



## SOME ASPECTS OF THE HUNGARIAN SPATIAL- AND SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Tamás BESZE<sup>1</sup>, Miklós LUKOVICS<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Municipality of Szeged, HUNGARY, <sup>2</sup>University of Szeged, HUNGARY

---

### Abstract:

The never before seen sum of the possible financial resources at Hungary's disposal supported by the European Union in the programming period 2007 to 2013, indicates a historical chance in connection with the fulfillment of the development objectives, especially the spatial objectives in Hungary. In order to the optimal utilization of the financial resources it is needed to continue the decentralization process – started in 1996 but refracted in 1999 – and to strengthen the regional institutional system. The efficient utilization of the financial resources co-financed by the EU and the Hungarian government also requires such a planning mechanism, which considers both the national specialities both the international spatial development experiences, and is based on a wide professional and political consensus. This paper aims to survey the most important milestones of the formation of the Hungarian spatial policy, especially the ones of the spatial- and settlement development. Also the evolution process of the Hungarian self government system will be explored, principally in connection with the relationship between the municipality development and EU grants. Finally the most important projects of the Municipality of Szeged will be demonstrated.

### Keywords:

EU regional policy, spatial development, municipality development

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

After the access of Hungary to the European Union, spatial planning comes more and more to the front, because the financial supports of the European Union are based on the completed spatial documents [17]. Ten years ago, the Hungarian Parliament has accepted the Act of 1996. XXI. on the regional development and physical planning in 1996. This has been a high level and complex regulation of the spatial development in Hungary [3]. Its further importance is, that among the candidate countries, Hungary has adopted firstly the legal conditions of the regional institutions regarding to the principles and requirements of the European regional policy. According to the act, spatial development in Hungary is based on national and regional planning documents, concepts, programs, and physical plans [15].

### 2. SOME ISSUES OF THE HUNGARIAN SPATIAL POLICY UNTIL 1996

The first legislative provision in connection with the spatial- and settlement development was the Act of 1937. VI. on the physical planning of cities, housing and construction. The law obliged the cities to complete city development plans [21], furthermore compelled the cities with high level of exactitude to prepare land use plans and general settlement plans. After the second world war, the Institute of Physical Planning (the so called TERINT) has been established in 1949. The general aim of the TERINT was to coordinate the socialist industrialization and the town-planning. Additionally, its task was to register all spatial and settlement changes, and to work out several plans. Its significance might be the completion of the first regional planning works, like the one of Zagyva-valley, Borsodi area, Baranyai area.

As for local legislation, in 1949 and in 1950 the Constitution, and later the first council law introduced a council system that was completely alien to the Hungarian conditions, by copying the soviet model [9]. From the beginning, the major function of this system was to accomplish the central decisions of the white trash dictatorship that aimed to change society and economy mainly with means of the polity, leaving little local independence. Similarly to the first one, the Second Council Law in 1954 also rejected the idea of local municipality [10]. There was a decrease in the councils' duties in administration and authority but the councils' spatial and settlement developing tasks slightly increased. The councils were regarded as the lengthened arm of the central state organization delegated by the monolithic party-centre. In the so-called dual subservience the centre managed the county by primacy means, the county managed the townships and most of the towns and the township councils managed the villages. This local dependence attached serious lack of local democratism, nominal votings and elections preceding the real free elections. Council boards were politically insignificant, as council leaders, close council meetings and closed executive board meetings decided on important issues beforehand, and the council meetings mostly just accepted these decisions. From

the aspect of city development, we cannot disregard that the panel program that started in the second half of the 1960s wasn't based on local decisions, either.

The decree with legal force of 1955. XXXVI. on the regulation of town- and village settlement determined the system of town- and village settlement, and dealt with the notion of regionalism more thoughtfully, than ever before. Thanks to this legislative provision, From the end of the fifties on, the number of regional plans increased significantly. In 1965, the National Settlement Development Plan has been completed, which surveyed the Hungarian settlements, and the development trends. In 1970, the National Settlement Development Concept has been worked out, which has been adopted by the Hungarian government after a wide dialog with the local and departmental authorities in 1971. According to the concept, all the settlements have been classified into development categories. The financial resource provided for each settlement has been dependent on the category of the concrete settlement.

This dual subservience remained during the later "reforms" of the council system, the laws didn't provide much more local independence. The council system was only the executor of central programmes. But these programmes didn't involve local needs that could have given a special image to settlement developments and that could have implemented developments in a way that would have fulfilled local needs the most. As local regulation didn't have any latitude in other developments either, settlements got poorer and poorer, regardless of their size.

On the whole, the Hungarian spatial policy before 1985 can be characterized with a settlement view instead of a spatial view. This policy was city-centric, which underplayed the role and importance of territorial units. In this period, the spatial policy was strong centralized in Hungary.

From 1985 till 1996 the Hungarian spatial policy can be characterized as a transitional one. The resolution of the Parliament Nr. 12/1980-85. aimed to develop the lagging behind territorial units, so this legislative provision was the first, which declared the spatial view instead of settlement view. In the middle of the eighties, it has been realized, that the development of separated settlements is not efficient, complex territorial units has to be taken into consideration and developed. In the decentralization process of the Hungarian regional policy, the Act of 1990. LXV. on the local governments counts as a substantial milestone, which pronounced the local demand on decentralization.

From 1991 till 1995, the spatial development efforts have been supported by a separated money fund in Hungary. The Spatial Development Fund had a very varied function: to support employment level expansion and economic restructuring in lagging behind regions, to support the creation of crisis management programs on the level of regions and sub-regions etc. It also has been emphasized, that during this transitional period the regional policy of the European Union has been also in Hungary get to know, and started the receipt of the core principles [4], but its effects has been only in the next period perceptible.

### **3. MILESTONE IN THE HUNGARIAN SPATIAL POLICY**

The adoption of the Act of 1996. XXI. on regional development and physical planning meant a turning point in the field of regional planning, institutions, financial and economic regulation and EU-integration. 1996, the year, when the act came into force is the beginning of the third stage of the Hungarian spatial policy. This legislative provision set its regional developments goals, overall objectives – therefore the partition of competences between the Parliament and the government – in compliance with the regional policy of the European Union. This act forms the basis of the Hungarian spatial policy [15].

The Country Report of the European Union in 1998 gave a very positive evaluation on the Hungarian regional policy, because the adopted act was unique amongst the candidate countries. One of the most important significances of the act was to define and to clear the most important notions of the theme, like region, sub-region, spatial unit, regional development etc. Furthermore the act defined the tools, financial resources and the institutions of the regional development. The notion of regional planning was given a high priority also in the preparation for the drawing of Structural Funds and the evaluation of the country alike.

The act set up the possibility of applying the regional policy of the European Union by containing the most important core principles of the EU's regional policy, like concentration, partnership, additionality, regional applications etc. Furthermore the act fulfils the requirements of justice, equity and solidarity, and the general cohesion objectives of the European Union [3]. Dissociation of the institutions into national, regional, and sub-regional level also can be evaluated as a big step in the efforts of decentralization. The act ordered to complete spatial development documents first of all on the level of regions and counties<sup>1</sup>. This is a very important issue from economical view,

<sup>1</sup> In connection with this point of the act, the following legislative provisions should be mentioned:

– 184/1996. (XII. 11.) Statutory order on the adoption process of spatial development concepts, programs and physical plans.

because foreign direct investment and enterprise development need a well documented background, because spatial documents contains significant information to support investment decisions (for example about externalities).

The progress of the Hungarian spatial policy come to a sudden standstill in 1999. The act of 1999. XCII. on the modification of the act of 1996. XXI. on regional development and physical planning can be evaluated as a withdrawal in the decentralization efforts in the spatial policy. The significant changes in the membership pattern of the Regional Development Councils are on the way back to the centralization: the preponderance of the ministries, its right of veto, the exclusion of the local economic actors (chambers, Council of Labour), the membership of deconcentrated organizations (Office of Agriculture) are steps towards the centralization. The European Union passed strictures on this issue, just as on the inadequate utilization of the financial resources: spatial resources have been used as resource replenishment by municipalities and their institutions so they didn't catch they original target group, the enterprises.

The European Union also crabbed Hungary in connection with the NUTS-2 level regions: the defined seven regions didn't satisfy the criteria of normative regions defined by the EU: there are not elected, only delegated representatives on regional level, and the Regional Development Councils don't have disposal on own financial resources. In 1998, the first National Spatial Development Concept (OTK) has been approved by the Hungarian Parliament (Decree 35/1998 (III.20.) of the Hungarian Parliament) order of the Parliament). This Concept has been the first complex and strategic development document in Hungary, which has been the principal document of Hungarian spatial development policy, regional development. It gave orientation for different instruments of regional policy, and formulated guidelines in order to reduce regional disparities. As a framework document it contains the development perspectives of the country and its regions, outlines the long-term regional development objectives and laid down the guidelines for the elaboration of the different development programs. In addition, the document provided regional planners and stakeholders with the necessary information [6].

#### 4. NEW TRENDS IN THE HUNGARIAN SPATIAL POLICY

According to the act of 1996, XXI<sup>2</sup>, the National Spatial Development Concept should be analyzed every six year. As a result of three comprehensive evaluations on the emergence of Hungarian spatial development policy and the regional processes of the country a new concept was elaborated approved by the Hungarian Parliament at the end of 2005 (Decree 97/2005 (XII. 25) of the Hungarian Parliament). The new concept sets up the principles of a more complex spatial development policy, which must be integrated into all other policies. At the same time these policies also should be integrated through the development of regions by the process of decentralisation.

The new OTK lays down the spatial perspectives of the country, and the long term objectives in harmony with them. Furthermore it draws up medium-term objectives and spatial priorities, tools, institutional conditions, and contains the targets of the regions.

The new National Spatial Development Concept contains the following innovations in comparison with the National Development Concept of 1998 [7] [20]:

- ✚ it is strong committed to accelerate and strengthen decentralization and regionalism in Hungary
- ✚ it defines a more complex spatial policy, than ever before: a spatial policy with widespread functions, integrated into the general development policy
- ✚ nearby the objective of decreasing regional disparities also the objective of spatial efficiency (competitiveness) and sustainability comes into the limelight
- ✚ it consists of a cross-border thinking.

In harmony with one of the most important core principle of the EU regional policy, the subsidiarity, the National Spatial Development Concept of 2005 puts down only such spatial objectives and task, which are valid for the country in general. These objectives of the OTK are results of a widespread consultancy process with the regional development agencies. The concept provides a wide elbow-room in spatial planning for the regions on several aggregation level, especially for the NUTS-2 regions. These territorial units are defined as the primary aggregation level in the decentralized development policy. During the spatial planning process of the NUTS-2 regions the general objectives written in the OTK should be taken compulsory into consideration [7] [20].

- 
- 112/1997. (VI. 27.) Statutory order on the information system about spatial development and physical planning.
  - 18/1998. (VI. 25.) Departmental order on the contents of spatial development concepts, programs and physical plans.
  - 23/2001. (II. 14.) Statutory order on the modification of the 184/1996. (XII. 11.) Statutory order on the adoption process of spatial development concepts, programs and physical plans.

<sup>2</sup> The act of 2004. LXXV. on the modification of the act of 1996. XXI. on regional development and physical planning and other related acts has gone back to the way of decentralization, because it abandoned the preponderance of ministries in the membership pattern of Regional Development Councils. Furthermore this act established development councils also on the level of sub-regions.

---



## 5. DEVELOPMENT POLES IN THE NEW SPATIAL POLICY

The National Development Concept (OFK), as an overarching development concept fulfils the role of a country strategy has been elaborated in 2005, parallel to the National Spatial Development Concept. Because of this fact, their main findings are the same: both of them define development poles in Hungary. “... in order that development is not limited to the area of the capital, the monocentric spatial structure should be resolved. [...] The whole country requires development poles to catalyze competitiveness, and which are organic elements of a harmonious, polycentric, cooperative town network system. [...] Hungary’s development poles are: Debrecen, Miskolc, Szeged, Pécs, Győr, and Budapest.” [7]. According to the concept, the most important task of the development poles are to facilitate innovation activity and help the spreading innovation in the region. They also should contribute to decrease regional disparities in Hungary.

The Decree 96/2005 (XII. 25) of the Hungarian Parliament on the National Development Concept and the Decree 97/2005 (XII. 25) of the Hungarian Parliament on the National Spatial Development Concept defined Szeged as a development pole also on the level of legislative provisions with other 4 cities listed in the decrees (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Regional development poles and axes in Hungary  
Resource: own editing figure based on OTK (2005) p. 39

Consequently, Szeged, as a defined development pole, with some other preferential cities together plays an accentuated role in the new spatial policy of Hungary. From the point of view of our research it also has to be emphasized, that both OTK and OFK highlight to increase the capacity for specialized research and development of the departments that are competent to instigate defined and significant development [7]. The core competence of the development pole program in Szeged is the biotechnology.

Szeged city. In the next few chapters we will enhance the most important milestones from the history of the Municipality of Szeged, than some of its relationships will be surveyed with the most important institution of the development pole competence, the University of Szeged.

Based on this, in the following part of this paper we will concentrate on

## 6. CHANGE OF THE REGIME AND THE EVOLUTION OF SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT'S LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENTAL LEGAL BACKGROUND

The change of the regime challenged people not only on a national but also on a local level: in Szeged, just like in all other towns of the country, the first general municipal elections were held in autumn 1990 as a significant step to developing democracy. It put an end to the council system and new type of local self-governments replaced them, which, contrary to common councils, could be founded in each settlement.

The political necessity of founding local self-governments, which have their own rights, wealth and income sources, met the national and international economic and professional efforts started in this issue several years before. The new legislation threw the whole council system out, building on municipal traditions and historical values instead. Dr. Balázs Horváth, the Home Secretary of the Antal-government initiated that the Act of 1990 LXV. should include those basic requirements that the 1985 municipal Charta of the Council of Europe contains, and that József Eötvös, the Cult and Educational Minister of the revolutionary government of 1848-49 drew up as follows [1]:

„ We demand the personal independence to be maintained;  
we demand the decisions that are of interest only for certain segments of citizens,  
for example a town or the inhabitants of a county,  
to be made only by those whom these issues concern!” [12]

The major basic requirement and the quintessence of the new local self-governments system is municipal independence, changing the local self-governments into owners and economic organizations, which could proceed to settlement development based on local interests.

## 7. THE ECONOMIC GROUNDS OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENTS' DEVELOPMENT SOURCES IN THE 1990's

The economic background of local self-governments that became legitimate by the democratic elections radically changed compared to the council system. At the change of the regime, the Act of 1990 LXV. significantly changed the conditions of settlement management and placed it on a new

basis. From this point, local self-governments had their own properties, and could manage their own budgetary incomes and expenses independently. In addition, they could alienate the items that had been taken away from the state property and had been given to the municipalities (such as roads, institutions, buildings, barracks etc). It was a milestone for settlement development because settlements suffering from financial sources could use their properties as collateral when asking for development aids or applying for tenders, or they could even sell, privatize these properties. Possessing own financial resources, local self-governments were able to decide on their own settlement's actuation and the direction of their development quite independently.

But this kind of independence did not always mean complete independence in terms of development tasks in the first half of the 1990s. The reason for this is that the municipalities' financial operation and their use of sources is strongly controlled: firstly because the budget of local self-governments is part of the public finance, they get most of their financial fund from the state<sup>3</sup>; secondly because in case of other supports financed by the public finance, the state determines the conditions how these supports can be used, for example earmarked subsidies and allocations<sup>4</sup> based only on national sources, that were significant in this period and that realized several important investments in Szeged in the last few years.

### **8. THE NEW FINANCIAL SOURCES OF THE CHANGE OF THE REGIME: PRIVATIZATION INCOMES, EARMARKED SUBSIDIES, REAL ESTATE BARTERS**

In the years following the change of the regime, Szeged couldn't see bigger developments due to a lack of sources. Similarly to other local self-governments the now owner Municipality of Szeged, the county town of Csongrád County, could experience not only the bright side of wealth growth, but also took on a lot of charges after its own ownership developed. Firstly the raising of municipal institutions' costs was almost an impossible task for the local for the local authorities. Secondly, the only significant source of income, privatization, which started due to the possibility to alienate the local self-government's properties, meant not only income but also expenses. These properties were often rather devastated buildings and building sites without public utilities, which had to be upgraded before sale. In most cases it meant restoring building and providing building sites with public utilities.

But in terms of town development and town rehabilitation, the undoubted merit of privatization is that the incomes of selling those properties that had been given by the state meant almost the only sources that could finance more significant projects in the beginning of the 1990s. Due to such incomes several buildings' reconstruction was started in the town (e.g. the restoration of Dóm square).

In the following years the local self-governments' independence in decision-making was damaged by the lack of other developments sources independent of the budget. Due to the Act 1990. LXV. local self-governments could manage local developments in their own jurisdiction, but without proper financial background they could implement only the developments which enjoyed central state support. This statement is confirmed by how the incomes of the privatization of municipal properties (building sites, buildings, etc.) were used, as according to central legislation these incomes could be used only to restore buildings (mainly residential properties), which were almost the only reliable financial background for building restorations besides earmarked subsidies and allocations in the beginning of the 1990s [11]. It includes the restoration of Szeged's historical centre, which, after the small renovations of the 1980s, appeared only point wise in the beginning of the 1990s, and was limited to certain institutional and residential buildings. From the end of the decade bigger and bigger projects were started with conscious town rehabilitation planning, such as the one billion-forint restoration of Kárász street – Klauzál square, the restoration of so-called 2<sup>nd</sup> block within Kárász, Somogyi, Kelemen and Kölcsey streets, and the 800 million-forint rebuilding of the dual roundabout at Dugonics square and the transformation of Tisza Lajos boulevard, which were remarkable to improve the city centre's traffic conditions.

For the sake of using the available sources independently, the local self-government has often tried to find other ways of utilizing its properties to gain alternative economic benefits. After the change of the regime the acquired buildings were taken into account not only as properties that could be sold, but they also gave the possibility for different organizations to join economically. The "Universitas property barter programme" that was started in the middle of the 1990s together by the local self-government and the university as their first development programme in the middle of the 1990s serves as a good example for that. It meant that the university, which covers the whole of the

<sup>3</sup> The bigger part of the incomes of the local self governments consist of state assigned taxes, normative contributions of the state budget, local taxes, incomings of its own economic activities and fees [11].

<sup>4</sup> According to the Act 1992. évi LXXXIX. the Hungarian Parliament supports some of law defined local investments in order to stabilize the actions of the local self-governments. If a local self-governments fits to the state specialized criteria system it gets the earmarked subsidies automatically. Beyond this adequate earmarked allocations were available just in competition: in order to get state subsidies local governments have to create competitive project ideas for a ranking list.

city's area, and the municipality, swaps properties on the grounds of mutual benefits with the approbation of Szeged's General Assembly. József Attila University and Juhász Gyula Teacher Training College, the legal predecessors of Szeged University possessed a notable number of properties [18].

### **9. SOURCES APPEARING WITH THE PRE-ACCESSION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION (Phare, ISPA)**

The city of Szeged started to work out investment concepts based on new sources in the second half of the 1990s. The reason for this was that the basis of Pre-accession to the European Union became available such as PHARE, ISPA and SAPARD. From these, mainly the pre-accession programmes of PHARE and ISPA were significant from the point of settlement development. Since these programmes – mainly ISPA – supported mostly cohesive investments, the main direction of developments was also limited to remedial projects.

Due to the shift in the direction of the targets of PHARE programmes in 1997, the programme's funds could also be used directly for institutional developments and supporting investment [2]. In autumn 2003, approaching the deadline of using the pre-accession's funds, an application was handed in to restore a square that belonged to the historical part of the city centre of Szeged. Competitive factors started to arise as part of the project as the application included not only rehabilitation, but also creation of workplaces. The reason for this was the establishment of a biomonitoring system at the square, that monitors the pollution level of the air, and to operate this system, experts had to be trained and employed, and other new employees were also hired through cooperation with civil services and the employment centre, who had to look after the renovated park. Thus the idea of partnership, that is a keystone of the grants of the European Union, concretely appears in this 1.1 billion-forint project.

Another important investment of Szeged, which aimed to establish the city's total sewerage system, also got started in this period. Hungary's biggest investment of this kind was implemented from a total gross budget of more than 23 billion forints, using sources from Brussels, ISPA funds, and it meant that 253 kilometres of drainage was built altogether in the city and in the neighbouring villages that joined to the programme.

The main aim of ISPA was to prepare the counties awaiting the accession to welcome the Cohesive Fund's supports, and to solve the concrete problems of traffic and environmental infrastructure, that were hindering the accession. So the supporting programme had remedial aims firstly, and not to improve economic competitiveness. We mustn't forget though, that as an indirect effect of this investment, the number of people employed in local construction increased significantly – even if temporarily -, because 80% of the contractors working on this project were local entrepreneurs, this way local employers and employees could also benefit from the rehabilitation, and it also enlarged the budget of the municipality because of the entrepreneurs' local taxes (mainly trade and communal taxes). Besides the restored roads and completed drainage system, a further benefit of the project was the strengthened local entrepreneurs, who could use this work as a reference and who, this way could apply for similar projects in other parts of the country with great chances.

### **10. INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT SOURCES BETWEEN 2004 AND 2006**

With Hungary's accession to the European Union on 1<sup>st</sup> may 2004, unprecedented financial sources became available for national and local developments. Between 2004 and 2006 675 billion forints were available for certain development priorities in the frame of the National Development Concept (NTF). According to the basic aims<sup>5</sup> drawn up in the NTF, there were calls for tenders in five operational programmes (OP): Economic Competitiveness OP, Environment and Infrastructure OP, Agricultural and Rural Development OP, Human Resource Development OP, and Regional OP. From these Operational Programmes mostly GVOP, KIOP, and ROP provided possibility to implement bigger investments. The support rates were around 50-80%, but in many cases raising the 10-15% own source was also a difficulty. Despite the extended funds, this problem could have discouraged a lot of local self-governments from potential development possibilities, but the Hungarian government established a tender possibility based only on national sources to help the local self-governments. The ministry of Home Affairs has called a tender every year since 2004 "to support local self-governments' own sources for the development tenders of the European Union" and it has supported a lot of local self-governments' development ideas, that gave fund for the own source of a successful application for an operative programme<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> The National development Plan (2004-2006) drafts three general goals (competitive economy, more effective human resource and well-balanced spatial development) in order to improve the living standard in Hungary [5].

<sup>6</sup> In the year 2005 a municipality managed project with the name of „Integrated Development of the E-government in Szeged” was granted by the EU. The total project budget was 670 million HUF (appr. 2,3 million EUR). Beyond the 540 million HUF EU grant the municipality got other 78 million HUF as an own source subsidy from the Hungarian Government [19].



In 2005 the Association of National Municipalities' Union's standpoint on the T/17700. bill of the 2006 Budget of the Hungarian government also drew attention to the problems of local self – governments' development sources. According to this bill, the extensive reform of local self-governments, that could make the operation of each settlement economical [14], does not come true again in 2006. According to the starting point and the accepted bill, which was mainly unchanged compared to the original one, there wasn't a change in the duties and jurisdiction, the conditions of management regulations remained basically unchanged, the financial conditions were damaged<sup>7</sup>, so for the next budgetary period of the European Union between 2007 and 2013, the ability to finance bigger municipal investments remained a key question of development policy.

### 11. NEW DIMENSION: THE DEVELOPMENT PERIOD OF 2007 -2013

Certain chapters of the presently effective national development document, New National Development plan (hereafter UMFT) enhanced the development possibilities of local self-governments. The 675 billion-forint fund available in the frame of NTF got ten times more in the period of 2007-2013 and it provides a possibility for more specific aims (Schedule 1.).

Schedule 1. Operational Programmes of the New National Development Plan (UMFT)

Priorities	Operational Programmes	Financial Sources (billion HUF)
Development of Economy	Economic Development OP (GOP)	690,0
Development of traffic and transport	Traffic and Transport OP (KÖZOP)	1703,2
Renewing the Society	Social reform OP (TÁMOP)	966,0
Environmental and energetical development	Social infrastructure OP (TIOP)	538,9
	Environment and Energy (KEOP)	1140,0
	<u>OPs of the 7 regions of Hungary:</u>	
Spatial Development	Nyugat-dunántúli OP, Közép-dunántúli OP	
	Dél-dunántúli OP, Dél-alföldi OP	
	Észak-alföldi OP, Észak-magyarországi OP	1609,4
	Közép-magyarországi OP	
State modernization	State reform OP	140,7
	Electronic government OP (ÁROP)	
ÚMFT (communication and coordination)	Executive OP (VOP)	87,2
<b>TOTAL (billion HUF)</b>		<b>6875,4</b>

Resource: own editing based on UMFT (2007, page 9.)

Schedule 2. Some high project of the Szeged competitive pole<sup>8</sup>

Operational Programme	Project	Project leader	Total Budget (Billion HUF)	Grants (Billion HUF)
TIOP 2.2.7	Infrastructural development in the Heathcare competitive poles (building a new clinic centre next to the river bank of the Tisza)	University of Szeged	12,366	Data no aviable
GOP 1.1.2	Development and strengthen of the Research & Development centres: DEAK – Research and Development	DEAK Cooperational Development Shareholders company	2	0,99992
TIOP 3.1.1 TIOP 3.1.1 - TISZK	Infrastructural development of the TISZK organization (human resource development)	Consortium with the Municipality	0,992	0,892
KÖZOP -2008- 5.2	Development of the Eletric Public Transport system in Szeged (reconstruction of the old lines, building a new tramline, procurment of new vehicles)	Municipality Of Szeged	29	25
DAOP 5.1.2/C	City rehabilitation ( rehabilitation of main streets and the old Mars square)	Municipality Of Szeged	3,3	2,1
TIOP 1.3.3./08/1	„Agóra Pole” cities: development of the innovative and cultural infrastructures of cities	Municipality Of Szeged	1,9	1,71

Resource: SZMJVÖ (2009)

According to the Decree 96/2005 (XII. 25) of the Hungarian Parliament on the National Development Concept and the Decree 97/2005 (XII. 25) of the Hungarian Parliament on the National Spatial Development Concept defined Szeged as a development pole also on the level of legislative provisions with other 4 cities listed in the decrees. The long term aims of UMTF is enlarging employment and ensuring permanent growth. As for the latter one, according to the UMFT Integrated

<sup>7</sup> According to the Act of the annual Hungarian Budget in 2005 the local self-governments got 1349,8 billion HUF (appr. 4,49 billion EUR) as state financial source which was half billion HUF less than in the previous year [13].

<sup>8</sup> Szeged, the county town of Csongrád county – as well as Győr, Pécs, Debrecen, Miskolc, Veszprém-Székesfehérvár got Development Pole function according to the 2230/2005. (X.26.) government order and they got 100 million forints fund to work out their Development Pole Programme. The pole programme is worked out with scientists, research and engineering experts in module system, similarly to research-engineering development programmes.

Settlement Development Strategy, the support for the economic growth of the settlements that are development centres predominates mostly in polycentric, cooperative settlement network system [8]. To ensure a long term, balanced spatial development, there is a need to compensate the capital's economic dominance and to change the monocentric structure of the country, which they want to establish with functionally assigned settlements and emphasized developments based on technological innovation. This idea was rather weakened later, in the phase of planning and social discussions, but because of the central role of 5 "pole cities" the possibility of some key investments (based mainly on equity) didn't disappear. As a matter of fact, cities that are assigned as competitive poles do play a key role in determining their area's competitiveness with their innovation potential.

Although UMFT also underlines the importance of settlements and the settlement system from the point of competitiveness in this case, it is probable that these settlements have also come to the front in case of other kinds of project concepts' central and EU funds – usually developing basic settlement functions (Schedule 2.).

## 12. SUMMARY

The reform of the institutional system in the Hungarian spatial development takes place very slowly. The institutional system set up for the access was not consequently built on institutions of regional development, which disappointed the regions [22]. The effective establishment of the seven NUTS-2 regions has not been achieved yet, though some encouraging efforts happened. The 6. § of the act of 1999. XCII. on the modification of the act 1996. XXI. ordered to set up regional development councils, hereby the regional framework has been defined by legal means. Some competences and tasks have been delegated to regional level, but the regions possess neither elected representatives nor own financial resources, although those later two are very important from the point of view the European Unions definition on regions.

The correct using of some core principles (decentralization, subsidiarity, partnership) requires to rethink decision competencies, to decentralize the power, to strengthen the autonomy of the local communities [16]. The institutional framework of the spatial policy in Hungary is strongly attached to the public administration, especially to the counties. Economic development is unfortunately only second priority in the distribution of financial resources, entrepreneurs are not able to enforce their interests. The counties hesitate to be partners of each other, although an efficient spatial policy requires a successful concentration of forces on each territorial level.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ETS 1985: *European Charter of Local Self-Government*, European treaty series No 122. Strasbourg, 1985.
- [2] Flamm Benedek L.: *Kulcs a sikeres Eu-s pályázatokhoz. A tagállamok tapasztalatai és gyakorlata*. 2003.
- [3] Horváth Gy.: *Az Európai Unió strukturális és kohéziós politikájának hatása a magyar terület- és településpolitikára*. ÖSZT-ICMA-USAID, Budapest, 1998
- [4] Lados M.: A területi tervezés kihívásai a kilencvenes években Magyarországon: a területfejlesztési stratégiák kialakításától a programozásig és az értékelésig. *Tér és Társadalom*, 2, 25-69. o. 2001.
- [5] Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya: *Nemzeti Fejlesztési Terv (NFT)*. Budapest. 2004.
- [6] Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya: *Országos Területfejlesztési Konceptió (OTK)*. Budapest. 1998.
- [7] Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya: *Országos Területfejlesztési Konceptió (OTK)*. Budapest. 2005.
- [8] Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya: *Új Magyarország Fejlesztési Terv (UMFT)*. Budapest. 2007.
- [9] Magyar Országgyűlés: *1950. I. tv. (I. Tanács-törvény)*. Magyar Népköztársaság. Budapest. 1950.
- [10] Magyar Országgyűlés: *1954. X. tv. (II. Tanács-törvény)*. Magyar Népköztársaság. Budapest. 1954.
- [11] Magyar Országgyűlés: *Az 1990. LXV. Tv. a helyi önkormányzatokról. 80§ (2)*. Budapest. 1990.
- [12] Magyar Országgyűlés: *Dr. Horváth Balázs 68. számú parlamenti felszólalása (1990.07.02.)*. Országgyűlési napló. Budapest. 1990.
- [13] Magyar Országgyűlés: *Magyarország 2006. évi költségvetési törvénye*. Budapest. 2005.
- [14] OÖESZ: *Országos Önkormányzati Érdekképviseleti Szövetségek Állásfoglalása a Magyar Köztársaság 2006. évi költségvetéséről szóló T/17700. számú törvényjavaslatnak a helyi önkormányzatokra vonatkozó szabályairól (Tárgyalási szám: a T/17700) szóló anyaga*. Budapest. 2005.
- [15] Rechnitzer J.: *A helyi önkormányzatok felkészülése az Európai Unió regionális politikájának fogadására*. In: Csefkó F. (szerk.): *EU-integráció – önkormányzatok I*. ÖSZT-ICMA-USAID, Budapest. 1998.
- [16] Rechnitzer J.: *Területi Stratégiák*. Dialóg Campus, Budapest-Pécs. 1998.
- [17] Rechnitzer J. – Lados M.: *A területi stratégiáktól a monitoringig*. Dialóg Campus, Budapest-Pécs. 2004.
- [18] SZMJVÖ: *A 42/2000 (I.14.) Kgy. határozat a szegedi egyetem és az önkormányzat között létrejött Universitas ingatlancsere-program megállapodásról*. Szeged Megyei Jogú Város Közgyűlése. 2000.
- [19] Belügyminisztérium - SZMJVÖ: *„Szeged integrált e-kormányzat rendszerének fejlesztése” elnevezésű projekt támogatási szerződése (Azonosító: GVOP-4.3.1.-2004-06-0007/4.0)*. Magyar Köztársaság. 2005.
- [20] Salamin G. – Péti M. – Czira T.: *Paradigmaváltás küszöbén. Az új területfejlesztési koncepció és a területi tervezés*. *Területi Statisztika*, 5. sz. 423-439. o. 2005.
- [21] Sipos A.: *Reformok és reformtörekvések a fővárosban*. Budapesti Negyed, Budapest. 1993.
- [22] Szaló P.: *Az alap mellé épült ház. Falu, város, régió*, 1. sz. 7-11. o. 2006.