

Ciângă N. PhD, Surd V. PhD.*

Abstract

This paper has in view the approach of touristic arrangement – an important component of infrastructure, through which the turning in-to account of the natural and anthropic touristic potential is made and which influences the touristic flow. The stages of touristic arrangement of Romanian Carpathians are also analysed, with the differentiation of the arrangement's categories at the level of balneotouristic resorts, of towns and of rural settlements, but also at the level of mountainous massifs and valleys. There are also highlighted the types of touristic arrangements' locations, depending on their position towards the mountainous units and the reciprocal terms which derive at the level of the neighbourhoods, as well as the groups depending on the sites and the complexity of the arrangements (touristic objectives, touristic centres, resorts, complexes of resorts).

Key words: *touristic arrangement, touristic potential, touristic categories, resorts*

The Touristic Arrangement of the Romanian Carpathian Mountainous Space

1. The proper stages of development

1.1.

The Carpathian mountainous region became a touristic destination and a space for a specific touristic arrangement in the second part of the 19th century, when the first nuclei of some mountainous touristic resorts for pleasure are initiated and developed: Sinaia, Păltiniș, Semenic. It is a proof of Romania's receptivity to the touristic tendencies of Alpine Europe and it had a varied motivation, on a background of a general economic and social progress of the country.

The development of the first modern mountainous-climatic resort (in the current meaning of the term), Sinaia, which became the first town-resort of Romania, too, in 1885, was due to the choice of the afférent space near the Sinaia Monastery, at the foot of Bucegi, in order to become a summer royal residence. Concomitantly with the building of Peleş Castle, was also built what would become in a short while the topnotch, pleasure and climatic resort, with private residence of the magnates from that time (the landed, industrial and political aristocracy), with accommodation units of villa and hotel type, with organizing of the green places and of those meant for pleasure (the casino – a copy at a smaller scale of the one from Monte Carlo). This favourable juncture was supported by other factors, too, of an objective nature: Bucegi Massif and Prahova Valley, with a great landscape impact, positioned at the nearest distance of the capital: giving into use of the railway between Ploiești-Brașov in 1979 (constructed on sectors beginning with 1876), paving the transcarpathian road Ploiești-Brașov, after 1870 above the Predeal mountain pass, opened to the direct access even from the period 1821-1950.

The development of industry in Bușteni and Azuga, on the royal domain (processing the wood, the paper industry, glassware, food industry) gave an impulse to the development of the settlements situated on Prahova Valley. This led to the achievement of touristic arrangement nuclei in these localities, but especially at the beginning of the last century at Predeal, situated in a favourable position towards Brașov, too, with touristic mountainous traditions of the Transylvanian Saxon origin. This will become in time the "rival" resort to Sinaia.

In all this lapse of time, the touristic arrangements from the analysed geographical space advanced in height in Bucegi, by the making of the access paths, by building the

first chalets-shelters from Omu and Peștera (in Ialomiței Basin), but especially through the building of the first Alpine road between Sinaia and Bucegi Plateau.

This effort, of a smaller scope and complexity, is materialized, too, in the Căndrel Mountains, with the incipient construction of Păltiniș resort (1 400 m) in 1895 and of the access from Sibiu-Rășinari and Semenic, with the implication of the towns from Banat, especially Timișoara.

An important role in impelling the mountainous tourism and arrangements from the Carpathian space was held by the touristic associations with headquarters in the towns, which will become the first issuing of touristic mountainous flows up to now: The Alpine Club of Banat-Caransebeș, The Transylvanian Carpathian Society (TCS) – Sibiu, The Society of Romanian Tourists – Bucharest; The Carpathian Society – Sinaia.

1.2.

In the inter-war period, the mountainous tourism with its specific arrangements is intensified and extended with differentiations upon the whole Carpathian area. A process of development is to be noticed, which, after the Great Union from 1918, has a unitary conceptual character. Concomitantly with the intensification and even with the modernization of the arrangements in Bucegi-Prahova-Brașov area, which will maintain the dominant position in the Romanian mountainous tourism till now, some directions are necessary to be taken: the development of some new mountainous resorts: Lacu Roșu (1931), Colibița, Cheia, Timiș, Sâmbăta, Muntele Mic, Stâna de Vale; the building of chalets in the massifs with the main touristic attraction, but situated near some towns issuing of touristic flows: Bucegi, Postăvaru-Piatra Craiului, Făgăraș, Retezat, Apuseni, Ceahlău, Rarău, Rodna; achievement of the first transcarpathian road, crossing the Alpine zone – the royal road (Transalpina) over Parâng between Sebeș and Novaci; correlating the touristic-associative system through grouping of the arrangement effort, promoting-popularization within the Touring Romanian Club, but also the involvement of some outstanding personalities in the touristic arrangement of some mountainous massifs: M. Haret for Bucegi, Czarani I. for Apuseni; the setting up of the first State's Organism with a coordinating role in the promoting and in the touristic arrangement – National Office of Tourism (N.O.T.), 28 febr., 1936.

* Ciângă N. PhD, Surd V. PhD., Babeș-Bolyai University, Faculty of Geography, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

In conditions of fundamental change of ownership (property) after 1948 and of the organizing principles of economic activities, the mountainous tourism has undergone several important stages: a period of recoil and stagnation until the '50s; signs of noticeable improvement, due to the creation of Poiana Braşov resort in 1951 and afterwards; the massive implantation of accommodation units in the acknowledged mountainous resorts Sinaia, Predeal, Buşteni and especially in Poiana Braşov, which becomes the most modern resort in Romania; imposing the mountainous tourism on foot and for sight-seeing and the winter's sports, which brought about the achievement of the profile's infrastructure (transport facilities on cable and ski tracks), which advanced in height in the mountainous space. The complex of resorts Poiana Braşov, Sinaia, Buşteni, Predeal, Semenic is to be noticed from this point of view, but also the balneoclimatic resorts, which, as a result, become multifunctional (Vatra Dornei); coming into existence of new resorts, Mogoşa, Borşa, Durău, Izvorul Mureşului, Părâu Rece, Băișoara, but also of the endowments' nucleuses for future mountainous resorts and for winter sports (Piatra Fântânele – Tihuța, Harghita Băii, Bălea Lac, Poiana Mărului, Râncă, Straja, Arieşeni, Cărlibaba 2005); improvement of the road communication's infrastructure, through the modernizing of transcarpathian roads, rehabilitable in the next period, the achievement of some roads crossing mountainous regions of touristic interest and shortening the distance between mountainous touristic destinations (Transfăgărăşanul, the section of line between Chiril – Câmpulung Moldovenesc over Rarău, the mountainside Izvorul Muntelui – Durău in Ceahlău, Poiana-Braşov-Râşnov, Stâna de Vale – Beiuş Depression); endowment of some mountainous massifs (especially in the zones Bucegi – Prahova – Braşov) with transport facilities on cable (the first telechair from Carpathians was given into use in 1942, in Semenic Mountains, between the resort and Văliug); stimulating the touristic arrangements in the area of accumulation lakes, which led to the setting up of new resorts (Voineasa related to the hydropower arrangements on Lotru and Beliş-Fântânele on Someşu Cald, Colibiţa); neglect of the touristic arrangement of the mountain with chalets, which were maintained numerically at the level of those constructed mostly in the inter-war period – but which were continuously deteriorated in the decades that followed, some of them even disappearing, as a result of negligence (Bunloc, Bălea Lac, Suru, Gheţar, Scărişoara etc.).

2. Specific features of the mountainous arrangements in Carpathians

The resorts, which represent the dominant constitutive part of the touristic arrangements, are situated at heights exceeding 500 m, in some cases exceeding even 1 000 m

(Predeal – 1 030 m, Poiana Braşov – 1 100 m, Stâna de Vale – 1 100 m, Semenic – 1 300 m, Păltiniş – 1 450 m), potentially being able to reach 2 000 m in the future (Bălea Lake). This situation is in accordance with the much more reduced height of the Carpathians as compared with the Alps.

As a **location**, the breaking up of the relief has imposed the option for the resorts' development, as well as for their grouping or association. Also, the birth and the development in time (a century) is reflected also by their dispersion in the Carpathian space (with a single exception, their concentration in Bucegi area – Prahova-Braşov) and the character somehow aleatory of the genetic factors that were not framed in an overall strategy of arrangement.

The models of touristic arrangement from the Alpine European countries, in the inter-war period, which inspired the Romanian mountainous tourism in notion and style, were replaced subsequently by a voluntarist conception, marked by agglomeration in site, architectural monotony; building of the same categories of accommodation, which often are accurately reproduced in more resorts, without taking into account the differentiated exigencies of the customers; reduced degree of comfort (in general equivalent with that of two stars), few vested interests and not always efficiently used.

Those approximately 30 resorts and nucleuses of resorts hold different positions in the frame of mountainous space. These could be grouped in several specific categories (Berbecaru I., Bottez M., 1977):

a) Resorts developed on the **outskirts** of the mountainous unit form the most frequent category. Here there are comprised the arrangements achieved in all those three phases of touristic Carpathian constitution (at a certain scale, of course). These are related to the existence of a settlement, at which it is attached, or contributes to the development of some nucleuses of settlements, often propelled to reach the rank of a town.

There is to be noticed the existence of three situations which shade this specific type of location, namely: resorts situated on the outskirts of the mountainous units, in direct contact with it (Borşa-Maramureş); peripheral resorts, positioned at the exterior limit and where the touristic arrangements are not to be found in a direct contact with the mountain but have in view the access to an important road (Cheia-Prahova); resorts placed at the inner limit alongside a valley which separate two mountainous massifs of a great activity, which has in the same time complex and modern transcarpathian ways of communication, which permit an arrangement in cascade including in succession more resorts (Sinaia-Buşteni, Poiana Țapului – Predeal).

b) Resorts developed **in the inner part** of the mountainous unit, either alongside a valley (Durău-Neamţ) or related to the accumulation lakes, Voineasa on Lotru, Beliş-Fântânele on Someşul Cald, Poiana

Mărului on Bistra Mărului; on an altitude platform with a space relatively plane, favourable to the arrangements (Poiana Braşov). Some of these are situated in terminus positions (unidirectional access), from which a farther change of place with railway or road transport facilities is not possible (Păltiniş, Muntele Mic, Semenic). In this situation, other stations were found with a unique initial accessibility, but which were subsequently related through new roads (Poiana Braşov, Durău, Stâna de Vale etc.).

2.1. The specific features of mountainous-climatic resorts

2.1.1. The size and structure of the resorts' basis of accommodation

The size of the touristic basis of accommodation (amounting to the level of Carpathian region more than 34 000 places) at the level of mountainous resorts, oscillates from 100 – 200 places represented by singular hotel-motel units, the potential nucleuses of some future resorts (Piatra Fântânele, Bălea Lac, Bistra Mărului, Arieşeni, Băișoara) at 300 – 1000 places (Borşa – 320, Semenic – 410, Durău – 625), at values between 1000 – 2000 places (Buşteni – 1600, Valea Dornei – 1500); 2000-3000 places (Poiana Braşov – 2636, Buşteni – 2840) so that only Sinaia would concentrate more than 4 200 places (Gabriela Țigu, 2001).

The structure of the reception capacity, besides the volume, spotlights the emphasis laid on the offer more or less differentiated. In this respect, there are to be noticed the acknowledged resorts having in endowment the most diversified categories of units: six for Sinaia, four for Buşteni and Predeal, Stâna de Vale, three for Poiana Braşov.

The tendency of *hotel units* implantation with different categories of comfort (predominantly of 2-3 stars) stands out, having after 1965 a decisive contribution to the resorts' modernization. This is a specific feature for the most of the resorts, with a special emphasis on those developed in the last half of the century (Borşa 100 %, Poiana Braşov 90,4 %, Durău 80,5 %, Semenic 82 %), but also for the "classical" resorts on the Prahova Valley (Sinaia 57,7 %, Predeal 46,0 %, Buşteni 31,1 %). Another aspect is represented by the maintenance of another important weight, that of *villas*, within the framework of the site's ensemble, which acknowledged in the inter-war period, through this category, the resorts Predeal 43,9 %, Buşteni 36,2 %, Sinaia 31,7 % and which grant a distinct personality, perfectly integrated in the mountainous landscape.

At these two basic categories, the *chalets* are to be added, which through their position and emplacement belong to the mountainous space, but in many occasions to the resorts, too; *camping sites* and more recent categories, *lodgings*, *holiday villages*, *bungalows* and, not in the last turn, *the private secondary residences* which have been built in a rapid pace

after 1990, though not always with respect to the operative laws with norms stipulated in the General Town-planning (G.T.P.)

Another category belonging exclusively to the mountainous space is the *chalet* placed at the foot of the mountain, reaching to heights exceeding 2000 m in the Alpine floor, which served to the inclusion of the mountain in the "touristic area". Those almost 90 chalets summing up approximately 15 % (5 000 places) from the accommodation basis in Carpathians, with an average size of 56 places, are to be found in many mountainous massives, with a tendency of concentration in several massifs as Bucegi, Piatra Mare and Postăvaru, Făgăraș or Retezat.

From the point of view of *location* and of concrete *functions* (Ciangă N., 1997), there are distinguished several categories of chalets: chalets belonging functionally to the resorts: Șuhard-Lacu Roșu, Clăbucet, Trei Brazi, Cioplea – for Predeal, Piscu Căinelui, Brădet, Cota 1400 for Sinaia, Junilor – Poiana Brașov, which were involved through their proximity to the skiable areas; chalets placed at the foot of the mountain – points of penetration and beginning of stage in the mountainous sight-seeing trips, but also for practising of winter sports: Mogoșa Gutâi, Roșu-Ciucaș Mountain, Dâmbu Morii – Piatra Mare, Sâmbătă, Cumpăna-Făgăraș etc.; chalets situated on slopes, as intermediary points in the access towards the mountainous high zone, but also bases for practicing winter sports: Fântânele-Ceahlău, Diham, Gura Dihamului, Piatra Arsă, Bucegi, Poiana Secuilor-Postăvaru, Bălea Lac-Făgăraș, Pietrele, Râușor-Retezat etc.; chalets of summit placed in the Subalpine-Alpine zone: Lochia în Ceahlău, Postăvaru, Cristianu Mare-Postăvaru, Piatra Mare, Vârful cu Dor, Babele, Omu-Bucegi, etc.

Related to the *communication potential* for Carpathians, the chalets can be classified in: chalets for resorts with direct access through the railway and road network; accessible chalets through transport facilities on cable: Postăvaru, Cristianu Mare, Clăbucet Plecare, Cota 1400, Cota 2000, Vârful cu Dor; chalets with multiple access: road, transport facilities on cable and touristic paths: Bălea Lake; accessible chalets through touristic paths: Fântânele, Dochia-Ceahlău, Piatra Singuratecă – Hășmașu Mare, Harghi-

ta Mădăraș, Ciucaș, Mălăiești-Bucegi, Curmătura-Piatra Craiului, etc.; chalets with access through forestry roads and local or Alpine highways: Rărâu, Sfânta Ana – Ciomatu Mare, Miorița, Izvorul Dorului-Bucegi, Pietrele-Retezat etc.

3. The specific features of the arrangements within the built-up area of the resorts

The connection between the built-up area of climatic resorts with the proper mountainous space is achieved through the agency of some infrastructural components of a diverse nature and adopted to their functional profile. From this cause there is not a clear division within the built-up area of the zones with activities exclusively touristic.

First of all there are to be imposed the nucleuses comprising the accommodation endowments (especially hotels and villas), pleasure, green spaces, all projected and built even from the first phases of resorts' development. These made themselves up in polarizing factors that contributed to the development of the future settlements – towns. Subsequently, the residential zones were achieved and even the unpoluted industrial objectives, as it was the case of Predeal, in the first case, and Bușteni, Sinaia and Azuga in the second case.

There existed situations of the resorts development with an exclusive touristic function, without generating an independent settlement, but belonging administratively to a town (Poiana Brașov de Brașov, Lacu Roșu de Gheorgheni, Pârâu Rece de Predeal) or to a rural settlement (Durău, Băișoara, Stâna de Vale).

The most typical example is Poiana Brașov, where the definitization within the built-up area was made on the principle of sectorial "scanning" (starting from the north-eastern nucleus built up for the winter students' sport competition from 1951) being continued in east and south, in the immediate contact with Postăvaru Massif. The hearths of the towns- resorts are marked by a physiognomic and stylistic heterogeneousness, dominated dimensionally by the touristic hotel units and by other categories, as would be the villas, which grant an impression of distinction and conservatism. At these, varied facilities serving the touristic function could be

added. All these are integrated in green spaces arranged and organically related to the continuous forestry surfaces, which spotlight the qualities of ambient environment.

After physiognomy and depending on the length of the traversed stages in the touristic arrangement, through successive endowments, the resorts Predeal, Bușteni, Sinaia stand out. They are older than a century, with an architectural variety and an offer adopted to a diversified request.

In contrast, the resorts developed in the last five decades are characterized by a concentration of endowments, through the dominance of the hotel units with capacities of many hundreds of places for each of them, with an increased degree of convenience, with multiple possibilities of pleasure, but with a relatively monotonous physiognomy. Poiana Brașov is an example of this kind.

The small climatic mountainous resorts, stimulated in their development by special natural landscape components (Borșa at the foot of Rodna, Cheia, placed at the foot of Zăganului, Durău, in Ceahlău, Lacul Roșu, between the lake with the same name, Stâna de Vale, at the contact of Bihor with Vlădeasa, Voineasa or Beliș-Fântânele, related to the accumulation lakes, Soveja) can be considered arrangements with reduced dimensions, with possibilities of extension in the conditions of the increasing of the request for mountainous tourism on foot, for sight-seeing and for winter sports' practising.

Bibliography

1. Berbecaru, I., Botez, M. (1977): Teoria și practica amenajării turistice, Edit. Sport-Turism, București.
2. Ciangă, N. (1997): Turismul din Carpații orientali. Studiu de Geografie Umană, Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca.
3. Ciangă, N. (2001): România. Geografia Turismului (partea întâi), Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca.
4. Erdeli, G., Istrate, I. (1996): Amenajări turistice, Edit. Univ. din București.
5. Gunn, A. C. (1994): Tourism Planning. Basic. Concepts. Cases. Ed. Taylor & Francis.
6. Snak, O. (1976): Economia și organizarea turismului, Edit. Sport-Turism, București.