

**LANDSCAPE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH LEISURE IN CAMPINAS'S
MASTER PLANS****Received:** 3/12/2024**Approved:** 4/30/2024License: *Silvia Cristina Franco Amaral¹*State University of Campinas [Universidade Estadual de Campinas - Unicamp]
Campinas – SP – Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7708-7034>*Danilo Ciaco Nunes²*State University of Campinas [Universidade Estadual de Campinas - Unicamp]
Campinas – SP – Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3050-3955>*Paula Marques Braga³*State University of Campinas [Universidade Estadual de Campinas - Unicamp]
Campinas – SP – Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5315-1297>*Daniele Medeiros⁴*State University of Campinas [Universidade Estadual de Campinas - Unicamp]
Campinas – SP – Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5493-1618>

ABSTRACT: This study examines the operationalization of the landscape concept in the Master Plans of Campinas from 2006 to 2016. Methodologically, legislation was analyzed to identify key terms such as "recreation" and "landscape" and their interactions. Although the City Statute (2001) aims to organize the social functions of urban property, its generalist approach lacks specific guidelines for Master Plans, resulting in gaps in defining aspects like recreation and landscape. Historically, Campinas' Master Plans have given little attention to such topics; only from 2006 onward has there been a deeper incorporation, particularly in 2018, where recreation is recognized as a social right and landscape is addressed more comprehensively.

¹ Professor with a PhD from UNICAMP. Leader of the Study and Research Group on Public Policy and Leisure.

² PhD student at the School of Physical Education at UNICAMP. Member of the Study and Research Group on Public Policy and Leisure.

³ Master's degree in Urbanism (PUC-Campinas) and PhD in Architecture and Urbanism (IAU/USP). Postdoctoral degree through Dean's office for Culture and University Extension at USP and Postdoctoral student at UNICAMP. Member of the Study and Research Group on Public Policy and Leisure.

⁴ Postdoctoral student at UNICAMP. Study and Research Group on Public Policy and Leisure.

KEYWORDS: Landscape. Leisure. Master Plans. Campinas.

PAISAGEM E SUA RELAÇÃO COM O LAZER NOS PLANOS DIRETORES DE CAMPINAS

RESUMO: Este estudo analisa a operacionalização do conceito de paisagem nos Planos Diretores de Campinas de 2006 e 2016. Metodologicamente, foram analisadas as legislações em busca dos termos-chave "lazer" e "paisagem" e suas interações. Ainda que o Estatuto da Cidade (2001) vise ordenar as funções sociais da propriedade urbana, sua abordagem generalista carece de diretrizes específicas para os Planos Diretores, deixando lacunas na definição de aspectos como lazer e paisagem. Os Planos Diretores campineiros historicamente deram pouco espaço à tais temas; somente a partir de 2006 houve uma incorporação mais profunda desses aspectos, especialmente em 2018, onde o lazer passou a ser considerado como um direito social e a paisagem foi abordada de forma mais abrangente.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Paisagem. Lazer. Planos diretores. Campinas.

Introduction

The urban challenges faced by major Brazilian cities are deeply rooted, stemming from the significant urbanization process that began in the late 19th century in regions like Campinas/SP (RODRIGUES, 2012). While urbanization itself is as old as human society, cities like São Paulo and Campinas only began to address these issues in a structured way as they transitioned into modernity. At that time, concerns such as housing, demographics, urban dynamics, land use, and the pressures of overcrowding became priority issues for local authorities (BRESCIANI, 1985).

Although many urbanization plans were developed throughout the 20th century to address these challenges, it was only with the 1988 Federal Constitution that Brazil established a regulatory legislative framework for such issues (BRASIL, 1988). Chapter II, "Urban Policy," in Articles 182 and 183, sets the parameters for urban policies in cities, requiring municipal authorities to create Master Plans, which are considered essential tools for urban development and expansion. These plans aim to structure cities to uphold basic citizenship principles related to residents' well-being. The

implementation of this urban policy outlined in the Constitution emerged 13 years later, in 2001, with Law 10.257, known as the “City Statute.” This statute aims to “regulate the full development of the social functions of urban property,” prioritizing citizens’ safety, environmental quality, and comfort in the city (BRASIL, 2001).

Since the establishment of this regulatory framework in Brazilian legislation, the city of Campinas has approved two Master Plans—one in 2006 and another in 2018. The city has experienced different urban planning policies, and one of the most notable is the Urban Improvement Plan proposed in 1938 by the renowned urban engineer Francisco Prestes Maia. Historically, these plans aim to shape social perceptions around urban planning, fostering transformations that link proposed solutions to ideas of modernity and progress, creating a public vision of urban improvements and benefits (RODRIGUES, 2012). Situated within their historical context, these plans often reinforce prevailing perspectives of their time, although such viewpoints are always subject to debate and contention.

One of the key debates regarding Master Plans concerns the relationships among leisure, nature, urban space, and landscape. This article, therefore, aims to analyze how this relationship has been addressed in the Master Plans of Campinas, comparing the plans created in 2006 and 2018. Methodologically, this documentary research study examines both pieces of legislation for the key terms “leisure” and “landscape,” as well as any potential interactions between these terms. Once identified, the analysis delves into their incidence and the contexts in which each term appears. This approach allows for a historical and analytical comparison of the changes in landscape and leisure concepts found in the two plans.

We recognize that investigating urban legislation has both positive and negative aspects. On one hand, this article does not allow us to assess the practical applicability of these discursive relationships; on the other hand, it reveals the point at which urban planning ideas and practices gain institutionalized space within public administration (FELDMAN, 2001). From a conceptual standpoint, we analyze the term landscape based on its conceptualization within the humanities, encompassing debates on cultural identities, modes of use and appropriation, urban dynamics, and everyday life. Thus, it is a multifaceted concept, with different meanings and interpretations attributed by both the public and government authorities, highlighting territorial disputes and sense of belonging.

The article is divided into four parts. First, we present the analytical tools used in the study, based on a conceptualization of landscape shaped by different perspectives on urban space. Insights from architecture and urban planning, territorial studies, geography, leisure studies, and physical education contribute to forming this understanding. Next, through a documentary analysis of the City Statute, we examine its concepts of leisure, nature, and landscape. The third section provides a brief historical overview of Campinas' urban legislation and its relationship with leisure spaces and access to nature, leading up to the 2006 and 2018 plans. In the final section, we offer reflections on the progress of discussions on this topic and the limitations of urban legislation.

Landscape: Different Approaches to Territory and Leisure

Studies on territory often focus on defining boundaries, selecting areas for analysis, and identifying specific locations for intervention. While territorial action requires spatial delineation to establish actions, timelines, and budgets, this also raises several issues. Areas, whether inside or outside established boundaries, tend to operate in a fragmented manner, lacking connection, which leads to a disjointed understanding of the city on a broader scale. This questioning extends to other reflections, such as the distinction between nature and culture, the contrast between the natural and artificial environments of the city, directly impacting public policies across different sectors, with a particular emphasis on leisure.

The discomfort noted, particularly within the scope of Cultural Heritage, is driving a significant increase in research on landscape and the interactions that arise from it. We can take the landscape surrounding a baroque church in Ouro Preto as an example, with the mountains in the background in their natural state; it would be drastically altered if the hillside were urbanized. An urban park located on a former coffee plantation would also undergo significant transformations, depending on the presence or absence of the original animals and the decision to relocate or maintain local residents with their intact cultural and social traditions. Intervention in the territory changes the dynamic between nature and culture, which, in turn, alters the spatial perception and appearance of the urban landscape. Therefore, the reflection proposed in this study, based on the concerns raised in the humanities, is the impact of the relationship between landscape and leisure, landscape and culture, nature, and other forms of perception or appropriation of space in the public policies under analysis, in this case, the Master Plans.

The development of the concept of landscape has always been intertwined with human existence. Various scientific disciplines, as well as common sense, offer their own explanations of what landscape is. The concept varies depending on the discipline that develops it, but there are also common parameters maintained across definitions. According to Maximiliano (2004), the view of landscape was utilitarian until the 18th century, but with the works of Humboldt⁵, a new conceptualization began to take shape. The author outlines a chronology of the concept of landscape from the 19th century onward, synthesizing the different interpretations the term has taken over time:

Summarizing the concepts from various eras and fields of knowledge, there are key aspects that deserve mention when approaching landscape, either as a research subject or as a method of study. These include: the visual aspect; the complexity of interrelations between physical elements and their connections with cultural elements; the possibility of mapping the landscape, given that it occupies a physical space; the diversity of landscape scale—from the local to the planetary; the possibility of classifying landscapes into differentiated or homogeneous units; the possibility of classifying landscapes with an emphasis on a specific element of their composition—such as vegetation, climate, or culture; the dynamic nature of landscapes; and the potential for analysis through the elements, structure, and/or functioning of the landscape (MAXIMILIANO, 2004, p.90).

In geography, the concept of landscape is currently understood as the product of the interactions between natural and human elements in a given space:

These landscape elements are organized dynamically, over time and space. This results in formations and conditions that are also dynamic, differentiated or repeated, which allows for classification by grouping similar arrangements and separating them from the different ones. As a whole, a cohesive mosaic is formed. This process can be as detailed or broad as the observer's interest (MAXIMILIANO, 2004, p. 90).

Similarly, there has been a significant increase in the use of the term "Landscape" in the fields of Architecture and Urbanism, particularly when dealing with challenges related to the preservation of cultural heritage. Traditionally, this heritage was understood in a restricted sense, focusing only on constructed objects. However, the

⁵ Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich Alexander von Humboldt was a geographer, polymath, naturalist, explorer, and proponent of Romantic philosophy, known for developing new conceptions of landscape in his artistic works (VITTE, SILVEIRA, 2010).

importance of Landscape emerges with the expansion of the concept of identity and culture, encompassing both material and immaterial aspects to be preserved. This implies not only the preservation of specific elements but also the safeguarding of the entire urban landscape, regarded as a “cultural landscape.”⁶ In this context, the significance extends beyond the constructed elements, also including the actions and dynamics occurring within this environment, with leisure playing a significant role.

The urban landscape encompasses several cultural identities, forms of use and appropriation, urban dynamics, and the totality of everyday life. This reality is shaped by different meanings and interpretations assigned by the population, alongside the definitions set by public authorities, often resulting in territorial disputes and conflicts of belonging. It is important to note that while the landscape may reflect the image of a specific time, it is not static; on the contrary, it is constantly reshaped by this temporality, through the diverse uses that can be either encouraged or restricted by urban policies and their guidelines.

The interaction between territory and territoriality, material and immaterial, leads us to the expanded concept of Cultural Heritage, which goes beyond the traditional notion of Historical and Artistic Heritage. It is crucial to emphasize that this understanding now encompasses not only physical elements but also the dynamics that unfold within the territory. According to Arantes (2008), Cultural Heritage consists of a set of assets, which can be tangible or intangible, that play a role in shaping identities and carry distinct values and meanings based on the appropriation by different social groups. This delimits territories and characterizes social practices. It is important to note that Cultural Heritage is subject to changes over time, without necessarily implying the

⁶ In this article, cultural landscape is understood as a spatial ensemble composed of built material elements associated with specific morphologies and natural dynamics, forms that are linked to socially assigned contents and meanings. For more information, please visit <http://portal.iphan.gov.br>

loss of its identity, an aspect that is crucial in discussions about its preservation and safeguarding.

This also applies to the city, which is the focus of analysis in the Master Plans. In this context, Arantes (2008) uses the term Urban Environmental Heritage, which encompasses three aspects of urban reality: its condition as an artifact, as a field of social forces, and as an aggregation of symbolic representations. Here, the use of the term “environmental” refers to the inseparable relationship between the natural and the cultural.

The creation of entirely new spaces occurs through the selection, reduction, and recombination of cultural references, often located in neighborhoods or enclaves traditionally occupied by a specific ethnic group. These places are enriched by synthesized images of each group's history, reinterpreted from an official perspective. The result is a simplified view offered to both tourists and residents, providing a refined experience that replaces the city's unruly complexities with a celebration of the existing order. The production of these spaces aims to create an enhanced version of complex reality. (SÁNCHEZ, 2010).

Authors such as Garzedin (2011, p.174) suggest that Cultural Heritage, referring to both material and symbolic aspects, incorporates the concept of landscape, shaped by individual or group interpretation through a “[...] process that involves selection, memorization, and attribution of meanings, which does not occur in the same way for all people; it depends on several factors, such as cultural repertoire, frequency of visits, established bonds, life history, etc.” Even the UNESCO guidelines for recognizing a site as a World Heritage asset support such definitions, identifying

architectural ensembles or landscapes as significant stages in human history (SILVA, 2003).

However, it is not only the areas officially recognized as historical that should be considered when it comes to the landscape. On the contrary, all areas of the city possess cultural and identity values assigned by their inhabitants. Intervention actions, new public policies, and updates to Master Plans are elements that significantly impact these areas, sensibly altering their local dynamics. Understanding the significance and importance of the cultural aspects that characterize different areas of a city and the transformations in the urban landscape thus becomes an essential element in analyzing interventions made at various scales. This approach allows us to explore not only the concept of landscape as something unique to each locality but also the contradictory relationship between particular landscapes and homogenization, a result that plans and intervention strategies may lead to.

According to Almeida (2005), the initial landscape that characterizes a region⁷ is shaped by natural elements integrated in harmony with the built environment. The natural elements, constructed elements, and buildings, when observed together, relate to each other and to public spaces. This relationship is established through the uses practiced, the sounds produced, the vertical or horizontal landmarks set, or the perspectives provided by the ensemble.

Urban interventions, across different scales, and the formulation of policies for various purposes, often use the connection between Cultural Heritage and specific landscapes as a tool for differentiation and promotion. In this context, cultural capital is transformed into economic capital through processes of financialization and the commercialization of culture, which can oversimplify the diverse elements that define it

⁷ In the case of the investigation at hand, the author focused on Recife neighborhood.

and, in turn, disrupt the urban landscape. A study by Amaral (2018) explored this issue, focusing on the construction of Campinas' largest shopping mall in the early 2000s. The project led to gentrification in the surrounding area, erasing the previous natural landscape and displacing long-time residents due to the skyrocketing real estate values.

It is also possible to explore, in line with the relationships previously discussed, the process of monumentalization, which occurs when elements of the landscape are taken and transformed into fetishes. In other words, they are treated as "sacralized objects, endowed with intrinsic values, as if they were autonomous, immutable, and independent from the very environmental context in which they are situated." (COSTA, 2010, p. 43-44)

Similarly, we can observe, at least to some extent, the alteration of the previously established urban landscape due to the reduction or absence of traditional forms of appropriation and everyday use. Within this context, the landscape undergoes a metamorphosis, turning into an artificial setting, monitored and controlled for specific uses and predetermined times. This process tends to trivialize meanings that were once assigned, leading to a loss of authenticity and disconnection from the original daily practices.

When it comes to urban space, the proposal to improve the quality of the urban landscape through urban design and the existing structure, such as sidewalk enhancements, installation of urban furniture, and increased tree planting, aims to ensure environmental quality and provide comfort to users. However, when examining the implications of these policies, it becomes apparent what the true intentions behind them may be. There is a risk that the city will be shaped by delineated spaces, resulting in a specific urban landscape that may conflict with its surroundings. The latter could be

relegated to a residual area, characterized by reduced urban dynamics, poorly maintained buildings, and a lack of public amenities. The uniqueness of the urban landscape, which architecture seeks to preserve, is impoverished and reconfigured when deprived of the dynamics, experiences, and forms of appropriation that normally give these spaces their meaning. In this scenario, the unique is replaced by the banal, marking fragmented spaces with specific functional assignments, social relationships without connections, and cultural elements transformed into objects for immediate consumption, losing their fundamental meaning associated with identity and the memory of the place.

Throughout history, various authors have opposed the capitalist and industrial appropriation of the city, particularly concerning its outcomes linked to gentrification and banalization. Authors such as Lefebvre (2001), Jacobs (2011), Harvey (2014) advocate, in contrast, for the humanization of urban space:

The right to the city manifests as a superior form of rights: the right to freedom, to individualization within socialization, to habitat, and to dwelling. The right *to work* (to participate) and the right *to appropriation* (distinct from the right to property) are implicit in the right to the city (LEFEBVRE, 2001, p. 134).

The idea of the right to the city, for Harvey (2014, p. 15), “does not fundamentally arise from different intellectual whims and fashions [...]. It basically arises from the streets, from the neighborhoods, as a cry for help and support from oppressed people in times of despair.” Finally, Jacobs, when discussing urban planning and criticizing the orthodox way in which urban planners approach it, argues that although many people are concerned with this issue, they generally do not pay attention to or do not want to pay attention to its humanized functioning:

On the contrary, they have worked very hard to learn what the saints and sages of orthodox modern urbanism said about how cities *should* function and what *should* be good for the people and businesses within them. They

cling to this with such devotion that, when a contradictory reality arises, threatening to destroy the hard-earned knowledge, they set reality aside (JACOBS, 2011, p. 6).

In short, the concept of landscape can be understood in different ways: as an occasional approach used to beautify a place, as a complex phenomenon resulting from the interaction between natural elements and human relationships, shaped by disputes, conflicts, identities, and belonging; or as a means of monumentalization aimed at enhancing the financialization of space. Thus, after exploring and presenting different perspectives on the concept of landscape and its impact on the views and decisions of urban planners, either mitigating or intensifying disputes related to public space usage, the next section aims to analyze the meanings and significance attributed to landscape and leisure in the City Statute.

The City Statute and the Operationalization of the Terms “Leisure” and “Landscape”

Since the 1988 Federal Constitution, a specific area of urban law and the regulation of city uses was established in Brazil. What was missing, however, was the publication of a regulatory framework—outlined in the Constitution itself—that would implement certain standards and guidelines, as well as provide tools for their proper implementation. This led to the creation of the City Statute, which faced the challenge of consolidating constitutional guidelines, coordinating entities, laws, and instruments, and systematically operationalizing its implementation. (ROLNIK, 2001; BASSUL, 2002; SUNDFELD, 2014). The City Statute, therefore, serves as an urban policy tool that, at the federal level, establishes guidelines to be adapted to each specific reality within municipal Master Plans. An analysis of this legislation reveals that the statute is

designed to highlight key aspects that each city must address, defining the directives to be followed in order to improve the quality of life for the population (BASSUL, 2002).

Though the Statute has been internationally recognized as a pioneering effort in crafting inclusive and social policies for urban reform, significant gaps can be seen between its formal enactment and its actual implementation, particularly in the political and technical aspects of public policy execution, its social reach, and the unresolved challenges of urban and housing issues (CARVALHO, 2001; ROLNIK, 2012). Additionally, new issues have emerged concerning the urban environment and housing, placing strain on the policies developed in the Master Plans based on this regulatory framework. Among these emerging issues, landscape and leisure stand out as prominent areas of concern.

According to Amaral (2018), the City Statute establishes the right to sustainable cities as its core directive, which includes the right to leisure as one of the topics covered. Additionally, by outlining the foundations of urban policy, the document also serves as a vital tool for managing the relationship between nature, urban spaces, and sustainability. Versiani *et al.* (2019) note that leisure is explicitly mentioned twice in the Statute: first as a guaranteed social right, contributing to the improvement of the population's quality of life, and second as an activity that requires public urban spaces for its enjoyment. Building on this premise, and aiming to link it with Campinas' Master Plans, the study specifically examines how the terms "landscape" and "leisure" are addressed within this legislation.

The term "landscape" is mentioned only once in the City Statute, specifically in section XII, which addresses the neighborhood impact study. This section requires that any new project or intervention in the existing urban fabric assess both the positive

and negative impacts on the urban landscape, as well as on natural and cultural heritage. There is a noticeable concern here with what Arantes (2008) conceptualizes as cultural and natural heritage. However, it can be inferred that the Statute also seems to allow for a process of transformation, where unique elements of heritage and landscape may be converted into features for differentiation and promotion, subjecting urban spaces to processes of financialization and commodification of aspects like leisure culture and other class-based policies.

The term “leisure,” in contrast, appears seven times throughout the document. Initially, it is referenced as a social right. Then, as a way to ensure this right, the document promotes the creation of public leisure spaces and green areas, suggesting a connection between leisure and nature-based activities. This conceptualization aligns with the approach of the 1988 Constitution: it seems to recognize leisure as a right, but simultaneously frames it as a means to an end, treating it as an activity or a consumable good. On this conceptual ambiguity, which does more to obscure than clarify, Santos e Amaral (2010, p.8) elaborate:

The constitutional definition of leisure as a social right implies—or should imply—the State’s responsibility to guarantee this right for everyone. However, leisure is currently treated only as a government policy, and for this reason, it has not yet become fully established or legitimized as a social right in Brazil. This may also suggest the reverse perspective: leisure might not be a target of the Brazilian State’s actions precisely because it lacks legitimacy with the public and is not widely recognized as significant. This lack of establishment and legitimacy is largely due to the absence of a more precise definition of leisure as a social right in itself, rather than as part of other initiatives or as secondary to other needs. This phenomenon highlights the need to construct the political meanings and significance of leisure, as without these, leisure will continue to be treated as merely a matter of governmental policy, rather than a right guaranteed to all.

However, the approach to these themes and the generalist nature of the document are limited to pointing out needs to be addressed, lacking more specific guidelines on how to actually proceed. This suggestion follows the same ambiguity

found in the constitutional document, as previously mentioned, which opens space for planners to view leisure spaces not as places of belonging and cultural production, but as a marker of social class distinction. This becomes evident in the proliferation of gated communities across different cities in Brazil, which is also the case in Campinas. A quick drive around the city reveals signs advertising land sales: “Guarantee your private leisure.”

Therefore, it is up to the city authorities to decide how to handle these matters. However, in many instances, the alleged autonomy in handling these matters does not lead to a deep understanding of local conditions. Instead, it often results in a shallow approach, which undermines the connection between the Statute of the City, the Master Plan, and their effective implementation in the territory.

Urban Legislation in Campinas: Landscape, Leisure, and Nature

A Brief History of Urban Legislation in Campinas and its Relationship with Landscape and Leisure

Urbanism, as an autonomous discipline, has its roots in the late 19th century, formed by a set of theoretical and practical issues aimed at solving the problems caused by the rapid and disorganized expansion of industrial cities, especially in Western Europe (CALABI, 2012). According to Sennett (2018), since the 18th century, migratory movements of poorer populations seeking better living conditions between European cities have required a rethinking of the city, due to the poor working and housing conditions. These new demands gave rise to the need for a new professional, one who was less concerned with economics and more with public health, given the plagues and epidemics spreading across the cities. This is when the figure of the urban planner emerged, as well as the term “urbanism,” first presented by Spanish architect Ildefons

Cerdà in 1859. People were already living in cities, but understanding them and thinking about urban life and its implications was something new (SENNETT, 2018). The urban planner also became concerned with public health, in addition to doctors and engineers. This trio became responsible for improving the quality of life and sanitizing the city, opening up the possibility of appropriating the street, being outdoors, and providing new opportunities for socializing, culture, and leisure in everyday life.

In Brazil, the rapid growth of cities like São Paulo and Campinas led to these discussions becoming prominent, with the aim of organizing urban flow (BRESCIANI, 1985). In Campinas, the first regulations aimed at controlling the relationship between the population and space were the municipal codes, published in 1858, 1864, and 1880. These documents constituted legislation that governed life in the city, addressing various issues such as hygiene and both individual and collective behavior. According to Limeira e Miranda (2022), these codes were, in their time, expressions of the ideals of civility, urbanity, order, discipline, education, and modernity.

In Campinas, the idea of progress was also closely linked to health concerns. Yellow fever had significantly impacted the city at the end of the 19th century, making it clear that sanitation was essential for progress. Engineer Saturnino de Brito was responsible for implementing the first sanitation measures. The urban population grew again, and there was a growing demand for an urban plan to guide this expansion (BADARÓ, 1996).

The 1920s marked a significant period of change and new perspectives in the city's urban planning. It was during this time that the then-mayor Orosimbo Maia delivered a speech in the city council about the need to remodel the city, sparking intense public and political debate over the new urban guidelines (KROGH e SOUZA,

2019). In this urban and political context, engineer-architect Francisco Prestes Maia was hired in 1934 to create a remodeling plan for Campinas, resulting in one of the most important urban plans in the city's history.

In his analysis of the Prestes Maia Plan, Rodrigues (2012) argues that this document profoundly altered the urban aspects of Campinas, reinforcing a conception of the city and urban life that was aligned with an ideal of prominence attributed to Campinas at the time, rooted in ideas of rationality, progress, and modernity. Badaró (1996) notes that this plan viewed the city from a functional perspective, dividing it into four main priorities: housing, recreation, work, and circulation. Pizani (2012) and Ramos de Souza (2023) highlight that the initial focus on recreation addressed the need to create parks and other facilities related to sports and leisure activities, aiming to provide opportunities for active leisure for the population. During this period, spaces such as urban parks and playgrounds were created to support these goals.

According to Ramos de Souza (2023), the reforms proposed in this plan, especially those implemented in the 1950s, significantly altered the relationship with nature, the landscape, and its elements within the urban space, marginalizing parks and other natural areas in favor of the construction of buildings.

The obsolescence and outdated nature of the previous plan, combined with changes in the urban fabric of the city, created the need for a new Urban Plan. Thus, between 1969 and 1970, the Integrated Development Plan for the City of Campinas was presented by the then-mayor Orestes Quércia. This plan was an organizational document addressing urban functions such as housing, commerce, industry, and circulation, essentially aiming to optimize, according to the political vision of the time, land use in Campinas. According to Bessa, Kufel Júnior and Sá Porto (2001), this plan

was developed in a broader context of political and social restrictions, as well as concerning the industrialization movement in Brazil at the time. Therefore, its guidelines were centered on issues linked to developmentalism with a clear focus on industrial growth. The discussion of the landscape in the document reflects this perspective: green areas were seen as an “effective filter against the excessive intensification of nervous stimuli” (CAMPINAS, 1970, p. 81). The primary concern with the landscape was related to the increasing population density in the city, which would reduce the availability of open and public spaces for outdoor recreational activities.

The first plan developed after the 1988 Constitution, which established guidelines for the organization of municipal Master Plans, was created in 1991 during the administration of Jacó Bittar. According to Bessa, Kufel Júnior, and Sá Porto (2001), the characteristics of this plan were quite different from the previous one, particularly with regard to public participation, emphasis on citizenship issues, and the redistribution of benefits. In essence, the plan aimed to address the growing social crisis.

Although the plan approached the city differently from its predecessor, the concepts of landscape, leisure, and the use of green spaces did not undergo substantial changes. These elements were still viewed as “mitigators of the tensions accumulated in individuals due to the exhausting daily activities” (CAMPINAS, 1991, p. 138). A significant step forward in the discussion was the acknowledgment of the inadequacy of green spaces in Campinas relative to its population. The document highlighted the saturation of the few available green spaces, which were insufficient to meet the recreational needs of the population.

The 1996 Master Plan, developed during Magalhães Teixeira's administration, focused primarily on decentralized urban policies and local development plans, assigning the municipal government the role of a negotiating entity. Furthermore, the plan identified several urban issues that needed to be at the center of the debate, setting out an action plan that divided the city into macrozones (BESSA, KUFEL JÚNIOR and SÁ PORTO, 2001; SCHNEIDER, 2002). This division had an impact on the discussions surrounding landscape, leisure, and nature that had previously been part of Campinas' legislation. While in the 1991 plan these discussions were treated collectively, under a single item, they were now spread across the city's macroregions. This meant that the issues related to these themes were subdivided and addressed geographically in different areas of the city, aiming for a decentralization of the main leisure provisions discussed up to that point (CAMPINAS, 1996).

The brief historical context provided highlights both changes and continuities in the concepts of landscape, natural spaces, and leisure opportunities for the population. These concepts evolve and are linked to the urban ideas produced at each moment, as well as to the political and business interests involved in the creation of each document.

The guarantees related to the right to leisure established in the Federal Constitution (1988), which are formalized in the City Statute, are put into action in the production of the 2006 document, presented in the next section.

Landscape, Leisure, and Nature in the Master Plans of Campinas (2006 and 2016)

As previously discussed, the obsolescence of the Master Plans, both in terms of their concepts and applicability, creates the need for the reworking of other municipal regulations. In cities like Campinas, the City Statute had set the deadline of October 10, 2006, for all cities with more than 20,000 inhabitants to develop their master plan. Therefore, by the end of that same year, the local government presented the document, the first to be based on the new premises of the Statute.

One of the document's key guidelines is the participatory democratic management in the construction of the proposals within it, aligning with the Statute's provisions. Rodrigues (2008) analyzes that the document preserves the political agenda of the previous plan, with an emphasis on sectoral policies such as housing, transportation, and urban infrastructure. However, its collective agreement aspects are limited by the deepening of partnerships with private capital. Rodrigues (2012) points out that it is during the development of this plan that the actions of real estate speculators in the city begin to trigger a hegemonic appropriation of space, highlighting the local power network, with a focus on the elites' sphere of influence and the commodification of urban space.

In this context, the 2006 Master Plan (CAMPINAS, 2006) clearly lacks references to the term landscape in the introductory part of the legislation, which establishes the objectives and guidelines of the city's regulatory framework. The term becomes more prominent in the urban structuring of the specific guidelines for Macrozone 2 (art. 26, Section VII), an Environmental Control Area (*Área de Controle Ambiental*, ACAM) in the northern/northeastern portion of the city, in the Atibaia River basin, which connects with Macrozones 3 and 8, regions undergoing accelerated

urbanization. This area stretches from the northern region of Barão Geraldo to the municipal boundary with Jaguariúna, characterized by small urban sections within large developments, still surrounded by substantial rural areas. According to a guiding document for the plan's development process, this control is described as "an important strategy for preserving the environmental quality of the cities, as it also contains environmental, landscape, and historical attributes that must be preserved" (CAMPINAS, 2006, p. 189).

Meanwhile, leisure is addressed in three distinct ways. The first is in the general guidelines, emphasizing the promotion of the population's quality of life, which includes improved housing, transportation, security, education, culture, health, infrastructure, as well as access to public services, green areas, and qualified leisure spaces (art. 2, Section II). A second perspective is economic, within the framework of economic development, where "culture, leisure, and sports are highlighted through the encouragement of cultural production and dissemination, public parks, and sports excellence centers (art. 6, Section VI)." The third perspective integrates leisure with environmental education, sports, and tourism, "drivers of the requalification and reurbanization of densely occupied areas" (art. 41). In this context, leisure is framed within the legislation as a social right, in line with article 6 of the Federal Constitution of 1988, and as a tool for urban policy. The urban instruments reflect these ideas, as seen in the urban operations that "prioritize a variety of needs, including the creation of public leisure spaces and green areas (art. 79º, Section VI)."

This is related to the concept of landscape, as the Environmental Policies, in addition to defining environmental preservation (Art. 36), incorporate management plans for land use and other social rights in the city. The instruments of these policies,

such as the Green Corridors (Art. 37) and Linear Parks, outline actions aimed at increasing the number of green spaces in the city and restoring the environment, making them compatible with recreational and leisure activities. Furthermore, these instruments aim to aid in the revitalization and redevelopment of highly populated areas, while also promoting environmental education, sports, leisure, and tourism (Arts. 38, 40, 41). Their goal is to preserve green spaces, mitigate microclimates, generate income, and enhance the urban landscape. These policies create a significant intersection between leisure, landscape, and nature.

Finally, when it comes to changes in land use, the plan appears to ensure regulation that prevents significant impacts on the landscape and guarantees that resources are returned to society for collective and public use through the Onerous Grants⁸: “The granting of this instrument may be denied if it is determined that the impact exceeds what the infrastructure can support or if there is a risk of compromising the urban landscape.” (Art. 70, Section I, § 1).

The plan notably approaches the concept of landscape through the lens of a more human-centered city, viewing the dynamics of each area as essential to interventions. This approach aims to preserve the unique landscape characteristics of each locality, with a strong emphasis on nature conservation and ensuring the right to leisure.

The 2018 Master Plan was developed in compliance with another requirement from the City Statute, mandating that all cities within metropolitan regions update their Master Plans every ten years. According to guidelines from Campinas Municipal Government, the plan was developed in three distinct phases: preparation, implementation, and conclusion. Although completed two years behind schedule, the

⁸ “Onerous Grant of the Right to Build” is a permission granted through payment to exercise the right to build. It is a legal instrument used by municipal administrations for land management and revenue collection to invest in urban development.

plan was finally delivered at the end of 2018, with a focus on involving different sectors of society in its drafting. While long-term analyses of its impact are still inconclusive, studies by Spilleir, Longo, and Falsarella (2020) highlight the public administration's challenges in ensuring urban development that aligns harmoniously with the environment and point to gaps in proposals to address the distortions caused by urban gentrification.

In our analysis, we find that the observations by the aforementioned authors are valid, as the 2018 Master Plan (CAMPINAS, 2018), does not introduce any new perspectives regarding the inclusion of landscape considerations in its objectives and guidelines. However, the document does present three perspectives on the subject.

The first of these mirrors prior approaches within the Territory Structuring Policies, specifically in terms of guidelines for density, subdivision, land use and occupation, as a guideline to "limit the maximum area for gated subdivisions and ensure compliance with parameters for integration with the urban fabric and landscape (Art. 20, Section XI)." Unlike the 2006 plan, however, this directive expands its scope to serve as a general guideline for the entire city, focusing less on the term's conceptual meaning and more on its application.

The second perspective also aligns with the 2006 plan, focusing on municipal environmental policy. However, it goes beyond the Green Corridor policy, becoming part of the "general guidelines for the identification and preservation of existing forested areas and significant landscapes in the city" (Art. 37, Section XV), along with:

the increase and maintenance of tree planting along public streets, squares, urban parks, and woodlands to promote thermal and acoustic comfort, improve air quality, enhance the urban landscape, and improve the population's quality of life and well-being (CAMPINAS, 2018, Art. 37, Section XVI).

If in the previous item we noted an expansion of green space use, no longer limited to Green Corridors or Linear Parks, aimed at restoring existing spaces, we also see a guideline that links green areas in new subdivisions to their potential for enhancing property values. This provision seeks to ensure green spaces not only for environmental, scenic, and social reasons but also to add value to new developments:

parameters for the quality of green areas and leisure systems in new land subdivisions, to enhance these spaces, improve the quality of the development and its surroundings, and fulfill their intended functions (CAMPINAS, 2018, Art. 37, Section IV).

Similarly to how we observe continuities and shifts in landscape perspectives, leisure also shows its own correlations. The topic is centered on two main perspectives: first, within the principles of urban policy and municipal development policies. According to the document, the

social function of the city entails meeting the essential needs of citizens, aiming to guarantee quality of life and well-being for the population through fair and balanced access to infrastructure and services, decent housing, public spaces, work, and leisure (CAMPINAS, 2018, Art. 2, Section I).

While the concept of leisure remains a principle in the updated legislation, it now embodies an expanded meaning—beyond the social right to leisure, it emphasizes the right to a city that upholds these rights as part of its social function.

A second aspect incorporating leisure into policies on culture, sports, and recreation defines its objectives and general guidelines as follows: “to value physical, sports, and recreational activities as factors for individual and collective well-being (Law No. 15/2006, Art. 55, Section I)”. This approach seeks to “promote social inclusion through physical, sports, and recreational activities, encouraging participation of people with disabilities (Law No. 15/2006, art. 55, Section II),” to integrate the “sports and leisure policy with other municipal public policies (Law No. 15/2006, art.

55, item III)," and to establish "sports and recreational infrastructure (Law No. 15/2006, art. 55, item IV)" in line with the 2006 proposals.

Through this analysis, we can understand the continued inclusion of landscape and leisure concepts in Campinas' 21st-century Master Plans. Present across both discussed legislations, the debates on leisure and landscape act as mobilizing instruments in city and rural management.

However, we can also distinguish significant differences in how these concepts are positioned within the legislation. Leisure is clearly embedded within the guidelines and general objectives of the highlighted laws, whereas the concept of landscape only gains this prominence in the 2018 framework.

There is also a scale shift in how these themes are approached: while leisure is broadly discussed in both laws, landscape is treated differently. In 2006, landscape is viewed through specific, localized lenses within regional policies, focusing on particular areas and periods in the city. A broader, citywide perspective on landscape only emerges in the 2018 plan.

Lastly, leisure, addressed in the legislation through specific policies (environmental, cultural, sports, and recreation), is also woven into the general framework for spatial organization and development of the city. In the 2016 document, leisure evolves beyond a social right to encompass the notion of a city that provides spaces supporting this right. This perspective does not always align with a humanized city vision; rather, it leaves room for a city with strong financialization and a tendency toward monumentalizing its spaces.

Final Considerations

This article aimed to analyze the relationship between leisure and landscape in the Master Plans of the city of Campinas, produced in 2006 and 2018. These plans were responses from municipal management to the need for alignment with the City Statute, and they represented the first legal documents produced in the city under its framework.

Initially, we developed a broad definition of the representations and definitions of landscape that could be used in this analysis. Without focusing on a single interpretation, we concluded that the concept of landscape is expansive, encompassing disputes, conflicts, identities, and senses of belonging. Above all, it is a definition that can be operationalized in different ways in the formulation of urban policies, linked to the expansion and new uses of the city, the care for heritage, or the processes of financialization of spaces. From this plurality of meanings, the analysis conducted moved from the generating document—the City Statute—through to the city's Master Plans, undertaking a historical analysis of the definitions of landscape and leisure in these documents.

Although the City Statute was created with the task of implementing the urban planning provisions of the Federal Constitution (1988), our analysis revealed that its generalist nature only serves as a pointer to needs, without providing more solid guidelines on how Master Plans should define leisure and landscape.

Based on this foundational document, the Master Plans of Campinas for 2006 and 2018 were developed. Historically, the city's Master Plans have given little space to the discussion of leisure and landscape, limiting themselves to the preservation of urban parks. When more critical and analytical evaluations were conducted, they revealed the saturation of these parks concerning to the city's population density.

This scenario changed starting in 2006, when the incorporation of both terms (leisure and landscape) was made in a more fruitful way. This characteristic continued and persisted, exhibiting both coherence and contradictions concerning the discussions held in 2018, although with distinct approaches. Regarding leisure, the 2018 plan incorporates, in addition to the idea of a social right, the perspective that the city should primarily provide space for its realization. Regarding landscape, the differences are more evident. In 2006, this discussion was framed within more specific debates regarding certain regions of the city. By contrast, the 2018 plan expands this perspective, treating landscape as something to be considered from a more global viewpoint concerning the entire city.

We understand that a documentary investigation, such as the one undertaken in this article, has both potentials and limitations. In conclusion, it was possible to conduct an initial analysis of the correlation between the meanings attributed to the terms landscape and leisure, and to identify the disputes surrounding the uses of the city developed during this period. The city, with its vibrant vitality, is appropriated in distinct ways, and understanding the legal framework supporting the reforms undertaken provides a broader grasp of the processes of appropriation, gentrification, and acculturation that have occurred in contemporary times. At the same time, this work does not allow us to recognize the practical applicability of these legal relations, which opens the door for further investigations to explore this perspective.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA. Érika Audet de. A articulação dos espaços públicos na paisagem do Recife através da evolução urbana. In: PONTUAL, Virgínia; CARNEIRO, Ana Rita Sá (Org). **História e Paisagem. Ensaios urbanísticos do Recife e de São Luís**. Recife: Bagaço, 2005. p. 113-146.

AMARAL, Silvia. Política Pública, lazer e sustentabilidade: desafios e perspectivas. In: BAHIA, Mirleide Chaar (org.). **Novas leituras do lazer contemporâneo**. Belém: NAEA, 2018. p.91-104.

ARANTES, Antonio. As dimensões do patrimônio. In: ARANTES, Antonio. **Patrimônio Imaterial. Política e instrumentos de identificação, documentação e salvaguarda**. DUO Informação e Cultura, 2008.

BADARÓ, Ricardo de Souza Campos. **Campinas**. Campinas: Área de Publicações CMU/UNICAMP, 1996.

BASSUL, José Roberto. Reforma urbana e Estatuto da Cidade. **EURE (Santiago)**, Santiago, v. 28, n. 84, p. 133-144, 2002.

BESSA, Wagner de Carvalho; KUFEL JÚNIOR, Walter; SÁ PORTO, Paulo. Campinas: análise dos planos diretores (1970-1996). **Leituras de Economia Política**, v.9, n.1, p. 121-148, 2001.

BRASIL. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988**. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm. Access on: 04 mar. 2024.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 10.257, de 10 de julho de 2001**. Regulamenta os arts. 182 e 183 da Constituição Federal, estabelece diretrizes gerais da política urbana e dá outras providências. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/LEIS_2001/L10257.htm Acesso em: 04 mar. 2024.

BRESCIANI, Stella. Metrópoles: as faces do monstro urbano (as cidades no século XIX). **Revista Brasileira de História**, v.5, n.8/9, p. 35-68, 1985.

CALABI, Donatella. **História do urbanismo europeu**. São Paulo: editora Perspectiva, 2012.

CAMPINAS. **Plano Preliminar de Desenvolvimento Integrado do Município de Campinas - 1970**. Campinas: PMC, 1970.

CAMPINAS. **Plano diretor – 1991**. Campinas: PMC, 1991.

CAMPINAS. **Plano diretor – 1996**. Campinas: PMC, 1996.

CAMPINAS. **Lei Complementar n.º 15, de 27 de dezembro de 2006**, dispõe sobre o Plano Diretor do Município de Campinas (revogada pela Lei Complementar n.º 189, de

08 de janeiro de 2018). Campinas: Câmara Municipal, 2006. Available at: <https://leismunicipais.com.br/a/sp/c/campinas/leicomplementar/2006/1/15/lei-complementar-n15-2006-dispoe-sobre-o-plano-diretor-do-municipio-de-campinas>. Acesso em 11 mar. 2024.

CAMPINAS. Lei complementar no 189 de 08 de janeiro de 2018. Dispõe sobre o Plano Diretor Estratégico do Município de Campinas. Disponível em: http://suplementos.campinas.sp.gov.br/admin/download/suplemento_2018-01-09_cod473_1.pdf Acesso em: 11 mar. 2024.

CARVALHO, Sonia Nahas. Estatuto da cidade: aspectos políticos e técnicos do plano diretor. **São Paulo em Perspectiva**, v.15, n.4, dez, p.130-135, 2001.

COSTA, Everaldo Batista da. **A dialética da construção destrutiva na consagração do Patrimônio Mundial**. São Paulo: Humanitas, Fapesp, 2010.

FELDMAN, Sarah. Avanços e limites na historiografia da legislação urbanística no Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais**, [S. l.], n. 4, 2001, p. 33-47.

GARZEDIN, Maria Aruane Santos. Espaços livres urbanos, paisagem e memória. In: CORRÊA, Elyane Lins; GOMES, Marco Aurélio A. de Filgueiras. **Reconceituações contemporâneas do patrimônio**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2011.

HARVEY, David. **Cidades rebeldes**: do direito à cidade à revolução urbana. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.

JACOBS, Jane. **Morte e vida das grandes cidades** 3. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011.

KROGH, Daniela; SOUZA, Henrique. O papel das exposições na formação do urbanismo: a difusão do Plano de Melhoramentos de Campinas de Prestes Maia na exposição de 1939. **Arq.urb.**, [S. l.], n. 17, p. 104–122, 2019.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. **O direito à cidade**. São Paulo: Centauro, 2001.

LIMEIRA, Aline. de M.; MIRANDA, Ana Carolina. Um código para a História da Educação: posturas como fonte e objeto. **Revista História da Educação**, [S. l.], v. 26, 2022.

MAXIMILIANO, Liz Abad. Considerações sobre o conceito de paisagem. **Raega-O Espaço Geográfico em Análise**, v. 8, 2004.

PIZANI, Rafael Stein. **Recreação, Lazer e Educação Física na cidade de Campinas: um olhar acerca dos parques e recantos infantis (1940-1960)**. 115 f. 2012. Dissertação (mestrado), Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Faculdade de Educação Física. 2012.

RAMOS DE SOUZA, Rachel. Os espaços verdes na Princesa D'Oeste - praças e parques na urbanização de Campinas. **Anais...** CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE CIÊNCIAS DO ESPORTE, 17 a 22 de setembro de 2023, Fortaleza, Ceará.

RODRIGUES, Fabíola. **A invenção da cidade:** população e planejamento urbano, imaginário e poder na formação urbana de Campinas (1930-2006). 2008. Tese (doutorado), Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas. 363p., 2008.

RODRIGUES, F. O plano “Prestes Maia” e a ideologia do planejamento urbano em Campinas: o poder e os limites das ideias de um urbanista. **URBANA: Revista Eletrônica do Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos sobre a Cidade**, Campinas, SP, v. 4, n. 1, p. 125–151, 2012.

ROLNIK, Raquel.. **Estatuto da Cidade - guia para implementação pelos municípios e cidadãos.** 1. ed. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, 2001. v. 1. 274p.

ROLNIK, Raquel. **Dez anos do Estatuto da cidade:** das lutas pela reforma urbana às cidades da Copa do Mundo. Leituras da cidade. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital; ANPUR, 2012.

SÁNCHEZ, Fernanda. **A reinvenção das cidades para um mercado mundial.** Chapecó: Argos, 2010.

SANTOS, Flavia Cruz; AMARAL, Silvia Cristina Franco. Sobre lazer e políticas sociais: questões teórico-conceituais. **Pensar a Prática**, v.13, n.1, p. 1-13, 2010.

SCHNEIDER, Ingrid Elisabeth. **Confrontos e dificuldades na implementação dos instrumentos urbanísticos propostos nos Planos Diretores Municipais de Campinas na década de 90.** 2002. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2002.

SENNETT, Richard. Construir e Habitar. **Ética para uma cidade aberta.** Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2018.

SILVA, Fernando Fernandes da. **As cidades brasileiras e o patrimônio cultural da humanidade.** São Paulo: Edusp, Editora Peirópolis, 2003.

SPILLEIR, Davi; LONGO, Regina; FALSARELLA, Orandi. A Bacia do Rebeirão das Pedras e o Plano diretor de 2018: a ameaça da superexpansão de Barão Geraldo-Campinas/SP. **Revista Nacional de Gerenciamento de Cidades**, v.8, n. 65, p. 62-75, 2020.

SUNDFELD, Carlos Ari. O estatuto da cidade e suas diretrizes gerais. *In:* DALLARI, Adilson; FERRAZ, Sérgio. **Estatuto da cidade.** São Paulo: Malheiros, 2014. p. 44-60.

VERSIANI, Isabela *et al.* Direito ao lazer e políticas urbanas: análise a partir do Estatuto da Cidade e inserção no plano diretor. **Confluências**, v. 21, n.1, p. 79-101, 2019.

VITTE, Antonio Carlos; SILVEIRA, Roberison. A paisagem em Alexander Von Humboldt: símbolo e linguagem no romantismo alemão de início do século XIX. **Caderno prudentino de geografia**, n.32, v.1, p.5-22, jan/jul. 2010.

Authors' Addresses:

Silvia Cristina Franco Amaral
Email: scfa@unicamp.br

Danilo Ciaco Nunes
Email: d962167@dac.unicamp.br

Paula Marques Braga
Email: paulamb@unicamp.br

Daniele Medeiros
Email: dccm@unicamp.br