Katalin Pallai :

Heritage in Prague and Budapest : Protection or the Balance Between Protection and Creativity[1]

Introduction:

The story of cities - since they exist - could be the summary of history. Physical relics, signs of previous events and often also the most obvious messages of the invisible forces leading them can be seen in them. The city is the centre, container and creator, guard and inheritor of culture since its beginnings. It seems to be of many little fragments, but it is also an ensemble of stiffened frames of memories from lives of old ages.

Throughout history cities lived, were destroyed or built up again into new and modified ones. When they were completely destroyed, they became a myth, like Troy or Mycenea, when they survived they became history itself. The modern movement of the XX century considered cities as construction ground. It wanted to detach itself from old ages and old urban values to create a better, new city for the new World and for an imaginary new man. It failed, because it is only a dream (or nightmare), that man can live happily - without keeping his old security handles, (attachments) - and set out for new adventures

---

[1] I was given the possibility to learn more about the system of protection in Prague by a scolarship for the semester on Arts organised in Prague, in 1993. at the Central-European University, where this article was my final paper.

into the totally new and unknown, whose perfection can be proved only by abstract thinking to him.

Now, at the end of the century we have already realised that man, rooted by many links into the past, can not become detached from it. And beside, why should he at all? We know, that he understands something as revolutionarily new, when it changes the old pattern a little bit, so that the new can still be safely comprehended as well.

Now, at the end of the century we feel at home again with the traditional, with the old, and we are inclined to admit even our romantic-little-personal attachments to them. We want the new, which is still comprehensible for us, where many familiar things, mental patterns, personal links and memories can guide us.

Now at the end of the century we want cities which contain our memories, the history, the spirit of the place (genius loci), and develop new colours out of them. We want cities, where there are familiar, homely, comprehensible places, where while walking on the streets we are day-by-day reinforced, we are backed by our own World and our past as well. And, we want cities which are different, where we always feel on which part of the World we are. Cities, whose actual form preserves the past as well, and whose new form, saving the speciality, character of the place, develops the future out of that.

We urbanists, architects, art historians - or hopefully all these spirits in each of us - try to build our cities in a hundred different ways, hoping to fulfil not only our ideas and theories about the concept of continuity in European cities, but to create liveable, functioning examples of it as well.

There were two separate fields earlier: urbanism and protection of monuments. One built cities, the other protected some individual monuments. Now more and more people try to combine the two. Starting from our different urban experiences they attempt to create a new era, when the due proportion between old and new can be found, where traditional values are not only protected, but can be completed with new ones and build into a contemporary pattern.

This is very important today, because the old plays an ever increasing role in our culture. We have been protecting old monuments for a long time already, but it still took another long time for us - and we had to recuperate from the euphoria of modernism as well - to be able to realise that areas, urban units and fabrics have an even more important role for the spirit, identity and character, so for our comprehension and local references.

Increasing the protection in time, territory and quantity, we had to realise that simply keeping everything as it was does not work, it makes us move out of our own city. So we have to find the way to keep our places still liveable. We have to create a new concept, where protection does not stand alone as a single, overruling principle, but protection and intervention happen in harmony, securing not only the physical but mental survival of our cities as well.

Situation of the protection:

These questions are especially vital in reviving Central-European cities now. Here, after the political transformations, we not only have to rethink all principles and concepts of our lives and the life of our cities, but our new rules and regulations as well. There is no question here that we have to create our new systems. A broken line of democratic and urban tradition has to be reinstalled. It can not surely be just continued on the old way, where and as it was left half a century ago, but has to be remade in the best possible way to fit contemporary norms.

We are lucky on the one hand, because during the last forty years the lack of prosperity could relatively save historical areas. Many old building types which became listed only in the last years were not destroyed, only left to deteriorate. As a result of a general neglect of central and historical areas, relatively little was changed, so many things can be regained after restoration and revitalisation.

So we still have the things to protect, but we have to revalue these things and reorganize our protection systems unfortunately - or more optimisticly thinking, fortunately - at a time when something is changing all over in the World, in the whole profession. So it is very difficult to look for references and reinforcement in our ideas. In luckier parts of the world continuity keeps the old traditions, and nobody feels it compulsory to change them totally at a time when new approaches are still at the theoretical stage. Here the transition gives the chance, and also the duty. If we have to remake it anyhow, let us do it in the most progressive way. Does this mean today that we have to find a totally new way? And can we risk our future with so much new methods? These are the biggest questions among professionals in Prague and Budapest and their attempted solutions could probably tell a lot about our thoughts, problems and difficulties of that famous transition.

Good and relatively strong laws concerning the protection of monuments are a common heritage of Central-Europe. In the ex-socialist countries of this region, unfortunately, the poor condition of many valuable buildings is another common feature. Still further discussion will not be about the protection of individual monuments, which is a more stabilised field and poses fewer basic theoretical questions, but only about the methods of territorial protection, and the protection of the cityscape.

Since the '1960s both Hungarian and Czech protection laws list not only important monuments, but protected territories as well. (1959 in the Czech Republic and 1964 in Hungary) Since then these protected areas have been limited, and special regulation plans have been prepared by restorers for them.

This situation has resulted in two problems. First, that a team worked in the limited, protected area, legally independently from the rest of the urban planning. This method existed in conflict with all accepted principles of urbanism and definitely did not secure the best integration of these parts into the whole of the city. Secondly, the exclusive monumental care and detailed plans for the reconstruction of the area often resulted in very strict regulations, no place for new creativity and caused the transformation of the district, instead of a living city, into an open-museum.

This is the common past of Prague and Budapest. The future should be integration and the revival of these areas. For this, today, we should create a new method to do it, in the new circumstances.

Prague :

Research on the Historical Core of Prague started in 1954 with the so-called "Passportisation of Prague". The method meant that a small book was prepared, first of each listed, then of all other building as well. These passports contained plans at a scale of 1:200, history, descriptions, bibliography, and all possible data.

In 1971. the whole Historical Core known as Prague Historical Reserve (later: HRP) received legal protection. In 1974-76 a complex urban analysis, which also included social, economical and structural surveys, was added to the already existing passports. On the basis of this incredible amount of collected, detailed knowledge Miroslav Base made the "Prognosis" of the Historical Reserve of Prague. (Prognosis means the less detailed and most comprehensive kind of plan in the Czech urban and regional planning system)

In 1979 a new period began, which added a different, much more perceptional survey, a method, based on the visual, architectural comprehension of the environment, to the

already existing more scientific material. This period could be signaled by the name of Marie Svabova and her method of the analysis of the relief, structure and visual values of the HRP.

Greatly influenced by the famous book of Kevin Lynch (The Image of the City)[2], she tried to create a method which understands and judges all urban and architectural values and makes the interventions for the protection, or maybe more appropriately, the re-creation of the urban composition and its referential function.

As opposed to the earlier method she did not begin with the buildings, but started from the urban composition and approached smaller units in a hierarchical order. First the relief - understood as the complete morphology and general urban composition - was studied. Then its big compositional parts - the panoramic units, or ensembles - were defined still from outside, possibly from higher viewpoints. These ensembles contain many smaller coherent ones, often formed around some significant, dominant elements. The results of this first part of the survey are summarised on an analytical map of the whole area, marking all dominant, subordinated and characteristic elements and signing structural qualities.

In the next phase, coherent, structural identity areas and different, smaller town compositional elements are defined from the pedestrians view as well. These are delimited on a detailed map as spatial units that belong by perception together. It can easily happen that units expressing different coherences overlap: one object can play different roles in more different surrounding contexts.

In the last phase we arrive to the individual objects, which in this method are always strongly defined by the surroundings. Judgement about them are of two sources: it is mainly by their position in the urban landscape, but their individual architectural quality is not completely forgotten either.

At the end of this survey, after having understood all of the effective elements and relationships at this depth, the suggested regulatives are already on the plans. The fate of the compositional elements are judged by their position in the superior spatial units, and individual buildings should ideally harmonise with all given contexts. The ideal heights, place, cubic form of each house and even the colour, style and strength of architectural elements to be used on the facades can be decided clearly.

---

[2] Kevin Lynch: The Image of the City, MIT Press, 1960.

In Ms Svabova's concept a very strict hierarchy prevails. The dominant is the space in a city, that gives the sense to it. She thinks that places were understandable, human and worked as public references only as long as the builder of each individual building could accept this supremacy. Until that time cities "created a milieu, an environment where human relations could develop in their complexity"[3]. Since then it has become impossible to understand our own environment, so there is a confusion and the loss of identity.

The city is luckily in a state of constant change, so a method can be worked out which turns these transformations back towards the re-creation of the local identity. Considering the composition of the city as fundamental, defining the parts by that higher order, and giving the force for the space to unify all smaller elements, she arrives to the regulation, where most of the desirable characteristics of buildings and objects are already mostly defined by these dependencies. Individuality of buildings will peacefully exist in this way in the order of the historical city, and will not quarrel as the modern type ones do. No major mistakes can be committed if the rules are followed. Soon the buildings will change back or be built as part of this unifying system, there will hopefully be order, peace and harmony. This order will be collective and comprehensible, and might even re-create identity and serve as public reference in our fragmented culture and society.

This seems to be a very elaborate and safe system of regulations for historical areas (maybe a little strong, but similar to traditional international experiences), even when the old mistake is still there, that it can be done only in very a limited territory, and it admittedly deals with the city - "free from provisory and facultative elements, such as traffic,etc"[4] -, as a statue without its confusing functioning, outer links and dependencies, or temporality. But would this at least do for achieving an appropriate spatial order today ?

Let us put beside this concept of harmonising order an other book, Gordon Cullen's The Concise Townscape[5] and an other expert of Prague, Petr Kratochvil. For them, the visual pleasure of a town depends on conformity and drama. Conformity as "the agreement

---

[3] Marie Svabova: La sauvegarde de la composition urbaine, in: Prague, ville historique capital, p.264, Éditions de l'Aube, Paris 1992.

[4]. quote from a paper written by Marie Svabova for an english book on protection, which is not yet published.

[5]. Gordon Cullen: The Concise Townscape, Architectural Press, 1961.

to differ within an recognised tolerance of behaviour"[6] and drama as "lucidity, contrast and difference"[7]. Though an architect "not only creates a building, but creates one part of the shape of the city, a word in a sentence"[8], poetic words can be said, and creative, contrasting buildings can be constructed. A place should be not only ordered, but interesting too, and you will never be able to put this into a regulation. What is more, the stricter the regulation is, generally the less creative it becomes.

Really, if we start to think about all those nice old towns, which enchant us tremendously today, and which seem to be so unified, how were they created? If we step a little further than the superficial, romantic story of old towns and ages, the history of a city is the history of a continuous transformation. Transformation of importance, links, structure and buildings. Earlier houses were constantly replaced by new ones, there were many changes of scale, or if this did not happen, we say, that the town is dead, but still it is a peaceful museum. Can regulations create nice, but dead museums out of formerly living towns? For examples we only have to look at some protected areas in a few of the "successful historical towns".

So what can we oppose to regulation? Creativity. The force and capability to create something new; a new idea, building, friendship or context. Regulation means the fixing of the context, which is reinforcing against big mistakes, securing the common language, but if taken seriously blocks most of the creativity.

Building the Saint Nicholas church in Mala Strana would have been impossible by any modern type of regulation of historical areas. There are still mostly smaller scale buildings around it, so by the sense of regulation the former church fitted much better. The work of Dietzenhofer is still considered to be not only a masterpiece of great architectural quality, but could also create a new spatial order. Prague was enriched by it, the famous Royal Way to the Castle became more elegant, interesting, eloquent, and different. Nobody could have predicted this in any regulatory plan. It was the achievement of an individual creator, which happened at that time and, luckily, on this way. And all the houses built after it had already to harmonise with this new context.

---

[6]. op.cit. p.16.

[7] op.cit. p.7.

[8]. quote from a talk with Petr Kratochvil.

Still, it is true that a new building could even be a real disaster. But should not discussion be carried out, beside the reassuring condition of limitations, on those - seemingly impossible - judgements on new qualities as well?

As a contemporary issue, we can look at the already famous story of the building at the end of the Rasinovo embankment. By any kind of regulation the building should continue and close the row of houses along the river as the original one, and many earlier plans did. In the last project Frank Ghery created a new solution: instead of harmonising with the given context of the embankment, he closes it and creates a new context on the square at the bridge head.

Was he supposed to do so ? No. All regulatory sense is against it. Is this a plausible solution ? Yes. A new context can always be created by the introduction of a new element in the existing order. How much this new context will work, always depends on the individual and reorganizative force of the new element, taken in relation to the context. Could he do it ? This is really a judgement on the quality; the quality of the building itself, the relative quality of the original and new contexts, and the development possibilities of the old and new orders.

But was he supposed to create this new context ? No, because this is a serious neglect of most of the regulations. Why? Because, nowadays regulations of historical areas are very similar to some preconceived generalised projects, limited in many details. It is to dictate the rules of the majority of the buildings and patterns for the new ones. Very democratic. It is not yet a real project, which would be called as authority, and leave no place for free decisions. It is a democratic limitation of the right of creativity in the name of the existing order of the city. Still this existing process maybe too limited to be considered democratic.

So remains the individual decision, and all we know it is quite shaky ground to make so complex quality judgements in this sense. However already forgetting about both mentioned examples, the real question would be, that, if not traditional type regulation, some other kind of method should be developed to assist in making good decisions about new constructions and alterations in existing city surrounding.

Two new attempts are forming in Prague and Budapest to get closer to the solution of these problems. Both of them are based on the principle, that modern urban area protection except for listed monuments, should not be an authoritarian prescription, but much more a method of understanding, help and, for the maintenance of the local character, a relatively

open control of the natural changing and developing process. Instead of telling "what to do" they try to invent methods for "how to discuss" and decide about new interventions.

In Prague this attempt happens as a third phase, started in 1989, of the protection of the Historical Reserve of Prague. The work is still based on all materials collected in earlier times, even when some of them already need to be revisioned. The aim was to work out a complex urban plan, UPMZ - (Urban Plan of a Zone) complying with the Czech planning hierarchy -.

In this work three new categories of zones were introduced:

- Zone of conservation, meaning an area, where a stable urban pattern and good quality buildings can be found;

- Stabilised zone, where a stabilised urban pattern, but different, often even contrasting architectural qualities can be found;

- Sensitive zone, where no prevailing urban pattern can be found, with different buildings, mostly bad quality, where the area needs strong intervention, a new solution.

Using the results of the earlier research and a new systematic approach the territory was devided into 20 parts of homogen identity. A detailed description of the character of each was also prepared for further use, and the complex research of the first period was refreshed.

Today all the prepared Protection Plans are accepted. The next phase would be the new kind of regulation concept or something else to defend the values. A key part is the Saint Anne district[9], as this is the most mixed area and here is, where the future of protection is the most questionable. This part is used as an experimental field.

By the new concept, instead of traditional regulation a so-called "model" could be decided, and later could also be the basis for new regulations. The "model" could fix an understanding and a vision of the area, which though partly subjective, could create a basis for discussion, a decision about the content of future interventions.

Stopping at the "model" might seem strange, but a model of an area is a definite guide-line in its understanding of the process which created the place, and in this sense for

---

[9]. The architect studio of Jan Sedlak is commisioned with this work. The thoughts, concepts and doubts discussed later, are also partly based on their considerations about the possibilities.

the possible prolongation of the process and system, and for the development in harmony with the existing. In this way it is definitely not a frozen regulative logic, but the logic of creativity. It is very much in the spirit of the motto given by V.V.Steck : "Prague does not need organisators, but creators"

This is how things stand today, and definitely will not stay for too long. We are at a time of rethinking and deciding, this is a symptom of our general transition period. We are not really sure of many things. Making a traditional protection plan, or project would presuppose that we believe we know the possible future of the area. Making strict regulations means to block a lot of new development possibilities. New economic and political situation would demand for clear regulations. Public sources are very limited and developers can not risk on long and partly unpredictable quality discussions and judgements. They rather have strict, but clear rules, so that they can rely on. Making soft regulation, gives place to the creative process, but risks the investments. And it does not defend too much either. It mostly relies on the persons who make the individual decisions. Let us hope they will be professional, creative and powerful enough in their decisions.

Budapest :

In Budapest the protection of individual monuments and their surrounding is traditionally stronger than the protection of ensembles. The whole historical centre was never listed; only some buildings were protected by national laws and orders of the City Council, and the facades of houses on streets of major importance in the cityscape are protected by the Budapest Urban Regulations.

In 1987 the castle and the panorama of the Danube was listed as World Heritage, since then this part has been protected as a territorial unit too.

After the political changes, in the course of legal reorganisation, national lists remained, but the local protection lost its validity. After being revised and up dated the first part of local protection, the protection of major monuments will hopefully be soon accepted again. We hope that this new protection order of the City of Budapest will be enough to bridge over the time when the new city regulations will be elaborated and accepted.

The aim is that, on the basis of the new Character Plan[10], territorial protection will already be incorporated into the general regulation. Not only the earlier nominated historical places and monumental values, but the whole city will be approached with a new, value-conscious method, based on the indentity and the local character. In this way, the atmosphere and character of each individual part can not only be protected but further developed as well. And all this can happen not by the above criticized traditional type of regulations, and separate projects limited to small areas, but, with the help of a structure plan, they can really be incorporated into and harmonised with the whole urban development.

The Character Plan is a new, experimental method, based on the international experiences of character surveys and local protection systems, and developed further by its creators. Its aim is to be a basic tool for the solution of further urban questions, such as zoning, planning, regulation or suggestions for all participants of the investment and construction process.

During the first phase of the elaboration the methodology was worked out, and published in February 1992. After it was accepted, work started in early summer. As the basic principle of the inventors is that each part of the city is important, has a role in the whole, and has the right to retain its own special character, the aim was to prepare the Character Plan of the whole city at the same time. The territory of Budapest is 525 km2, so the work was huge, the collaboration of many architects and students from the architectural faculty was needed, and for the production of comparable results, with quite a good coordination.

A survey was made of each individual district, block and house of the city on analytical, analogical and chronological basis. In each group of the survey the characteristic features of the urban environment were registered, and put on a computerised map, by the Arc-INFO system. (interestingly also used in Prague but for other urban purposes)

The registered features were the following :

---

[10]. The Caracter Plan was elaborated by the concept of Ferenc Cságoly and Tamás Meggyesi, by the Építész Stúdió KFT, on the comission given by the Municipality of Budapest.

- analytical survey : the type of the buildings, the height of the buildings, the function of the buildings, the age of the buildings, vegetation of the surroundings of the buildings, morphological situation)

- analogical survey : character of the area (like metropolitan character, small town character, garden city character, peripheric, suburban character or village like character)

- chronological survey: grouping the buildings into the typical periods of the construction of Budapest.

The computer was the tool to superpose all these features, and distinguish the existing areas of individual, and homogen character. Many thousand units of homogen character resulted from the mechanical processing of the data, out of which 538 units with individual character were created by already small restrictions. The result, the Character Plan of Budapest, was published in November 1992. In the publication of all summarising plans of individual surveys, a separate page for each of the individual units was also put beside, containing not only the description of the unit, but also defining its smaller, absolutely homogen parts, and some illustrations of the possibilities for its further use and development.

For the discourse here, the most important aspect is the elaboration of the so-called Cadastre of Values, which is a method for relatively deep surveys of territories for a later regulation or development concept. (But beside this the Character Plan is naturally also aimed to be further elaborated in different directions, as - mentioning only two extremities - to create a more sensitive zoning, and territorial basis for regulations, as the existing mechanical ones, and can also serve for a better understanding and presenting of our local environment even for public civic education[11])

The elaboration of the Cadastre of Values means that each unit of individual character will undergo a closer scrutiny:

1. first all plans, photos, historical facts, existing protection lists, bibliographies are collected, then the historical and cultural description of the area is prepared. Here subjective

---

[11]. "The Caracter Plan could serve as a possible tool to fight against the indifference towards the environment and our living areas, it could help to know and apperciate our built environment, and it could also help to develope the necessary local attachments and local patriotism. Karaktertérkép, Értékkataszter, p.3. Budapest, 1992.

literary sources are used as well, as, in addition to the seemingly objective data, personal views, feelings, impression can also be revealing. On the basis of all this material the presentation of the area is prepared.

2. The already prepared surveys are presented again, completed by some new ones on the structure and qualities of space among the buildings. Then the smaller units with homogen character are surveyed individually. To the relation of the homogeneity thematic - meaning harmonising - and non-thematic - meaning different character - elements are defined.[12] The quality and condition of individual buildings and different natural units, then typical elements of the environment, are also registered. Finally visual connections and visible silhouette elements are defined from important external and internal viewpoints.

3. Based on the synthesis of all these surveys in the last part of the Cadastre of Values, the character values of each homogen sub-unit are described, and suggestions are defined, which can create the spirit and basis of any decision on interventions into the area.

The Cadastre of Values of one area was already prepared in last November as a first example. Since then some 30 new parts are already being elaborated, and hopefully, the whole work can be finished in the space of a few years.

With this work in Budapest the whole city was surveyed, parts of individual character were defined, and later scrutinised by their inner features and outer connections and definitions. The method surveyed both building and territory, volume and space, and their interdependencies. It tried not to pose preconceived value systems, but to accept existing local characters, and understand the environment from the viewpoint of its inhabitants. It conceived the existing character as "a possible local energy, which could work as a potential for development". It gave the credit even to the strangest periphery to have some local speciality that residents can be attached to. It did not want to make a "comme il faut" "art city" out of each neighbourhood, but to strengthen colours, the local human reference. In this way, the city is conceived as a place to know, to feel at home in, to be attached to it, to live in.

But this is not yet finished. The creation or maintenance of these basic values has not yet been secured. This is exactly the same point, where - after a very different start - Prague

---

[12]. Being valued as a defining thematic or non-thematic element in this sense is naturally almost independent of artistic or architectural quality.

stopped as well. In Prague the idea is the "model"; here the "suggestions". In concept and content they are very much the same.

In Prague in addition to the "model", "conserved, stabilised and sensitive zones" were delimited. As a further step for regulation a matrix was suggested in Budapest, in which on one side territorial categories, on the other side categories for the protection of buildings can be found. Territories can be of three types: worth of protection, place of possible modifications, needing development. Buildings can also be of three types: to be protected, completed/modified, or changed. This create nine basic possibilities for the mutual relationship of the value of the individual building and the value of the character of the territory including it, with the aim to unite the regulations of zones and individual buildings in one, comprehensible system.

One major difference still remains between the two methods. In Prague the work is limited to the Historical Reserve. This part of the city has a long tradition to be dealt with separately, and this tradition does not seem to be broken today either. Even in the elaboration of the new Master Plan, the Historical Reserve is a separate question, in many ways devided from all other parts of the city. Harmony and connections are only made in the minds of individual planners.

In Budapest, the unchangeable basis of the method is that, from the beginning each part of the city has to be studied in the same way. We have to give the credit and attention to each area, otherwise we can not defend all those values which are locally important. And this method wants to be incorporated in the whole new Master Plan. Completed with structure plans, it can not only serve as the basis of the new regulation as well, but in some places the character can even be a strategical element of development. So the method in Budapest has much higher aims, which do not only depend on the inventors, but on political decision makers as well. They also have to be courageous to start and commission something very new, which is naturally still often discussed among the professionals as well.

Final conclusion:

As a conclusion, I would like to emphasize once more, that the two systems are different in their history, details and dimensions, but their concept about regulation is very similar. Both of them feel the need to find a new type of regulation, and both of them decide

for a comprehensive conceptual approach, where not precise mesures, or preconceived constructions are the aim, but to define values, and conditions to be fulfilled and what can also serve as a basis for concrete decisions.

The situation for the two methods is also similar in the sense, that they both began to think about possibilities of a new type of urban thinking and acting, at a time when the whole system of planning and regulation is - as a consequence of the political transformations - in the remaking. And they both tried to do this by creating a system of absolutely acceptable concepts and values for their purely professional methods. Both of them are only beginnings, they have not arrived to final results yet. Their future fate and elaboration will be decisive about how successfull they will be in changing the up till now static and rigid regulation logic into a new system of complex, flexible and dynamic rules, which harmonize better with the spirit of the city.

Still, they can both already reinforce the feeling that here is the basis, possibility, energy and let us hope the stamina too for major future changes in these formerly unlucky, Central-European countries. They can also show that by our attempts many crucial contemporary questions are deeply thought over. We might not find "the" solutions, but we can raise valid questions for others too. Out of our struggles and experiences, surely many other people can also learn and start to think about the same issues, though possibly differently.

The question of territorial protection is very important today, because the old plays an ever increasing role in our culture. We have been protecting old monuments for a long time already, but it still took another long time for us - and we had to recuperate from the euphoria of modernism as well - to be able to realise that areas, urban units and fabrics have an even more important role for the spirit, identity and character, so for our comprehension and local references. Increasing the protection in time, territory and quantity, we had to realise that simply keeping everything as it was does not work, it makes us move out of our own city. So we have to find the way to keep our places still liveable. We have to create a new concept which allows the necessary intervention, but gardes for their harmony with the old ensembles, because this is the only way to secure not only the physical but mental survival of our cities as well.