Acta Univ. Sapientiae, European and Regional Studies, **15** (2019) 83–104

DOI: 10.2478/auseur-2019-0006

The Necessity of Planned Urban Development

László BAJNAI
National University of Public Service, 1083 Budapest, Ludovika Sq. 2.
Senior Research Fellow, e-mail: bajnai.laszlo@uni-nke.hu

Attila JÓZSA
National University of Public Service,
Doctoral School of Public Administration Sciences
1083 Budapest, Ludovika Sq. 2.
PhD student, e-mail: attila@sapientia.ro

Abstract. The necessity of planned urban development might seem self-evident, but in reality is far from being so – particularly in former socialist countries turned into EU Member States such as Hungary or Romania. In Hungary, for instance, prior to EU accession, there was no generally accepted public opinion supporting the necessity of a planned urban development controlled by the public sector. However, the substantial resources – that in Hungary, e.g., involve impressive amounts – placed at the disposal of urban development within the framework of European Union development policy are not sufficient by themselves to answer the question as to why planned urban development is truly necessary. Based on the most recent research results on the topic and some relevant earlier Hungarian and foreign studies lesser-known in Central Europe, the present paper seeks to answer this question. It analyses the international literature as well as certain Western European, Hungarian, and Romanian cases in order to define the general objectives of urban planning and uses them as a starting-point to demonstrate the necessity of planned urban development.

Keywords and phrases: urban development, urban tissue/fabric, systematicity, urban planning, urbanization, integrated settlement development strategy

1. Introduction – Is Planned Urban Development Necessary?

Until more than a decade after the regime change, it was by no means clear in Hungary whether there was a need for planned urban development in market economy and whether or not it was feasible under market conditions. In the

public opinion of a country newly freed from the shackles of planned socialist economy operated based on dictatorship, there was a prevailing view in the 1990s that in a market economy functioning in the conditions of a democratic rule of law there was no need for the public sector's planned intervention in shaping the physical reality of the urban landscape. This general view was not characteristic of non-specialist audiences alone. It permeated both public policy decisions concerning urban development and part of the manifestations of scientific and professional community with a significant impact. The majority claimed that the market would settle everything, including urban development.

In Hungary, faith in the omnipotence of the market system was destroyed by joining the European Union. Apparently, changes in mentality took place overnight. Starting from 2004, on the theoretical level, everyone agreed that one of the major duties falling to the public sector was the conscious, planned shaping of the urban tissue. This fast-paced and general paradigm shift was probably not independent of the fact that from the very first moments of the 2004 EU accession urban development/urban rehabilitation became and has since remained one of the focus areas of Hungarian development projects enjoying large financial support, co-financed by the EU. The significant funding of the integrated local development projects aimed at reshaping the physical reality of settlements was not accidental. Nevertheless, it was not an inevitable outcome either – a consequence that automatically follows from the enforcement of a certain European Union mechanism – since not every Central and East European country joining the Union in 2004 came by regular financial support of substantial amounts starting from the very first years of EU membership in order to bring into being the complex settlement development and settlement rehabilitation ideas of its municipalities.

For instance, in Romania too, where urban development underwent a temporary slowdown following the 1989 regime change, major renovations took place in several regions owing to European Union grant opportunities – the secessionist downtown of Oradea being the most telling example –, while they were making efforts to meet the housing demand as a concomitant of population dynamics by launching various programmes such as the NHA (in Romanian: ANL) housing programme.[1]

Naturally, EU requirements were also of great consequence for the Romanian legal order. Thus, for example, Act 151/1998 on regional development came

1 For literature on urban development in Romania, see: Veselina Urucu–L. Dobraca–Bianca Dumitrescu. 2005. Oraşele. In: Dan Bălteanu (coord.), *România. Spaţiu, Societate, Mediu*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române. 206–225; József Benedek. 2006. *Területfejlesztés és regionális fejlődés*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană. 130–145. On the regional urban development concepts of the Romanian–Hungarian border region, see: Egon Nagy. 2015. *A román-magyar határrégió és határmenti együttműködések a Kárpátok Eurorégióban*. Cluj-Napoca: Kolozsvári Egyetemi Kiadó. 81–88.

into force specifically at the request of EU institutions. The Law provides an opportunity exclusively for county councils to establish regional cooperation structures. At the same time, local councils can also make themselves avail of the possibility to associate with the county council to draw up microregional development plans. Foundations or associations can serve as legal entity forms for these partnerships. (Balogh–Pop 2010: 50)

Both the seemingly overnight paradigm shift that came along with EU membership and supporting the public sector's urban development activities in Hungary from ERDF resources are owing to the persistent preparatory activities carried out throughout the last fourteen years as part of the country's European integration process.

At the same time, the urban development experiences of the past three decades in Hungary indicate that now, 15 years after the EU accession and one and a half years before the new, EU 2021–2027 multiannual financial framework would enter the implementation phase, some fundamental issues worth addressing.

In addition to the fact that obtaining EU grants for urban development and urban rehabilitation requires action plans, which assumes a systematic nature of budgetary planning, is a planned urban development plan suitable for the given type of urbanization and to be carried out based upon real urban development plans actually necessary (in what follows, planned urban development is understood as such that takes place based on actual urban development plans and in accordance with the nature of urbanization)? Are there any real, more profound reasons for the necessity of planned urban development? Or, indeed, merely obtaining a few financial planning documents – needed for the scheduled calls on the national or municipal budget and European Union funding sources in order to have a planned provision of financing the state's and the municipalities' local construction activities – would meet all the necessary requirements? Can the task of planning local construction activities carried out by the public sector be truly considered as completed by itself just because the project list of one or another city's construction investments is drawn up on the budgetary planning level by the simple enumeration of the forecasted resource estimates of the projects at hand? Could a planned development truly make do without a basis provided by an urban development plan that has beforehand harmonized the spatial, technical-physical characteristics of these projects as well as their corresponding financial content (the necessary urban development expenses and the potential direct revenues from urban development) with the specific physical, social, and economic features and possibilities? Would any urban development planning that reaches beyond the mere outlining of construction projects be some sort of a deluxe package and would in fact be unnecessary should the EU not tie granting support for local construction projects to integrated urban development or regional development strategies? In this context but taking a

slightly different approach, the same question could also be raised as follows: is indeed justified to go with the existing established routine in Hungary and treat urban development, settlement development, and regional development as a separate area in planning at the Member State level the utilization of the EU's multiannual financial framework for the period of 2021–2027 in the same manner as, for example, transport, economic development, or climate protection so that, based on its significance similar to the them, it would be awarded grants 'in its own right' from the Structural Funds? Anyway, is urban development, urban rehabilitation such a high-profile issue that would necessitate a special consideration in allocating the European Union and government funds at a level similar to, e.g., transport or economic development?

The upcoming 2021–2027 development period of the EU makes the topic of planned urban development particularly relevant, and in support of this it is useful to take stock of the current situation. In this context, the analyses of our study do not aim at exhaustively addressing the above formulated questions as those would require further research of considerable volume, a larger apparatus, and much broader frameworks. In consideration of the available frameworks, we can only embark on pointing out the potential answers – resulting from the research carried out – to some questions and drawing attention to our analyses, conclusions, and suggestions so as to promote a success rate of the EU's 2021–2027 development period in terms of urban development and urban rehabilitation, which rate is even higher than the current one or the ones before; and not only in Hungary but, through the emerging ideas and exchanging experiences, in Romania, too, as well as in other European Union Member States of Central and Eastern Europe.

2. Planned Urban Development Is Necessary

2.1. Planned Urban Development Is Necessary

The present study has a clear answer to the key question asked in the *Introduction*: planned urban development *is* necessary.

To be more specific, its necessity does not only derive from the fact that the scheduled call on the national budget and on the European Union financing resources needs financial supporting documents to subsidize the local construction activities of the state and of the local governments, but such planning is indispensable precisely in order for the said construction activities of the public sector to be able to truly make people's lives better in cities and smaller settlements. That is to say, as a basic principle, the mentioned construction activities constitute by definition an integral part of shaping the urban tissue, namely of the regulation-based and operational urban development carried out by

the public sector. Therefore, on the theoretical level, it is an essential instrument of achieving the urban development objectives of public interest. If construction activities take place in practice, too, as an integral part of implementing the regulation-based and operational urban development plans, then these can truly meet the specific urban development requirements set by them and serve the public interest. After all, it is hard to imagine a construction investment of public purposes theoretically at the service of public welfare that is practically inconsistent or not in conformity with urban development plans. This means, in turn, that the public sector's undertaking of a local construction activity implies that it must be a planned action also in the sense that one should be able to trace back the justification of the construction activity of public purposes to the given city's urban development plans. In other words, the pure existence of local construction investment activities itemized in the public sector's draft budget entails a planned urban development and the necessity of urban development planning representing its factual prerequisite.

This line of approach would, of course, still make possible such a formal interpretation of planned urban development according to which a systematic nature suiting the common good is fulfilled as soon as an urban development plan is built up around the establishment of public facilities meeting the already well-grounded demands, which plan, by definition, would thus correspond with the project list containing the public sector's planned construction investments. However, planned urban development rendered as indicated in the *Introduction* is necessary for much more profound and complex reasons, making it a far more complicated task.

In addition to those already mentioned, planned urban development and urban development planning at its service are necessary most of all because urban development, by shaping the urban fabric, must promote the achievement of such essential objectives whose complexity, level of difficulty as well as the spatial dimension, substantive complexity, and long duration of the activity necessary for achieving them, its high-volume and highly complex financing all presuppose that it can be successfully realized through planned activities alone. Furthermore, these planned activities can only be carried out by the public sector through pursuing the complex system of objectives of general interest, and their accomplishment cannot be expected of the private sector's construction and real estate development companies. To make this allegation conceivable, in the following, we will look over the universally valid objectives of urban development and, in the light of them, point out the necessity of planned urban development.

In the territory of Hungary, research carried out at the University of Pécs and at the National University of Public Service (Bajnai 2011, 2018) addresses the definition of the universally valid – essential – objectives or urban development that are built on the foundations of urbanism and architecture renewed by

Francoise Choay (Choay 1996). As conclusions of the aforementioned research indicate, there are certain *general objectives* that *once concretized, the most relevant specific objectives appropriate to local conditions can be defined practically in every case*.

Besides the specific objectives derivable from the said general objectives, legitimate decision makers can define as much and as many types of ad-hoc specific objectives – that perhaps cannot be necessarily inferred from the key objectives – for urban development as they can and deem justified based on the circumstances; in this sense, the scope of specific urban development objectives can be widened almost indefinitely in principle. The need to realize ad-hoc objectives that complement specific goals derivable from general objectives further increases the necessity of planned urban development. In addition, specific objectives that can be inferred, based on local conditions, from general objectives make up the vast majority of real-life urban development objectives which are encountered in practice. Therefore, in what follows, we will focus on general objectives so that we can point out the necessity of planned urban development in the light of them.

The aforementioned general objectives also issue from the general theory of urbanism, the global insights of recent years, the nature of urban development, and – in the case of Hungary – the regulatory framework. The first two groups include those with general applicability according to research, which, at the same time, are related to the essence of European culture. Consequently, they are relevant in every European Union country. Those directly deriving from the Fundamental Law in Hungary also stem from the nature of urbanization and the fundamental values of European culture, wherefore – similarly to those mentioned above – they are valid in the rest of the European countries as well. Furthermore, it is extremely important to indicate in this context that the central objectives issuing from the general theory of urbanism can also be deduced from the Fundamental Law of Hungary, and they serve as a silver thread for legal regulations on construction and urban development. In terms of the present study, however, this is not their most important feature but the fact that they come from a context of history of ideas and practical urban development looking back to cca. five and a half centuries, from which the general theory of urbanism emerged 152 years ago (Cerdá 1867). Legislations are the products and results of this underlying process and not the other way round. It could also be interesting to show how general urban development objectives and legal regulations are built upon one another or how universal principles and goals define the way general urban development objectives derivable from the Fundamental Law of Hungary are presented in Hungary's constitution and laws, but these are not intended for discussion in our study. We aim to look into general objectives to present in view of them the unavoidable necessity of planned urban development.

2.1.1. General Objectives of Urban Development Based on the Theory of Urbanism

General fundamental objectives of urban/settlement development that can be derived from the theory of urbanism (Cerdá 1867, Choay 1996) and from its history of ideas (Choay 1965, 1996) as well as, in accordance with Francoise Choay's categorization, from:

– the treatise of Alberti (1485) and *Utopia* (More 1516) underlying the emergence of the concept and theory of urbanism (Cerdá 1867),

– treatises and utopias following them,

– theories bearing features of treatise and utopia as well as theories on urban planning (in essence and nature),

from creations exemplifying the lasting achievements of urban architecture, also serving as models for it (Pogány 1965, Claval 2014, Lacaze 1995), and, regarding Hungary, from the letter and spirit of the laws on urban planning and building affairs (1937), building affairs (1964), and shaping the built environment (1997) can be formulated as follows:

The central objective of urban/settlement development is the creation of an urban fabric that makes a

– beautiful,

– healthy (hygienic),

– convenient-to-use, and well-functioning urban environment (Bajnai 2011).

The concept of urban fabric (Bajnai 2009) is used here in the same sense as in our previous study (Bajnai–Józsa 2018) and as used in Hungary by the policy guidance on urban development, the *Városfejlesztési kézikönyv* [Handbook on Urban Development] (Aczél–Bajnai–et al. 2009). According to the said sources, the urban fabric is the aggregation of buildings and built spaces defined by buildings, the physical framework of the local society's life and functioning, the tangible medium of urban life (Bajnai 2009).

2.1.2. The General Objectives of Urban Development Based on the Challenges of Sustainable Development

Relying on the research results published in recent years (Bajnai 2016, 2018), we can formulate the claim that for purposes of sustainable development and sustainable urbanization the objective of urban development through transforming the built physical reality of the city/settlement is *addressing the challenges of:*

– environmentally sustainable development,

– socially sustainable development, and

– economically sustainable development.

2.1.3. The General Objectives of Urban Development Based on Additional European Approaches and on the Fundamental Law of Hungary

Art. P) in the Fundamental Law of Hungary says that – along with other values listed therein – cultural values constitute a nation's shared heritage whose protection, maintenance, and its preservation for future generations is the duty of the state and everyone in it. Architectural heritage represents the irreplaceable expression of the richness and diversity of Europe's cultural heritage (CoE Convention 121, 1985). Following the regime change, in 1991, Hungary acceded to Convention 121 of the Council of Europe, that is, the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe signed by the Member States of the Council of Europe in Granada on 3.10.1985. In Art. 10 of the Convention, all signatories commit to accepting such public policies for supporting the integrated preservation of architectural heritage that conform to the provisions of the Convention. Consequently, the state and local government activity's general objective of creating a new or renewed piece pertaining to the urban tissue, that is, of urban development is the integrated protection of architectural heritage, which in Hungary directly follows not only from the general European principles and European conventions but also from the Fundamental Law.

Pursuant to management principles applied in developed democratic constitutional states operating based on market economy, Art. N), par. (1) of Hungary's Fundamental Law states that 'Hungary adheres to the principle of a balanced, transparent, and sustainable budget management', while par. (3) stipulates that 'in the performance of their duties, the Constitutional Court, the courts of general jurisdiction, local governments, and other public authorities are obliged to comply with the principle referred to in par. (1)'.

It therefore follows that the state and local government activity aimed at creating a new or renewed piece pertaining to the urban tissue, that is, at urban development must also meet that objective in order to follow the principle of a *balanced*, *transparent*, and *sustainable* budget management.

Title I., Art. 3 of Romania's Constitution currently in force discusses the country's territory, art-s 120–123 of Chapter 5, Part Two are on local administration bodies, and Art. 148 of Title VI. deals with the necessary measures to be taken for the country's European integration – including the acceptance of the *acquis communautaire* –, but it does not contain a specific provision concerning the necessity of regional development.[2] However, there are a number of laws that refer to regional development in general, such as:

2 The Constitution of Romania – in Romanian language – can be accessed on the website of the Chamber of Deputies at the following link: http://www.cdep.ro/pls/dic/site.page?id=339. Accessed on: 30.03.2019.

– Transport Routes (Law 71/1996),
– Waters (Law 171/1997),
– Protected Areas (Law 152/2000),
– Settlement Network (Law 351/2001), or
– Natural Risk Areas (Law 575/2001) (Benedek 2006).

Further to this, it is worth pointing out a few passages of the laws listed above, without being exhaustive, illustrating their complex content comprising significant forward-looking elements. E.g., Art. 1 of Law 350/2001 on spatial planning and urbanization indicates the fact that *the entire territory of Romania needs the promotion of a sustainable development that benefits every citizen of the country, while Art. 2 requires as mandatory caring for the country's territory in the interest of the communities*.

Pursuant to Art. 4, urbanization, urban development as a process and activity is operational, integrative, and normative (regulatory). Art. 13 defines the following as the main objectives of urbanization processes:

– promoting the quality of life,
– ensuring special conditions for children, the elderly, and people with disabilities,
– efficient land-use,
– protection and marketing of natural and built heritage,
– ensuring the quality of natural and man-made environment, and
– protecting the settlements from the effects of natural disasters.

One can see that in Romanian legal regulation on urbanization and urban development the general objectives of urban development become visible just as in Hungary. Art-s 21–24 of the latter provide for the urbanization competences of county authorities while art-s 25–27 for those of the local administration. Later, Government Decree 27/2008 was adopted to supplement Law 350/2001, which provides for several aspects of its legal implementation, such as the existence of required documentation and naming the bodies responsible for compiling the documentation.

2.1.4. Summing up the General Objectives of Urban Development

Pursuant to the theory of urbanization, the challenges of sustainable development, and a number of further European approaches as well as the Fundamental Law of Hungary, the general objectives of urban development are:

– the creation of an urban fabric that makes a beautiful, healthy (hygienic), convenient-to-use, and well-functioning urban environment;

– the promotion of an environmentally, socially, and economically sustainable urbanization by addressing the challenges ahead;

– implementing the integrated protection of monuments and built heritage as well as adopting the principle a balanced, transparent, and sustainable budget management.

2.2. Why Is Systematicity Necessary in Realizing the General Objectives of Urban Development?

The limitations of the present study do not permit to give a detailed demonstration for each and every case of all ten general objectives as to the impossibility of achieving them without a planned urban development – not even in a universal approach –, let alone the indispensable systematic approach when it comes to reaching specific goals derived from general objectives. Due to the aforementioned limitations, we will discuss below the implementation of a single general objective and show how achievement through planned urban development is analogously valid for the rest of them.

Our selected key objective of the total ten is the oldest and – apparently – the simplest one, the very first of them, according to which *the general objective of urban development is to succeed, as a result, in creating an urban fabric that makes a beautiful urban environment*.

In the following, we will resort to lessons drawn from the history of urbanism to demonstrate that in historical periods and places when and where the prevailing goal of the activities what we may call today urban development was to create a more beautiful urban environment, achieving this objective was possible by way of long-term, continuous planned activities. Further, we will show why the general objective of a beautiful urban environment must be 'translated' into specific local development objectives and how, in relation to this, planned urban development becomes necessary.

Due to space limitations, we must also refrain from discussing the period, manner, and reason regarding when, how, and why, respectively, the general consensus has come to an end as to what we consider a beautiful urban environment within the boundaries of western civilization or, in the narrower sense, of Western and Central European culture. It is, however, to be noted that this took place during the historical period of the general agreement on the essence of the beauty of urban environment, before the last decades of the 19th century.

2.2.1. The Necessity of Planned Urban Development in Order to Create a Beautiful Urban Environment, in the Light of Lessons That the History of Urbanism Can Teach Us

Within the period of four centuries giving rise to urbanism and urban development in the modern sense, we can identify a period and location whose studying

enables us to see crystal clear that a beautiful urban environment can be created through the planned transformation of the urban fabric and that intention alone is not enough to achieve this goal. This period includes the one and a half centuries between the final decades of the 16th and the first decades of the 18th century with Paris serving as the location.

In this context, systematicity cannot be interpreted, of course, as a concept exactly corresponding to present-day urban development planning since the latter has developed in its essential richness and dimensions precisely owing to the results achieved following the period under discussion, among others, in the very period analysed here. Therefore, the historical analysis of the present study attributes a systematic character to those interventions adopted prior to the development of urbanism as a concept that upheld the core principle of planned urban development. In accordance with this interpretation, the present study enumerates the following urban development actions among the historical examples of planned urban development:

– building complexes, royal squares, boulevards, avenues, roads, streets, parcelling/subdivisions, parks, and promenades, whose design and building in was realized based on concrete plans and according to specific alignments, on the sites of demolished town walls and building complexes or on undeveloped lands, as envisaged by the king, the queen, or the chief minister (Richelieu, Mazarin);

– related to the abovementioned, public space interventions (designing new streets on undeveloped areas or by the demolition of already built-up areas, widening, regulating existing streets, etc.) and associated parcelling.

In the period between the last decades of the 16th century and the first ones of the 18th, Paris became the most influential location of the urban development activity that unfolded in the 16th-century Florence and Rome (Claval 2014) for the beautification and ennoblement of cities in accordance with the architectural principles of the Italian Renaissance (Wittkower 1986). The city of Paris, where the French architectures of the 12th century built the most famous Gothic cathedral of all times, Notre-Dame de Paris, had been under the influence of the Italian Renaissance since the end of the 15th century (Blunt 1983).

The implementation in Paris of the Florentine Renaissance was directly promoted by Lorenzo Medici's granddaughter, Catherine de' Medici, Queen Consort of France, who was the wife of King Francis I's son: King Henry II, the first wife of King Henry IV, and Marguerite de Valois's mother, who commissioned Philibert Delorme in 1564 to start the construction of the Tuileries Palace. The palace built outside the city walls, several hundred meters from the mediaeval castle of Louvre was a few decades later connected via the Grand Gallery built by Henry IV to the building complex of the renewed royal residence. This direct Florentine influence was further reinforced by Henry IV's second wife, queen consort Marie de' Medici. Acting as a regent, she had Salomon de Brosse build the Luxembourg Palace and

Gardens between 1615 and 1621, thus creating the prototype of the 17th- and 18th-century French palaces built between 'the cour d'honneur and the garden' (Claval 2014) that would fill the upscale parts of Paris in the next one and a half centuries, such as Faubourg Saint-Germain (Pogány 1965).

However, Henry IV himself was this period's most influential figure of the process leading to the reconstruction of the 16th- and 17th-century Paris started by the Renaissance ruler, Francis I. Louis XIII, his son from his marriage with Marie de' Medici, and Louis XIV, his grandson, carried on this legacy in Paris and Versailles. The construction activities of Philip Augustus at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries and of Charles V one and a half centuries later were still focused around protection and fortified city walls, whereas they were little preoccupied with the comprehensive design of the city's physical reality inside the walls.

Henry IV and his descendants continued along the path laid out by Francis I – who received the aged Leonardo da Vinci into Amboise, his residence by the River Loire – by designating Paris as the capital city in 1528 instead of his Châteaux of the Loire Valley (Ferrero 1996) and launching the Renaissance reconstruction of the mediaeval Louvre by issuing a commission to Pierre Lescot in 1546.

As a result of the contemporary scientific achievements of the Florentine Renaissance Neoplatonic thought and architectural principles (Wittkower 1986), the projective geometry – perspective and cartography –, Henry IV and his descendants already considered the city as an objectified built world whose buildings and built spaces they wished to consciously transform according to their worldview and concepts of beauty, with the expressed purpose of making it more beautiful, and thus more noble, through their interventions (Claval 2014). Their endeavour meant a full-on paradigm shift as compared to mediaeval rulers' and citizens' position towards the development and transformation of the city's physical reality. In his book entitled *Breve histoire de l'urbanisme* (ibid.), Paul Claval reveals in detail the development and implementation dynamics of the new mentality emerging with Renaissance and, on the heels of it, the Baroque. The internal logic of the spatial organization of the Italian and French Renaissance as well as of the Baroque is best illustrated in Hungarian literature by Zoltán Szentkirályi (Szentkirályi 1983).

One of the pivotal moments launching on its way the era under discussion was that in the 15th century the ascendants of Italian origin of the queen consorts to France, the Medicis of Florence, found a new strategy to legitimize their power. Their authority was derived from the company of humanists, and they put the spectacular shaping of the physical frameworks of their lives in the charge of a new figure, who was an artist, architect, and engineer at the same time: his expertise in the new science of projective geometry, his architectural and engineering knowledge and taste enabled him to design the fortification of a city just as to build a palace or organize a celebration. Making use of perspective

and respecting the proportions of antique monuments guaranteed the quality of his creations. Soon, all prominent figures of the age would be imitating the Medicis: to ennoble their existence, they would spectacularly embellish their built environment serving as the theatrical framework of their lives spent under public scrutiny. This paradigmatic shift brought along new ways of designing buildings, roads, streets, squares, gardens, districts, and towns. It served as the genesis for urban architecture inspired by aesthetics, whose first theoretician was Alberti (Alberti 2004), while its true philosophical and architectural principles were revealed by Wittkower (Wittkower 1986), disproving at the same time misinterpretations – sometimes emerging even today – in works on Renaissance.

The French kings of the era, operating in the spirit inherited from the Italian Renaissance, were preoccupied with transforming the physical reality of Paris throughout one and a half centuries expressly to make it more beautiful, and thereby more noble. The complex sanitarian, functional, and sociological criteria of urbanism in today's modern concept existed only at an initial stage in those times, and they crystallized in the complexity of our era in the second half of the 19th century, which, however, could not take place without their grandiose creations of urban construction. This opens up the opportunity for us to gain a deeper knowledge and understanding of what and how happened in that period of time when shaping the urban fabric took place with the intention in mind to make the physical frameworks of urban life more beautiful.

Within the context of urban construction activities – in modern terms, operational urban development – organized and coordinated by the state, the Crown worked towards achieving its objectives by transforming, expanding the royal palace, the Louvre building complex, building royal squares and then demolishing fortified city walls, building avenues, boulevards, promenades, alleys, bridges, and quays, constructing new urban roads, creating new building lands, widening and arranging existing streets, or creating gardens and parks.

In the second half of the 16th century and in connection with the Paris constructions, the oldest means of the planned, that is, regulation-based and of operational urban development appeared: determination of the alignment (Merlin–Choay 2010). The very first edict on this came on 14 May 1554 followed by the decrees of January 1560, 22 September 1600, and then December 1607. Articles 3, 4, and 5 of the latter one lay down essential provisions that would survive in the following three centuries (Ferrero 1996). Determination of alignments separating the public space occupied by roads and the properties lining them were used for purposes of creating new roads, streets, and squares, opening them up in built-up areas, widening existing ones, or eliminating obstacles to traffic or those protruding into their cross-section. They were approved by royal decrees (letters patent) or orders of the royal council. Drawing up a regulation plan valid for the entire city was decided by the royal council only in 1765, two centuries after

they first determined alignments on a case-by-case basis. The comprehensive regulation plan is the work of Edme Verniquet – it was made ready on the eve of the Revolution and was brought into force by the Directory on 2 April 1797.

From the analysis of textual as well as cartographic sources (Ferrero, Freres Lazare, Merian, Turgot, 1842 map), we can conclusively establish that operational urban development interventions and regulations, also referred to herein, aiming at the urban tissue were adopted according to specific plans.

Place Dauphine and Pont Neuf (New Bridge), Place des Vosges, Place des Victoires and Place Vendome, the expansion of the Louvre, building in the Île Saint-Louis, demolishing the city walls of Charles V and Louis XIII, the Grands Boulevards, the Tuileries Garden, creating the parks and avenues of the Champs Élysées, today's Place de la Concorde, marking the transverse axis of the Palais Bourbon and today's Rue Royale, forming of the Dauphine Street on the left bank, the Luxembourg Palace and Garden, the Dôme des Invalides as well as opening new streets and cases of parcelling related to the above-mentioned are all outcomes of documented planning work known from several sources. Nevertheless, based on literature interpretations, one rather gets the picture as if (Claval 2014) the said urban architectural creations of the era, inspired by aesthetics, had not actually led to significant changes regarding the whole of the vast city's building jungle as, according to this approach, they were far too small-scale and insular 'products', wherefore their influence finally faded in the metropolis. On the other hand, recent research results (Bajnai 2019) indicate the exact opposite. They reveal that the tremendous urban development work carried out in the course of the one and a half centuries under discussion for the beautification and ennoblement of the city played a crucial role in the development of modern-day Paris – and in the present-day beauty of the world's most visited urban tourism destination. Owing to the development of digitalization and information science, it has now become simple to access and analyse those cartographic and textual sources (ibid.) that were previously difficult, and next to impossible for researchers in Hungary, to become acquainted with and examine. As recent research results relying on the sources referred to above indicate (ibid.), the urban architectural creations of the era discussed here have significantly increased the city's built-up area – even if with development activities of lower intensity at the beginning – and had decisive influence on the development of Paris as a whole. On the 1735 Turgot map made with axonometric projection, research analyses showed urban architectural creations whose design and construction were commissioned directly by the king and that are linked with the names of Henry IV, Louis XIII, and Louis XIV. They managed to identify them by a comparison with the urban tissue represented on the 1615 Merian map as well as based on literature (Pogány 1965, Lacaze 1995, Ferrero 1996, Claval 2014) (hereinafter: Group 'A'). They also included in the map those development works, street openings and extensions,

and subdivisions that were realized in connection with the previous ones and that, without the royal constructions, could not have been connected at all – or only under far worse conditions – to the existing urban tissue (hereinafter: Group 'B'). On this elaborated image, we can clearly distinguish Place Dauphine and Place des Vosges, the town – basically still developed with the mediaeval building stock – existing as early as 1600, before the construction of the first royal squares, and the territory of those districts that were realized as parts of groups 'A' and 'B' between 1600 and 1730. Disregarding qualitative changes, it can be clearly seen in terms of quantity that Group 'A' realized in just over a century's time means an enormous change in itself. The extension of the new urban tissue falling within this corresponds to 38% of the mediaeval town's territory bordered by the one-time walls built in more than one and a half thousand years, even if it had a lower development intensity on the average. On the other hand, the total area of the new urban territory covered by Group 'B' amounts to 31% of the area taken up by the original urban fabric. This means that in just over a century we experienced a 69% increase in the territory of the city shaped in more than one and a half thousand years.

In the process, the urban fabric of the area already built-up in 1600 underwent a total change in terms of quality. The largely replaced building stock's typical number of floors increased to 4-5 as compared to the 2-3 floors visible on the 1615 Merian map. The architectural design of the new buildings was greatly influenced by regulation and the architectural style adopted in royal constructions. Thus, the operational urban development actions of the Crown significantly changed the city's spatial extent and structure in their own right. Street openings and subdivisions realized in the wake of these activities exploited the new development opportunities created by the royal constructions and made the best of them within the new urban structure frameworks created by the interventions of the central power. In the course of the plot-by-plot reconstruction of the urban fabric, designing the new buildings was determined by regulation and the architectural style of public constructions.

The expansion of the Louvre accomplished in three century's time, the tracing of the Grands Boulevards' western sections, shaping the axis and starting-point of the Champs Élysées, or marking the spot for the later Place de la Concorde around the other four royal squares all attest to the same kind of conscious and planned transformation of the urban structure as Fontana's urban construction works before them, through which he knowingly transformed the structure of the city of Rome to ennoble it and make it more beautiful, therefore serving as a model for the Paris constructions. The main difference consists in the fact that three generations – Henry IV, Louis XIII, and Louis XIV – managed to carry through urban restructuring activities of a much larger scale than in the case of Rome, in just over a century's time. Taking a holistic view, the specific kind of

urban management/urban development plans in the modern sense was inexistent in those times, and it appeared only along the development of the concept and theory of urbanism in Paris and Barcelona in the mid-19th century. Yet, the urban architectural accomplishment achieved during the urban development of Paris between 1600 and 1730 bears witness to an intergenerational, long-term planning urban development thinking and a consistent urban construction activity. Long-term urban development thinking is also evidenced by a fresco dating from around 1600, which can be found in the Galerie des Cerfs inside the Palace of Fontainebleau and depicts the grand plan of King Henry IV on building the Louvre (Baziani–Lebrat–Bezombes–Vincent 1989). In bird's-eye view and looking west from the city centre, one can see the completed Cour Carrée, the Grand Gallery, the Small Gallery, the Tuileries Palace as well as the area between the latter and Cour Carrée, featuring a contiguous park and wings (annexes) connected to the building complex of the palace. At the time the painting was made, only a quarter of Cour Carrée was ready of the above-listed items – Louis XIII would carry on the construction activities that were ultimately completed by Louis XIV. The Small Gallery had already been there, and the Grand Gallery was finished later, in the life of Henry IV. Likewise, the Tuileries Palace was already standing. The area between Cour Carrée and the Tuileries Palace was, however, occupied by the urban fabric – the 'faubourg' du Louvre – built up along the streets perpendicular to the Grand Gallery (Baziani–Lebrat–Bezombes–Vincent 1989, Ministere de la Culture 1989), which 'faubourg' was pulled down during the urban development/urban planning works under Napoleon III, in the period of 1852–1866.

2.2.2. Why Must the General Objectives of a Beautiful Urban Environment Be 'Translated' into Specific Local Development Objectives and How Does Urban Development Planning Become Necessary in Relation to This?

By the nature of things, even in the historical period of the general agreement on the criteria of the beauty of urban environment, before the last decades of the 19th century, answers varied as to what beautiful urban environment is. For example, it depended on whether it was a small town or a big city, whether it was an area developed with high or low intensity, etc. But in order to give a universally valid answer to the question formulated in the subtitle, we must leave the realm of historical examples for a while and we must set out from the fundamental concepts of urban development and their context, as we will further elaborate below.

Let us suppose that, based upon a common agreement, we have a general idea of how a beautiful urban environment looks like. As mentioned above, there has not been such kind of general agreement since the end of the 19th century, not even regarding the theoretically comparable categories of urban fabric such as the

metropolitan downtown area developed with high intensity or the metropolitan green-belt garden suburb developed with a lower intensity. The argument below, however, does not build upon the lack of general agreement on the concept of beauty, but it shows that, taking the basic concepts and fundamental connections of urban development as a starting-point, the specific criteria of the beautiful urban environment would be subject to individual definitions even in the case of a common agreement on the general interpretation of the concept of beautiful urban streets, squares, and buildings. That is a fortiori the case when there is no common agreement even on the generally accepted meaning of the concept of beautiful urban environment.

Considering the relevant key concepts and inherent relations of urban development, we can state the following. As defined by the policy guidance in Hungary (NFGM 2009) and the publications providing the foundation for it in this respect (Bajnai 2009), *urban development is creating a new or renewed piece pertaining to the urban tissue. The urban fabric is the aggregation of buildings and built spaces defined by buildings, the physical framework of the local society's life and functioning, the tangible medium of urban life* (Bajnai 2009), *with which it exists in interaction* (NFGM 2009).

The definition implies that, due to the reasons detailed below, no two areas with identical urban tissues can be delineated in either different cities or within the same city. Not even areas developed with physically, architecturally, or technically identical urban tissues or physically identical vacant building lands can be delineated. The technical-physical, geotechnical characteristics of the soil, the physical and geodesic features of the ground level, its surface environmental context as well as, connected to this, the topographical features and solar exposure conditions of the area as a whole and its parts, the wind exposure conditions depending on the area's specific location and spatial context, and the area's functional connections to the city as a whole and its surrounding parts are all subject to change from territory to territory with respect to some of the aforementioned features. And this change inevitably entails the larger and smaller deviations of the realized or realizable developments. Technically-physically and functionally different features will give rise to technically and functionally different developments, even if, e.g., the most extreme uniforming efforts were adopted during the implementation phase in relation to the architectural design of an existing urban fabric. As for the materialization of the latter intentions, the housing estates built throughout Europe after World War II serve as fine examples. Despite their apparent uniformity, however, their urban tissues are far from being physically uniform thanks to the aforementioned physical-technical and the soon-to-be-mentioned functional reasons. In the context of Hungary, recent research (Bajnai 2018) indicate that this is well demonstrated by the morphological plans, too, that were drawn up in cities with county rights during the background

studies on the integrated settlement development strategies approved in 2014 (Bajnai 2016). Further, the fabrics of the various definable urban areas are not only physically different from one another following from the basic definition. The urban fabric as a concept and physical reality is not interesting purely for its own sake regarding urban development. Besides its physical features meaningful in isolation, its role inseparable from its essence is just as interesting as those features – which role it fulfils as the tangible medium of urban life, *the physical framework of the local society's life and functioning*. And if *we look upon the urban tissue as the framework of the local society's life and functioning (and, within that, e.g., of the functioning of local economy), as a physical reality in interaction with the local society and its functioning (e.g. with local economy), then the expected qualitative and quantitative characteristics of this physical reality cannot be defined independently of that local society and its functioning whose life it carries and with which it is in interaction*. It follows that the urban tissue of two delineated urban areas could be considered as identical if and only if, beyond their physical uniformity, the urban life carried by them, that is, the local society made up of people living within their physical frameworks as well as the functioning of this society would be identical from place to place. But all experience and scientific knowledge indicate that no one in his right mind can doubt that we can technically exclude all cases where any two urban areas could be defined as accommodating local societies that would differ from each other in no respect. They would not show any difference in terms of their biological, demographic, sociological, ethnic, or cultural composition, in their customs, morals, religious or political characteristics or regarding their functioning as a local society or as part of a higher-level social organization and not even from the perspective of changes in social characteristics and their dynamics. As for one of the crucially important dimensions of the local society's life and functioning, which is local economy, again, we cannot assume that the local economies functioning within the physical frameworks of the urban fabric of two distinct, delineated urban areas would be identical in every respect. The divergences in the local economy of different urban areas have repercussions on the above, non-exhaustively enumerated characteristics of local society as well, and they in themselves lead to the fact that even the seemingly identical local societies differ from each other in reality.

Given that urban life – the local society's life – carried by the urban tissue also varies from area to area, it becomes obvious that the interaction existing between the urban tissue as the tangible medium of urban life and the urban life carried by it will show differences too. This means that the needs of the particular local society with regard to the actual condition of the urban tissue and its transformation are not the same across different urban areas. In respect of its own cultural, social, and economic conditions, the local society of an

area will consider important other specific aspects concerning the realization of a beautiful urban environment than another area pertaining to the same local society. Consequently, the question as to which existing state of a given piece of the urban fabric or, by way of transformation, which one of its achievable goal states can induce specific compliance with the general objectives of a beautiful urban environment can only be answered by drawing up urban development plans that are based upon the satisfactory knowledge of the actual local physical, social, and economic reality.

2.2.3. Why Must the Other Nine General Objectives Be 'Translated' by Defining Specific Local Development Objectives and How Does Urban Development Planning Become Necessary in Relation to This?

In the light of what has been set out in the previous paragraph, it becomes clear that even a 'simple' general objective as the urban development goal state of a beautiful urban environment can only be defined as the result of urban development planning addressing the particular local physical, social, and economic reality.

Of the ten general urban development objectives summarized in Subchapter 2.1.4, each one of the following nine were established along the path leading to the development of the present-day concept and theory of urbanization, in a later period of the 20th-century development of the theory of urbanism, and, from a certain point of view, they imply much more complex objectives than the apparent simplicity of a beautiful urban environment. The attributes of these nine objectives are presented in detail in the literature (Cerdá 1867, Choay 1965, Choay 1996, Merlin–Choay 2010, Bajnai 2016) listed in the *References* section. Within the limitations at our disposal, we cannot attempt even a schematic overview of this vast subject. Concerning them, what have been outlined in the previous paragraph are especially true regarding, on the one hand, the reasons why the translation of general objectives into specific goals appropriate for local conditions is necessary in order to effectively realize the objective of a beautiful urban environment and, on the other hand, how urban development planning becomes necessary in relation to this. After all, if the objective which is the longest-running – for over four centuries – regularly implemented 'simpler' goal of the activity called urban development in the modern sense can be achieved through planned urban development alone, then, naturally, the attainment of more complex objectives cannot be possible either without urban development plans specifically defining the goal state or without urban development interventions adopted according to plan and seeking the implementation thereof.

2.2.4. Urban Development Is about the Simultaneous Realization of the Ten Urban Development Objectives When the Transformation of the Urban Fabric Happens at a Particular Place and Time. Its Outcomes regarding the Necessity of Planned Development

In the above, we have presented the ten general objectives of urban development. It has also become clear that these ten general objectives are not automatically achieved in the course of interventions implemented on a particular urban area in a particular period. So far, discussion of the aforementioned elements has taken place through distinct approaches to each objective apart. Nonetheless, in the everyday practice of urban development, these objectives should not be interpreted in isolation or perhaps selectively. The essential point of these ten general objectives is that whenever urban development activities take place all ten of them must be adopted concurrently and in interaction in a particular area and period of time – and, as far as possible, not to the detriment of one another. This is rendered more difficult by the fact that the specific interpretations of the general objectives corresponding with local conditions are inevitably and regularly contradictory. Examples of this are well known both from practice and literature, what makes their concrete presentation unnecessary here if only because their schematic overview would alone break the limits of the present study. Nevertheless, the issue comes into view here with respect to the necessity of planned urban development. Are objectives defining the goal state of urban development necessary and do we need a planned, concerted urban development activity in order to realize the desired state?

If we set out from the facts that:

– the analysis of a shining historical instance demonstrates that not even the oldest and 'simplest' one of the ten general objectives is automatically achieved without plans and planned actions *and*

– it is even less possible to realize the other nine, later developed and more complex objectives without plans and planned actions,

then can it be logically and realistically expected that the initially inevitably contradictory ten objectives will be realized at the same time and place and to the greatest extent possible without such complex urban development plans and planned actions seeking the implementation thereof that have the ability to resolve or manage contradictions, make the necessary compromises, and thus attain all ten essential objectives in the goal state to the greatest extent possible?

We cannot claim that. Planned urban development is necessary in order to adopt the ten general objectives of urban development in conformity with the specific local conditions.

References

ACZÉL, Gábor–BAJNAI, László et alia (eds). 2009. *Városfejlesztési kézikönyv.* Budapest: NFGM.
https://www.google.hu/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=V%C3%A1rosfejleszt%C3%A9si+k%C3%A9zik%C3%B6nyv (last access on: 5.09. 2016).

ALBERTI, Leon Battista. 2004 [1485]. *L'Art d'édifier* [*De re ædificatoria*]. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

BAJNAI, László. 2009. Bevezetés. In: ACZÉL, Gábor–BAJNAI, László: *Az akcióterületi terv módszertana és a városfejlesztő társaság*. Budapest: Scolar Kiadó.

2011. *Az építészeti örökség integrált védelme az operatív városfejlesztés eszköztárával*. PhD dissertation. Budapest: Scolar Kiadó.

2016. *Bevezetés az urbanisztikába: A fenntartható urbanizáció tervezése és megvalósítása*. Budapest: Scolar Kiadó.

2018. A településfejlesztés teljesítményeinek, jó működésének értékelési, mérési lehetőségei. Tanulmány. In: KÖFOP-2.1.2-VEKOP-15-2016-00001. A jó kormányzást megalapozó közszolgálat-fejlesztés. „Jó Önkormányzat – a jó állam részét képező teljesítőképes és intelligens önkormányzati menedzsment". Ludovika Kiemelt Kutatóműhely. A jó önkormányzás mérése – elvi, módszertani és működési megalapozás" – enclosing research document. Budapest: Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem.

2019. *Fenntartható urbanizáció. A városfejlesztés tervezésének alapjai* (manuscript in press). Budapest: Scolar Kiadó.

BAJNAI, László–JÓZSA, Attila. 2018. An Insight into Operational Urban Development in Hungary in the Light of Regulation-Based Urban Development. Cluj-Napoca: *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, European and Regional Studies* 13: 39–64.

BALOGH, Márton–POP, Daniel. 2010. Cooperarea intercomunitară ca exercițiu pentru implementarea guvernanței regionale. In: BAKK, Miklós–BENEDEK, József (eds), *Politicile regionale in România*. Iaşi: Editura Polirom.

BENEDEK, József. 2006. *Területfejlesztés és regionális fejlődés*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

CHOAY, Francoise. 1965. *L'urbanisme, utopies et réalités. Une anthologie*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

1996 [1980]. *La régle et la modéle. Sur la théorie de l'architecture et de l'urbanisme*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

CERDÁ, Ildefonso. 2013 [1867]. *Az urbanizáció általános elmélete.* Budapest: Scolar Kiadó.

CLAVAL, Paul. 2014. *Breve histoire de l'urbanisme*. Paris: Fayard/Pluriel.
LACAZE, Jean-Paul. 1995. *Introduction á la planification urbaine. Imprécis d'urbanisme á la francaise.* Paris: Presses de l'école nationale des ponts et chaussées.
MERLIN, Pierre–CHOAY, Francoise. 2010. *Dictionnaire de l'urbanisme et de l'aménagement.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
MORUS, Tamás. 1941 [1516]. *Utópia*. Budapest: Officina Könyvtár.
POGÁNY, Frigyes. 1965. *Párizs*. Budapest: Képzőművészeti Alap Kiadóvállalata.
SZENTKIRÁLYI, Zoltán. 1983. *Az építészet világtörténete*. Vol. II. Budapest: Képzőművészeti Alap Kiadóvállalata.
WITTKOWER Rudolf. 1986 [1949]. *A humanizmus korának építészeti elvei*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.