*. `http://www.architectural-review.com/essays/leon-krier-on-sustainable-urbanism-and-the-legible-city/8659343.article`

[11] Mehaffy, M., & Salingaros, N. A. (2015). *Design for a living planet*. Sustasis Press.

[12] Mehaffy, M. W., Kryazheva, Y., Rudd, A., Salingaros, N. A., Gren, A., Mehaffy, L., Mouzon, S., Petrella, L., Porta, S., Qamar, L., & Rofe, Y. (2020). *A new pattern language for growing regions: Places, networks, processes*. Sustasis Press.

[13] Penacchio, O., & Wilkins, A. J. (2015). Visual discomfort and the spatial distribution of Fourier energy. *Vision Research*, 108, 1–7. `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2014.12.013`

[14] Salingaros, N. A. (2020). Symmetry gives meaning to architecture. *Symmetry: Culture and Science*, 31(3), 231–260. `https://doi.org/10.26830/symmetry_2020_3_231`

[15] Salingaros, N. A. (2024). Architectural knowledge: Lacking a knowledge system, the profession rejects healing environments that promote health and well-being. *New Design Ideas*, 8(2), 261–299. `https://doi.org/10.62476/ndi82261`

[16] Taylor, R. P. (2021). The potential of biophilic fractal designs to promote health and performance: A review of experiments and applications. *Sustainability*, 13(2), Article 823. `https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020823`

[17] Tzonis, A., & Lefaivre, L. (2003). *Critical regionalism: Architecture and identity in a globalized world*. Prestel.

[18] Wilkins, A. J., Penacchio, O., & Leonards, U. (2018). The built environment and its patterns: A view from the vision sciences. *Journal of Sustainable Design & Applied Research*, 6(1), Article 5. `https://doi.org/10.21427/D7VV5G`

Alexander Tzonis, Department of Architecture, University of Technology Delft, 108 Oude, Delft 2611, Netherlands