

a selected chapter from

Rome: A New Planning Strategy

by [Franco Archibugi](#)

*draft of a forthcoming book to be published by
Gordon and Breach, New York*

[an overview of this book](#)

CHAPTER 5: THE NEW STRATEGY FOR ROME

1. The "Catchment Areas" of the New "Urban Centres"
2. The Spatial Distribution of the Catchment Areas
Table 2 - Catchment Areas of the Roman Metropolitan System (by thousands of inhabitants)
3. What decentralization of services for the new "urban centres"?
4. What "City Architecture"?
5. What Strategy for "Urban Greenery"?
6. Programmed Mobility
7. A "Metropolitan" Residentiality

Notes

References

Further Reading

THE NEW STRATEGY FOR ROME

Authentic "polycentrism", therefore, is founded first of all on an evaluation of the "catchment areas" of the services that define it. The location of the centers and infrastructures of such services is a subsequent question (we would say "secondary" if with this adjective is meant not inferiority in importance, but rather a temporal and conceptual subordination).

The polycentrism supported here in Rome means, first of all, a theoretical assignation of the potentiality of the catchment area of the Roman system to respective "*units*" of service that locationally assume the

role of realizing the objectives, reasserted by everybody numerous times of: *integrating functions, improving accessibility, distances, traveling times, not exceeding the thresholds that have been indicated as "overloading"*.

The locational problem of the new strategy therefore, is posed as a problem of *not* letting all the users participate in *any* function in *any* part of the system (the 2,8 million Roman citizens plus the by now recognized other 700 thousand citizens of the Roman "system"); but to functionally distribute the services in such a way as to not render "indifferent" (but on the contrary very... "different", i.e. preferred) the access to this or that function, with a process that we call "*de-polarization*"; such a process is none other than that of instituting other alternative poles to those existing already (but of a "polarizing" capacity that is adequate to those existent ones: or rather better, without the negative aspects of the overloading).

5.1 The "Catchment Areas" of the New "Urban Centers"

The new strategy was defined in 1980, very summarily but very precisely, by the "Frame of Reference for Regional Planning" of the Lazio Region (the Irspe study already mentioned), in the point in which it asserts that the Frame of Reference intends to pursue:

"the hypothesis of "decentralization" relative only to the rare and very rare services, which consists of the identification of three or four distinct territorial ambits to be rendered autonomous, albeit within the compact and concentrated system of the city with the relative locating of the services centers in three or four fundamental catchment areas, within which the needs for services can be measured further, with the fundamental strategic aim of ensuring a "decentralization" that is not however so dispersed as to be inconclusive for the purposes of the city-effect."

The design plan of the new strategy is resolved thus in the determination of the existence (and subsequently in the study of their location) of a *certain number of systems* of central or business and administrative services (such as the SDO), that correspond to as many "virtual catchment areas".

The 3,5 million users of the Roman metropolitan or urban system may give life - at the frequency thresholds of the services allowed by current economic and social development - to about *6/7 centers* and as many *catchment areas*.

For the moment, given the still strong polarizing capacity of the historic center (which it will certainly not be easy to oppose), the distributive

nature of the morphological and urbanistic realities of the urban boundary, the importance assigned to a "spatial line of development" that integrates the communes of the East side of the city from Tivoli to the Castelli Romani, and given other conditions that it would take too long to enumerate here, the organization of these new *catchment areas* can be configured (some of which are already discounted such as EUR and the future SDO), as collected in six centers of reference and distributed in six corresponding territorial sectors:

1. an "*internal*" sector that continues to gravitate on the old Centre;
2. a set of *other sectors* (corresponding more or less to the four cardinal points of the city and its hinterland) which would be presented as the same number of *territory "cones"*, that each gravitate however on *its own center*;
3. an "*external*" sector, relative to the set of communes of the hinterland that are part of the East-South line of development from Tivoli to the Castelli Romani¹, with a "linear centrality" (if one accepts the pun), made up by the communes located to the South and East of Rome and which should begin to gravitate on the new "linear-center";

These territorial sectors, therefore, represent as many catchment areas and include evidently also the citizens of the areas around Rome (that today are part of the Roman system, and gravitate upon it); of the 700 thousand users that they represent, 400 thousand should be concentrated by afferece to the sector that we have defined as "external" or "east" or also "Latin"².

5.2 The Spatial Distribution of the Catchment Areas

The spatial distribution of the catchment areas (with its quantitative implications) has been proposed by aggregation of Rome's municipal "*circoscrizioni*" and of the adjacent communes³ (see Map 1). Only in the

¹More details and explanations are in the contribution already mentioned from 1985 (Archibugi, 1985).

²Because the ancient inhabitants of the area were called "*latins*", and because it was crossed by the ancient *via latina*; the other 300 thousand would be distributed, in very irrelevant proportions, in the other sectors of afferece, the critical mass of which would be nevertheless represented by the users of Rome (Rome municipality).

³Excluding the communes of the three districts (Civitavecchia, Anzio-Nettuno and Segni-Colleferro) which a correct delimitation of the spatial urban systems of Lazio should assign to the systems of North Lazio (Rieti-Viterbo) and South Lazio (Frosinone-

case of *Circoscrizione XIV* has it been considered opportune to divide it into two parts afferent to two sectors and gravitating on two centers.

The overall demographic summary of the catchment areas (inclusive of the population of the Roman circumscriptions and that of the communes of the metropolitan area that have been made afferent on the various catchment areas) is expressed in Table 2.

The criteria with which we have proceeded to formulate the proposed catchment area distribution are obviously territorial: postulating the best combination of the already existing gravitational areas, the maximum use of the operating infrastructures and finally the minimum access costs.

Latina).

Table 2 - *Catchment Areas of the Roman Metropolitan System (by thousands of inhabitants)*

Catchment Area	Rome Municipality	Gravitating Communes	Total
(Historic) Centre	450,00		450,00
North	329,00	131,00	460,00
East	959,00		959,00
South	597,00	40	637,00
West	505,00	41	546,00
"Latin"		481,00	481,00
Roman Metropolitan System	2840,00	693,00	3533,00
Communes outside System			163
Total for Province			3696,00

Source: Istat data

The results proposed are the following:

a) *A Southern Area (ROMA-SUD)*

The sector of this catchment area may be considered that of a vast South-West territorial cone, including the sea coast from Fiumicino to Castel Porziano (thus the so-called "marine" areas) and all the zones that with the sea lines of development (Portuense, Ostiense, Cristoforo Colombo) and those of the Pontina, Laurentina, and Ardeatina gravitate on the already well defined directional area of EUR which, with its outgrowths to the Magliana and to the Laurentina, would be configured as an actual Southern Business and Administrative System.

To this area, in fact, may be made to refer all the residential quarters of Portuense, Ostiense, Ardeatino, EUR, Giuliano-Dalmata and the areas in rapid expansion of "Circoscrizioni" XII and XIII (with an overall population of about 600 thousand people). This catchment area would include, moreover, (with not more than 40 thousand inhabitants) the users settled in the territory of some communes of the province of Rome to the

South of the city, to be precise Ardea and Pomezia (excluding therefore Anzio and Nettuno, which in a correct organization of the Lazio urban systems would be aggregated in the "Southern Lazio System" of Latina-Frosinone).

This catchment area should be made to gravitate on the above-mentioned southern business and administration system.

b) *An Eastern Area (ROMA-EST)*

Another catchment area would be represented by the strongly concentrated population represented by the *circoscrizioni* from the V to the X, with a cone to the East of the historic center which develops along the accesses represented to the North-East by the Tiburtina and Prenestina, and to the South-East by the Casilina, and Tuscolana as far as the Appia.

These are the quarters of Pietralata, Collatino, Ponte Mammolo, San Basilio, Prenestino, (Labicano and Centocelle), Tuscolano, Appio Latino, Alessandrino, Don Bosco, Appio Claudio, and numerous zones of the *Agro romano* such as: Tor Cervara, Settecamini, Torre Spaccata, Acqua Vergine, Lunghezza, S. Vittorino, Torre Angela, Borghesiana, Torre Maura, Torrenova, Torre Gaia, Capannelle, and Casal Morena.

In this area, which has a catchment area of almost 1 million inhabitants, and which is presented as the most important "city" of the new strategy, the SDO is supposed to constitute the fulcrum of the new centrality; but it would be much hoped for that it is strengthened and projected *even more to the East of the present "Pietralata-Centocelle axis"*, in order to baricentre better the great residential area which has been forming, and so that it is not compacted in an uncontrollable way with the old center which has in the meantime been expanding.

On the contrary very opportune would be - even if it is a bit late - a fundamental overturning of the locational choices implemented: with a radical revision of the Town Plan of 1962, it would be opportune to destine the still "free" areas reserved for the "equipped axis" to *areas of "equipped greenery"*, with the purpose of constituting, with all means, a strip of detachment and respite between the old center and the agglomeration of services of the new SDO. (It would even be better to shift the planned Line D of the metropolitan onto the axis of Via Togliatti rather than onto the present axis).

And the baricentre of the new SDO should be shifted towards the Cinecittà area *on the one side*, and towards the Tor Sapienza-Tor Cervara area *on the other*, with an attempt to link itself to the infrastructures of the ring road. The premises would be thus created of a future *splitting in two directional centers*, which the total of 1 million potential inhabitants of the area amply justifies (a Northern Eastern directional system and a Southern

one).

c) *A Northern Area (ROMA-NORD)*

But beyond the two catchment areas - the alternative centrality of which (with respect to the historic center of Rome) has been long since promoted and sought for by means of EUR and SDO - if we want to "liberate" the historic center from the vice that has gripped it, the necessity emerges of recognizing and preparing directional nucleations that can satisfy the demand for superior services on the part of other catchment areas to the *north* and to the *west* of the "metropolitan" city.

A catchment area to be served autonomously is that which weighs in a cone shape on Rome (and the historic center) with the consular roads of the Nomentana, Salaria, Flaminia, and Cassia. These are the imposing quarters of Montesacro and Tor di Quinto, but also of a large number of mainly "illegal" peripheral zones to the north of the city, which have reached important levels of population density (Tomba di Nerone, Grottarossa, Labaro, Prima Porta, La Giustiniana, Isola Farnese, Cesano, Polline Martignano, Val Melaina, Castel Giubileo, Marcigliana, Casal Boccone, Tor San Giovanni). But to this catchment area naturally belong a great quantity of communes of the Rome province and its metropolitan area which on this side fit into the commune territory (for example, Mentana, Monterotondo, Riano, Sacrofano, Formello), but also another numerous bunch of small communes of the province the demand for services of which is not otherwise satisfiable. On this side the population of communes adjacent to Rome that may constitute a catchment area of a new business and administration center is greater than in the other cases: if in the Rome commune the new business and administration center of the Northern sector may count on 330 thousand users, out of the Rome commune would gravitate other communes with 170 thousand inhabitants.

This is also the fact that would suggest "baricentering" the new business and administration nucleus and the sufficiently Northern services at the entrance of the motorway to Florence and also beyond (in a triangle Castel Giubileo-Marcigliana-Casal Boccone). The operation should be carried out bearing in mind the conservation of the Tiber Valley which presents delicate situations at this point. The entire Northern business and administration system would thus have a catchment area of not less than 500 thousand inhabitants, which is more than sufficient to justify it.

d) *A Western Area (ROMA-OVEST)*

There is a catchment area to the west of the city that has the potential for a new "Western" business and administration nucleus. It becomes

possible and necessary in order to complete the effective polycentrism about which we have spoken at length. Besides it is already emerging, although in a disordered, uncertain and confused form; because of which an urgent official definition has become necessary in order to face this confused emergency and to oppose all its negative aspects.

The catchment area of this nucleus would involve some peripheral quarters and suburbs to the West of Rome (the Gianicolense, Aurelio, Trionfale, and Primavalle) which presently gravitate only on the historic center and numerous urbanized zones of the Agro: Ottavia, Casalotti, S. Maria di Galeria, as far as Polidoro, Maccarese, and Fregene. It is a sector that only within the communal area or Rome has 520 thousand inhabitants. The lines of development of the Roman cone would be in essence the Aurelia, and also the Boccea and the Pisana.

And it is at the exit of the Aurelia, from the new Aurelia station at Malagrotta and adjacent areas that the best places are situated for the new business and administration location. The achieved "Roman Railway Belt" and the Maccarese-Aurelia Station link would exploit this strategic choice, and make another substantial contribution to the alleviation of the historic center.

e) The *Historic Centre System*

The historic center would remain an important catchment area: virtually 400 thousand inhabitants (all the "rioni" of *Circoscrizione* I and all those of *Circoscrizioni* II, III, and XVII: Flaminio, Parioli, Pinciano, Salario, Trieste, Nomentano, a large part of the Tiburtino, and Della Vittoria). It is probable that given the extremely unbalanced concentration of services in this area⁴, for a long time yet the actual (and not only "virtual") catchment area will go far beyond the borders assigned to it. This to the detriment of the other business and administration centers proposed, which for this reason will have difficulty in taking off. But with the long term tendency being inevitable, the realization terms of the planned re-equilibrium (and as a consequence the acquisition times of the social and economic benefits that will be had from the re-equilibrium for the entire population) will depend on the rigor with which the public choices (of the Council and also other entities operating on the sector) will follow a strategy of "depolarization" of the historic center, and - conversely - of "polarization" of the four to five new alternative centers designed by the strategy.

⁴The imbalance of services presently existent in this sector, with respect to the virtual catchment area assigned to it, is documented by the appendix prepared by Oreste Ferri.

f) The "*Eastern*" or "*Latin*" Centre

But the problem of Rome will not be resolved without a radical operation that must by now involve also the communes of the Eastern circle of the Province, above all the system of the Castelli Romani. The conurbation with these communes is by now a reality; and the same damaging effects are produced that have been produced with the conurbation of more or less scattered settlements of the Agro romano.

These small but historic towns (Tivoli and Castelli) in their growth induced by the conurbation, are losing all their historic-cultural character and identity: they too are becoming an anonymous, degraded, Roman outskirts, that is drugged by a sort of "development" which hides - behind an appearance of greater dynamism, and greater physical closeness to the city - more environmental degradation, more pollution, and thus a substantial socio-economic decline, with respect to the emerging opportunities. Such emerging opportunities are not opposable: they are the increase of consumption and the access to superior services, which now concerns all the citizens, even those in once small and not--served centers, which were thus excluded from their function.

The territorial function of "sustainable polycentrism" postulates the search for those thresholds, at which such services can be located as closely as possible to the user areas.

The Castelli Romani and Tivoli, taken together and with the adjacent communes of the province, reach this threshold: they reach 400 thousand inhabitants (and their tendency is towards an increase); and they can almost "do without Rome" for the rare services. A radical strategy of "polarization" is necessary on their part however, to avoid their continuing to slip towards Rome, leaving behind them a shapeless territory. It is necessary to put up some "barriers"; which will be valid and functional only if the strategy is implemented in "common": between the communes of the area, and between these and Rome. In fact, the benefit would be in common: the residents of the "Latin" system would above all benefit from actual non-dependence on Rome as far as the superior services are concerned, work opportunities, etc.; and those more properly Roman would not suffer the costs (in many cases the financial costs for services consumed by users that pay their taxes elsewhere, but also economic and social costs of various types) of a daily "presence" of users of the city that live elsewhere.

This strategy implies the design of a "Latin system" which gathers in a *single virtual catchment area* all the communes of the Castelli (and others around the area) in an "axis" equipped with services and a business and administration centrality that is conceived unitarily and is "tangential" to Rome. The motorway strip constructed between Fiano and S. Cesareo is a

modest contribution to this strategy, which could be reinforced with its semicircular lengthening, to the foot of the Colli Albani, from Colonna to Aprilia. But above all it is on the tertiary equipment and that of the urban services of this axis that the "environmental" safeguard of the Castelli is passed.

5.3 What decentralization of services for the new "urban centers"?

In short, the thus articulated catchment areas configure the possibility, the "feasibility" of a series of polyfunctional business and administration "Urban Centers" that are alternative to the historic center, the location of which is outlined in Map 2.

The Rome business and administration centers would become, in time, six. An SDO, an SDOC and an SDIS. But how much better it would be to begin by calling them an *East Rome*, a *South Rome*, a *North Rome* and a *West Rome*, plus a *Central Rome* and a "*Latin*" or "*Castelli*" Rome!

It is necessary to define however what is meant by the content of these "*business and administration or Service Centers*".

Let it be clear that we do not intend here to refer to a number of services that can be located functionally for catchment areas that fall much below the 500 thousand inhabitants threshold. For this type of services one can easily rely on spontaneity, or on "commercial" or "social" urbanism that chooses places and access modalities on the scale of the local area or of new building structures.

Here we are referring to those "operational units" that manage relations with a population of a million or more and which suffer from hyper congestion. Let us take an example that will suffice for all: the University.

There is no reason for concentrating those enrolled and the users of the "urban"⁵ University in a single unit, with perhaps over 100 thousand enrolled/users⁶, when it is well known that over certain thresholds (let us say 20-30 thousand enrolled), the University and its decision-making, administrative and didactic organs cannot function well, because of "laws"

⁵That is those Universities (which today are the only Universities growing in the world and considered suitable for what a University must do) which carry out a service for the urban residents, and do not contemplate a special "residentiality" (like the old campus universities which might also survive, but which have another function and by necessity serve an elitist population). (See on the subject: Berube, 1978).

For a wider analysis and for the planning practices in American Universities and in other countries, see my essay (Archibugi, 1984) in which many bibliographical references to the subject are collected.

⁶In Rome the La Sapienza University has reached the level of 170 thousand enrolled!

of technique of the organization. In this case why not distribute in as many units as their are hypothesized operational centers the same polyvalent services of the single University, with the creation of more Universities, as has been done in many great cities (Paris, Tokyo, etc.)?

And the example could continue for other operational units and Public offices (Taxes, Health, Social Security) all those services that are suffering today from hyper congestion, which rather than being "economies" of scale seem more like "diseconomies" of scale.

But in the business and administration centers, we intend to suggest designing the concentration too (which would be "spontaneous" if favored by an opportune public planning) of all those "operational units" that in one way or another benefit from being *adjacent* or even integrated. is it not the case that the

concentration of shops, even of the same sector, big department stores, cinemas, other recreational or service structures, and finally offices today is not considered anymore a limiting factor (because of the "competition" that it provokes) but rather as an augmentative both for the volume of business (which increases) and for the level of costs (that diminishes), because of the attraction of clients that it produces and the synergies that it allows.

The dispersion of activities, because of a misunderstood "polycentrism", has been seen as a factor of difficult economic development (as seen already in Chapter 3). It is necessary to achieve the correct polycentrism, *a sustainable polycentrism*, in order to maximize its economic effect, and the city-effect of which it is a corollary.

The strategy thus implicates a careful examination of all the great service structures that may be broken up without difficulties, (but on the contrary with "internal" organizational advantages); and, together, also a design of potential services, leaving it up to private initiative and the "market" - with adequate conventional instrumentation - to test and evaluate its economic convenience.

If, once and for all, we only stopped thinking that everything that is in the "private" interest is by necessity against the public interest! It is a persistent, dangerous, mentality of underdevelopment, that leads one to commit the worst errors of evaluation and - as a consequence - the worst abuses in the name of the public interest, which are then revealed as the most "counter-productive" for the interest of the whole collective. And if, once and for all, we only began to understand that the "real" useful discrimination to make (for the purposes of the defense and promotion of the "social" interest) is not that between "public" and "private", but that between planned and non-planned actions and interventions, both by public and private decision-makers and amongst themselves: in brief in the

existence or not of an urban planning process (as of other subjects that are not necessarily urban, but at other levels: regional, national, supra-national)!

5.4 What "City Architecture"?

The strategy recommended of a "sustainable polycentrism", i.e. which is capable of responding to the need to create other centralities, does not contrast - because of the territorial scale at which it is posed - with the need to ensure a perception that is also "physical" of the city, that perception of the volumes and visual image that is dear to an important school of town planning⁷.

It is in fact a serious error to set (as if they were incompatible) the rationality of locational choices and macroterritorial models (which have their own sphere of validity, necessity and logical indispensability), against the aesthetic values of "microterritoriality" which are asserted in the "urban design", in that which may be called "the architecture of the city". It is in fact always expressed, and almost exclusively, in the optical sphere of visual perception, and therefore of aesthetic value and judgment.

The contraposition risks "neglecting" the rational approach in favor of the aesthetic one or vice-versa, when not only is there no need to do so, but it is also necessary not to do so, if we want one or the other to have a chance of success and lasting assertion.

In this sense as well the planning process must be "integrated" in the correct ways.

In the case that we are dealing with, neglecting the logical-rational aspect - which we believe is at the base of sustainable polycentrism strategy that we are defending for Rome - also damages the opportunities and chances of designing more "impressive" physiognomies for the city at a more suitable scale⁸.

A widespread growth of the city, with a more dispersed fabric of "works", will be able perhaps to provide the occasion to care in detail for this or that work in the environment - necessarily anonymous - in which it inserts itself (with the inevitable pluses and minuses); but certainly, on the whole, the image of Rome will always and only remain that of its historic center and nothing else. All the works - however important - that

⁷We are referring to the bulk of the "post-modern" tendencies in architecture.

⁸The classic reference for this subject is the well known work by Lynch on the "image of the city" (Lynch, 1960). But a very exhaustive work on all the aspects implied in the visual perception of cities is in the systematic work by Rapaport (1977).

would be realized would be inserted in a "peripheral" context, without much urban "identity". Would this not damage the very identity of the single work or of the single "design" of the urban microscale that would concern it?

Without considering, moreover, that a non-ordered placing of the "works" of the higher tertiary sector in all the urban fabric, would risk making many fall back - as is happening inevitably today - on the historic center again, with the mixture of styles and architecture which is always a source of perplexity and dissent, because it is not always resolvable in terms of "ideological" schematisms, but only by means of possible single design solutions (which, by definition, therefore cannot be generalized in a general policy). The general acceptance thus of this "mixture" of styles, means finding oneself involved permanently in a difficult urban policy to be managed well and be accepted without argument.

This not considering, besides, another aspect: that the mixture of styles, by its very nature, obliges the planners to place greater conservative safeguard constraints and the designers to adhere more to such constraints. This compromises perhaps the possibility of adopting technically more rational and suitable solutions than the absence of these constraints would permit. or, alternatively, it compromises the complete respect of the conservative values, in the incessant attempt to get round these constraints. or it leads to the renunciation of the full "conservative" recovery of the works and oldest areas, because of the need to use them for "modern" solutions in some way.

Only further damage can come from this for the "historic" image of the city and, at the same time, also for the potentially "modern image" of the city. The historic would not be completely historic, the modern not completely modern.

The "polycentric" solution outlined would provide on the contrary the opportunity to organize autonomously the perceptive image of the various business and administration "centers" which would be promoted.

For the historic center, naturally, there would only be the obligation to maintain its quality and present image, perhaps freeing it from all the intervening deterioration: "diffuse" garagisation, a certain excessive infrastructuring of automobile routes, areas still in a run down or precarious state of use (military, railway property, etc.)⁹.

For the "Latin" system or that of the Castelli, likewise, it would be a question of asserting the historical-environmental character: much greenery, a lot of business and administration recovery of historic

⁹I feel it is valid to recall the considerations of Benevolo on these points (Benevolo, 1960).

buildings, very pronounced landscape constraints etc., and perhaps the development of a strip at the foot of the hills with modern constructions along the circular directrice already mentioned.

Also for the Centre South (EUR and satellite adjacencies) the urban-perceptive and "architectural" image is by now largely determined; and it is not at all bad. (It is a matter perhaps only of encouraging the development of a certain "night life").

But for the other three, and perhaps four, business and administration centers to be conceived and created, there is still everything to do. For the Centre North, the East and the East-North and East-South, there is still no identity of image. Neither for the traditional SDO, ex "equipped axis" is there yet a suitable, even architectural design on a wide scale. Some designs, from the '60s¹⁰, have been superseded by events, and should be designed from the beginning on the basis of new well identified localization's.

They should be designed with a careful examination of places and the terms of reference collected up to this point. And they would be encouraged by being the subject of "International Competitions" for ideas, promoted by the Council in cooperation with other public bodies¹¹. Each center could also acquire its own architectural "identity", to the advantage of the overall identity of the city of Rome, to be made as equally prestigious next to that of the "historic" one.

The "International Competitions" besides responding to a fair and civil system of professional competition, do not cost very much, in comparison to the advantages they bring, both in the collection of ideas, and in the popularity and prestige for an intelligent administration of the city¹².

5.5 What Strategy for "Urban Greenery"?

In the strategic proposal for "sustainable polycentrism", a specific strategy for the "urban greenery" is also implicit which should be mentioned briefly.

At first sight, the situation in Rome is not worse than that of many other European capital and major cities. But if the situation is considered at the correct territorial scale, the metropolitan one, and in the logic of the new

¹⁰I am referring to those conceived for the old "equipped axis".

¹¹There are some excellent proposals in this sense. See for example a proposal by P. Portoghesi and E. Cerioni for a new forum at the centre of a quarter on the outskirts (Portoghesi, 1989). Portoghesi places as the first idea that of a "polycentric city".

¹²For further evaluations with regard to the new architectural centres, see the work by Victor Gruen (1973).

strategy, the situation changes notably. Rome becomes the only European capital that is not surrounded by a ring of important forestry which constitutes above all an important climactic safeguard.

The projects up until now - on several occasions - proposed and commenced, all go in the same direction of a strengthening of the "green infrastructuring". But they are not yet orientated with courage towards a program of reforestation in the still available areas at the level of the external urban circle, a reforestation that would be so essential for the improvement of the environmental quality of the city¹³.

In the 1962 Master plan, in which a praiseworthy attempt was made at indicating the "public green" to be planned (around 20 thousand hectares), the conception of a "green belt" for Rome was relinquished, for correct reasons of morphological pre-existencies and particular constraints. But an equivalent conception was formulated including great penetrations of the "archeological spine", the Tiber and Aniene parks and other important initiatives.

Today, however, the strategy indicated postulates a direct and different implication on the territorial policy as well of the greenery within the urban circle: *that of maximizing a "belt" of detachment, of "respice", of a less dense fabric, and thus of greater "greenery"* (equipped or not, public or private, recreational or for sport) *around the historic center*, to separate as clearly as possible its centrality, not from the residential quarters, but from the other centralities proposed.

Another implication of the polycentric model suggested is also that which the same research into a territory of detachment and respice should be operated to separate the East business and administration center, from the system that we have called "Latin".

The two specific strategies of "greenery" that follow from it are certainly very "heroic": to judge from the process of compacting and "welding" of territories that is currently taking place, in both cases. The strategy implies that one should operate for *the possible recovery of all the margins still existing*, given that alternative strategies are not to be seen.

In both cases indicated of specific "strategy" of lightening and of greenery, *areas should be identified that are not completely compromised*, in which one should stop any development of business centrality, in order to orientate it to the areas that are more suitable for its concentration. And, together, *other areas in which also the expansion of residential building availability is conditioned by determined constraints of the same*. Today a policy of control of building capacity of a business and administration

¹³See on the subject the old study directed by Cabianca (1966) and the more recent one of the "Special Office for the Town Master Plan" (Quarra, 1982).

type, and also of a residential type, may be exercised in conditions that are clearly more favorable than in the past: a clarity of ideas and of will on the part of the public decision-making process overall would be enough (which does not lead to tranquillity: given the diffused experience of "public abuse" that is still perpetuated).

However in Map 3, we have tried to configure, in a very initial approximation, which areas could be identified to constitute the "*the safeguard belt*" around the historic center, and that of separation between the sectors of Rome and the "Latin" system. A relevant characteristic of this attempt is that, which has already been mentioned, of conserving the areas, in particular the public ones, as still free and reserved for the old "equipped axis", to a sort of new "equipped axis of greenery".

To this policy has been added a generous zoning around the city - where possible and most advisable - of new areas of reforestation; with the purpose of applying to Rome that general policy of reforestation around the most intensive urban areas which is capable of impeding the climactic disequilibria of the urban "heat islands" and of excessive emissions of carbon dioxide. However the proposals of Map 3 are still approximate and intend only to give the sense of the strategy of greenery hoped for.

In particular, in Rome a "*green belt*" could be reconstituted - in the new strategy - with decisive controlling interventions in the still free areas around the city at the level of the "forts"¹⁴: such a belt in fact should be "internal" to the location of the new business and administration centers proposed.

Moreover, the areas destined to the architecture of new business and administration centers, could anticipate a "vertical" typology of buildings between the greenery (with density constraints and of "respect" between buildings to be established in the competitions). All this would increase the effects and results of a policy aimed at improving the quality of the urban greenery in the city.

5.6 Programmed Mobility

A completely renewed policy of urban and metropolitan transport is an integrating part of the new strategy: above all in the *way of conceiving* such

¹⁴It is to be hoped that at least the circle of "forts", planned with a law of 1877, because of an anti-historic frenzy of military defence for the city, and against which Garibaldi railed with vehemence and lucidity, may serve for an improbable (and by now highly compromised) *recovery of greenery* for the city! (On the history of the forts there is a work by A. Fara from 1985).

a policy.

The interventions in the field of transport infrastructures should be designed and realized, only in relation to a theoretical simulation of transport demand generated by the prospective settlements produced by the proposed territorial strategy¹⁵.

A permanent examination of compatibility should be ensured between the interventions being designed or carried out with the prospective needs of the new strategy. Otherwise the actions and decisions that are taken with regard to transport, may completely cancel out the feasibility of the strategic decisions taken with regard to territorial organization. Despite much verbal and formal recognition, traffic policy continues to be permanently disassociated from urban policy; this happens even in the studies: where at least the conceptual premises should converge, if not be identical.

But this too is the damage of the absence in Rome of a real "new" Master Plan, that should incorporate also the adequate checks of compatibility with the problem of transport infrastructures and the means and resources to be destined to them (as mentioned in Para. 3.10).

This is certainly not the occasion to anticipate those analyses and evaluations of compatibility between territorial strategy and the best transport infrastructure advisable. It is a complex work that must benefit from stable structures of management and study, that are not to be seen today. Here we will limit ourselves to stating that:

1. the best design studies carried out in this direction - for example that by the *Intermetro Co.* for the metropolitan system in Rome (Intermetro, 1986) - should be still (I would say permanently) reviewed, in the light of a new territorial strategy; and contain moreover serious financial evaluations on cost parameters and on the time grouping of the expenses;
2. the models of traffic generation that have been utilized or will be utilized, must not be based only on the present behavior of the users, but on "virtual" or "theoretical" behavior with respect to prospective scenarios that are coherent and compatible with the strategies¹⁶.

The solution to Rome's serious traffic problems, will never be found in

¹⁵ for an extended technology of the operation see the results of a research lasting several years by the Planning Studies Centre in the context of the "Progetto Finalizzato Trasporti" of the CNR (Archibugi, ed. 1983-1987)

¹⁶For an elementary and yet exhaustive methodology of urban transport planning, and faced with a wide and complex existing literature, permit me to refer to Chap. 27 of my manual *Principi di pianificazione regionale* [Principles of Regional Planning] (Archibugi, 1982, 2 ed.), which is dedicated to "transport planning" (and which includes an essential bibliography).

"traffic engineering" - however useful some of the techniques of analysis and evaluation that it offers and allows may be - but rather in the balanced relationship "land use-mobility" that only a territorial strategy can guarantee.

A draft aimed at the description of a possible "equilibrium", is in the overall project of metropolitan and railway lines (and of the principal nodes of railway and modal interchange) delineated in my contribution of 1985 on "Rome in the Year 2000" (Archibugi, 1985). We reproduce the essential outlines in Map 4, to which is attached the numeric table of stations proposed in the new system of *mass-transit* in conformity with the new territorial strategy (creation of alternative centers and movement towards the East of the SDO).

But this draft as well demands quantitative checking, and eventual adjustment, by means of a prospective simulation of the effects on transport demand generated by the new settlements of the proposed directional centers.

5.7 A "Metropolitan" Residentiality

In the new strategy, founded on the creation of new "centralities" of superior and business and administration services, and in the resistance (with a heroic intervention in "defense of greenery" and the creation of zones of respite between the historic center and the new centrality) to the compacting that is taking place, the role of new residential locations does not become so strategic, as it was in the old Master Plan.

Let us be clear: the lesser emphasis on habitational building means that, once the functional safeguard of destination of the areas for the intensive or at least coordinated operations of the business and administration centers, on the one hand, and of the public or private areas for protected greenery on the other, are guaranteed, the new Plan should "loosen" the destination constraints, with the introduction of the possibility of negotiating the new residential building, whether it is public, semi-public or private, with business initiatives. Since the Plan should embrace, without any distinction, the land situated in the communal territory of Rome, like that in the other adjacent communes, a general strategy should bring together the possible creation of diffused residential areas, and *clearly privilege* (respecting access requirements, public transport, and other primary infrastructuring) the *areas of the adjacent communes*.

The dislocation of new centralities in fact renders even more favorable the *functional recovery* of the communes of the province *for an essentially residential purpose* (with connected services of an inferior level); these

territories have a low habitational density and could take on the load, without particular environmental damage - by means of an increase in this density - of an eventual increase in habitations both through the expansion of inhabitants in the overall urban system, and because of an improvement of habitational, quantitative (crowding) and qualitative (typologies) standards.

On the contrary, the further invasion of communal Roman territory would damage the image of the alternative strategic model discussed, which is based on the effort to create new essentially business and administration centralities in respect of the historic center¹⁷. And, moreover, it would compromise the residual possibilities of implementing a "strategy for urban greenery" (such as that outlined in Para. 5.5).

¹⁷An initial evaluation of new habitational needs and their opportune distribution in the territory of the entire system is already contained in the essay mentioned previously on the proposal for an organisation of Roman metropolitan territory (Archibugi, 1985). In the framework of the new Master Plan, it would be a question of precisely calculating the needs and modalities in order to satisfy them, in relation to building typologies explicitly preferred by real and potential users (by means of opportune investigation such as opinion polls). This point has been largely neglected by the procedures and determinations of the Town Master Plans of the past; this neglect too has had its role, albeit difficult to quantify, on the phenomenon of *abusivism* in the proportions witnessed in Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Archibugi F. (ed.) (1966a), *La Citta'-Regione* [The City-Region], Quaderni del Centro di studi e piani economici, Boringhieri, Torino, 1966.
- (1966b), *L'analisi ecologica per la delimitazione di aree di programmazione* [Ecological Analysis for the Delimitation of Planning Areas] (Introduction) in G. Giannotti, *L'analisi ecologica. Panorama della letteratura* [Ecological Analysis. Panorama of the Literature], Quaderni del Centro di studi e piani economici, Boringhieri, Torino, 1966.
- (1968), "Enti pubblici, imprese pubbliche e governo del territorio" [Public Bodies, Public Businesses and Land Management], in *Politica e Mezzogiorno*, a. VI, 1968.
- (1976), *La pianificazione integrata: problemi di didattica e di ricerca* [Integrated Planning: Problems of Didactics and Research], Paper for a Seminar at the University of Calabria, March, 1976.
- (1981), *Pianificazione territoriale: la funzionalita' nel quadro istituzionale*, [Territorial Planning: The Functionality of the Institutional Frame] Report to the II National Architecture Conference, INARCH, Rome, July, 1981.
- (1982a 2ed.), *Principi di pianificazione regionale*, [Principles of Regional Planning] 2 vols., Angeli, Milano, 1982.
- (1982b), *Un nuovo progetto policentrico per Roma*, [A New Polycentric Design for Rome] Report to a Meeting of the Rome Province and the Club Rosselli on the theme: "L'area metropolitana e le grandi opere a Roma", [The Metropolitan Area and the Great Works in Rome] Rome 29-30 March, 1982.
- (1983a), *La politica della citta'*, [City Policy] in *Atti del XXIII Congresso Geografico Italiano*, Catania 9-13 May, 1983.

- Archibugi F. (1983b), *Quattro nodi interdipendenti per un piano di crescita metropolitana di Roma*, [Four Interdependent Nodes for a Plan of Metropolitan Growth in Rome] Intervention in the Meeting of the "Circolo di Roma" on the theme: "L'area metropolitana romana: un progetto per il 2000" [The Roman Metropolitan Area: A Project for the Year 2000], Protomoteca del Campidoglio, 9-10 Nov., 1983.
- (ed.) (1983-1987), *La programmazione della domanda di trasporto*, [Transport Demand Planning] in 2 vol., (Vari saggi del Progetto PRODOTRAS, nell'ambito del Progetto Finalizzato Trasporti del CNR [Various Essays for the PRODOTRAS Project in the context of the CNR Transport Project]), Centro di studi e piani economici, Roma, 1987.
- (1984a), "Un'autorita' metropolitana per Roma capitale" [A Metropolitan Authority for Rome Capital], in *Mondoperaio*, n. 4, April, 1984.
- (1984b), *La Programmazione universitaria in Italia: criteri e metodi di base*, [University Planning in Italy: Criteria and Basic Methodology] Centro di studi e piani economici, Rome, 1984.
- (1985), *Roma 2000: una proposta di assetto per il sistema metropolitano romano* [Rome 2000: A Proposal for the Organization of the Roman Metropolitan System], Lazio Ricerche n. 2, 1985.
- (1986), *La Politica dei Sistemi Urbani* [Urban Systems Policy (appendix: "Una proposta per il territorio italiano", [A Proposal for the Italian Territory]), Centro di studi e piani economici, Roma, 1986.
- (1987a), *Sistema Romano (n. 22): La "Grande Roma"*, in: *I sistemi urbani in Italia*, vol. 3: *Parte Seconda: B. I sistemi del Centro*, [Urban Systems in Italy, Vol. 3 Part 2: B. The Systems of the Centre] Centro di studi e piani economici, Roma, 1987.
- (1987b), *I Sistemi Urbani in Italia. Una proposta di riorganizzazione urbana e di riequilibrio territoriale e ambientale a livello nazionale*, [Urban Systems in Italy. A Proposal for Urban Reorganization and Territorial and Environmental Re-equilibrium at the National Level], Centro di studi e piani economici, Roma, 1987.
- (1989), *Une Politique Communautaire pour l'Amelioration de l'Environnement Urbain*, Rapport au Seminaire sur le meme sujet de la Communaute' Economique Europeenne, Avignon (18-20 decembre), 1989.
- Archibugi F. & S. Lombardini (ed.) (1963), *Piano economico e impresa pubblica*, [Economic Planning and Public Enterprise] Boringhieri, Torino, 1963.

- Argan G.C. (1964), *L'Europa delle capitali, 1600-1700*, [The Europe of Capitals 1600-1700] pp. 226, 1964.
- Bairoch P. (1977), *Population urbaine et taille des villes en Europe de 1600 a 1970: presentation de series statistiques*, in *Demographie urbaine XV-XX siecle*, Centre d'Histoire Economique et Sociale de la Region Lyonnaise, Lyon, 1977.
- Bartocchini F. (1985), *Roma nell'Ottocento. Il tramonto della "citta' santa". Nascita di una capitale*, [Rome in the Nineteenth Century. The Decline of the "Holy City". The Birth of a Capital] Bologna, 1985.
- Beguinet C. (cur.) (1986), *La citta' cablata. Un futuro per il presente* [The Wired City. A Future for the Present] IPIGET, Napoli, 1986.
- (cur.) (1987), *La citta' cablata. Lo stato dell'arte nella ricerca scientifica* [The Wired City. The State of the Art in Scientific Research] IPIGET, Napoli, 1987.
- (cur.) (1989), *La citta' cablata. Un'enciclopedia*, [The Wired City. An Encyclopaedia] IPIGET, Napoli, 1989.
- Beloch K.J. (1965 2ed.), *Bevolkerung geschichte Italicus, II: Die Bevolkerung der Kirchenstaates, Toskanas und der Herzogtumer am Po*, Berlin
- Benevolo L. (1960), *La conservazione dell'abitato antico di Roma* [The Conservation of the Antique Habitat in Rome], in L. Piccinato (ed.), *Problemi urbanistici di Roma*, [Urban Problems in Rome] Sperling & Kupfer, Milano, pp. 111-122, 1960.
- (1971), *Roma, da ieri a domani* [Rome, from Yesterday to Tomorrow], Bari, 1971.
- (1977), *Roma oggi*, [Rome Today], Bari, 1977.
- Berg L., van den, *et al.* (1982), *Urban Europe: A Study of Growth and Decline*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1982.
- Berube M.R. (1978), *The Urban University in America*, Greenwood Press, Westport (Connect.), 1978.
- Bird J.H. (1977), *Centrality and Cities*, Routledge, London, 1977.
- Bonetti A.M. (1896), *Venticinque anni di Roma capitale d'Italia e suoi precedenti*, [Twenty-five Years of Rome as Capital of Italy and Its Precedents] 2 vols., Roma, 1896.
- Borelli De Andreis G. (1938), *Le condizioni di vitalita' del quartiere della Esposizione Universale del 1942* [The Conditions of Vitality of the Quarter of the Universal Exposition of 1942], in *Atti del V Congresso nazionale di studi romani*, aprile (cit. in Guidoni, 1987, p. 53), 1938.
- Bortolotti L. (1988), *Roma fuori le mura. L'Agro romano da palude a metropoli* [Rome Beyond the Walls. The "Agro Romano" from Marsh to Metropolis], Laterza, Roma-Bari, 1988.
- Bottai G. (1936), "La prima Esposizione Universale di Roma" [The First

- Universal Exposition of Rome], in *Bollettino della Capitale*, ottobre, 1936.
- Brotchie J. *et al.* (eds.) (1985), *The Future of Urban Form*, Routledge, New York, 1985.
- Cabianca V. , "Roma: verso un sistema generale del verde", [Rome: Towards a General System of Greenery], in *Urbanistica*, n. 46-47,
- Calvesi M., E. Guidoni e S. Lux (cur.) (1987), *E42: utopia e scenario del regime* (II: Urbanistica, architettura, arte e decorazione) [E42: Utopia and Scenario of the Regime - II: Town-Planning, Architecture, Art and Decoration], Cataloghi Marsilio, Roma, 1987.
- Campos-Venuti G. (1960), "Il piano intercomunale del comprensorio romano" [The Intercommunal Plan of the Rome District], in *Urbanistica*, n. 31, luglio, 1960.
- Caracciolo A. (1956), *Roma capitale*, [Rome Capital], Editori Riuniti, Roma, 1956.
- Centro di studi e piani economici (1969), *Il traffico a Roma. Primi lineamenti di una nuova politica* [Traffic in Rome. First Outlines of a New Policy] (ed. by Pierluigi Sagona, presentation by Franco Archibugi), Etas-Kompass, Milano, 1969.
- (1971a), *Le proiezioni territoriali del Progetto '80: Ricerca e modelli di base*, [The Territorial Projections of "Progetto '80": Research and Basic Models] (3 volumes) Ministero del Bilancio e della Programmazione economica, Roma, 1971.
- (1971b), "Le proiezioni territoriali del Progetto 80" [The Territorial Projections of "Progetto '80" (Short Edition)], in *Urbanistica*, n. 57, Roma, 1971.
- Chandler T. & G. Fox (1974), *3000 Years of Urban Growth*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- Commission of the European Communities (1990), *Green Paper on the Urban Environment*, (Communication from the Commission to the Council and Parliament), Brussels, 1990.
- Comune di Roma (1957), *Proposta di Piano del CET* [CET Plan Proposal], (Comitato di elaborazione tecnica), Roma, 1957.
- (1958), *Studi per il Piano intercomunale* [Studies for the Intercommunal Plan], (Guidi, Lugli, Moretti e Rossi de' Paoli), 1958.
- (1959), *Piano regolatore generale* [General Town Plan] (adopted by CR 24 June), rejected by the "Cons. Sup. dei LLPP", 1959.
- (1962a), *Progetto di PRG* [Project of the PRG], (Fiorentino, Guidi, Lugli, Passarelli, Piccinato e Valori) 1962.
- (1962b), *Piano regolatore generale*, [Town Master Plan], 1962.
- (1966), *Il traffico a Roma. La situazione attuale e le previsioni fino al 1985*, [The Traffic in Rome. The Current Situation and Predictions up

- until 1985] Primo rapporto: maggio 1966, Secondo rapporto: febbraio 1968.
- (1967), *Variante generale al PRG* [General Variant to the PRG], 1967.
- (1973), *Relazione sul Piano regolatore*, [Report on the Town Plan], Roma, 1973.
- (1974), *Variante generale al PRG*, [General Variant to the PRG] agosto (adopted 1976).
- Ufficio del PRG (1974), *Studio di verifica e aggiornamento della rete di metropolitana prevista nel 1962* [Verification Study and Updating of the Metropolitan Network Planned in 1962] (in agreement with ATAC, STEFER, FFSS, Regione) 1974.
- (1981), *Delibera "Quadro"* ["Quadro" Resolution], 1981.
- (1983-86), *Studio di fattibilit  dello SDO* [Feasibility Study of the SDO] carried out by ISVEUR, ITALTEKNA, CONAO, COOPER-PROGETTI, 1983-86.
- (1984), *Piano Quadro del Sistema Direzionale Orientale* [Frame Plan of the East Directional System], maggio, 1984.
- Coppa M. (1960), *Roma senza cuore* [Rome Without a Heart], in L. Piccinato (cur.), *Problemi urbanistici di Roma*, [Urban Problems in Rome], Sperling & Kupfer, Milano, 1960, pp. 63-107.
- De Cupis C. (1903), *Saggio di bibliografia degli scritti e delle leggi sull'Agro Romano* [Example of a Bibliography of the Writings and Laws on the "Agro Romano"], Roma, *Supplemento*, 1926.
- Di Maio L. e I. Insolera (1986), *L'EUR e Roma dagli anni '30 al 2000*, [EUR and Rome from the '30s to 2000] Roma-Bari, 1986.
- Doxiadis C.A. (1968), *Ekistics: An Introduction to the Science of Human Settlement*, Hutchinson, London, 1968.
- Fara A. (1985), *La metropoli difesa* [The Metropolis Defended], Roma, 1985.
- Ferrarotti F. (1970), *Roma, da capitale a periferia*, [Rome, from Capital to Periphery] Laterza, Bari, 1970.
- Friz G. (1974), *La popolazione di Roma dal 1770 al 1900*, [The Population of Rome from 1770 to 1900], Roma, 1974.
- Frommel C.L. (1986), "Papal Policy: The Planning of Rome During the Renaissance", in *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 17, pp. 339-65, 1986.
- Gale D.E. (1985), *Gentrification in the UK: Toward an Anglo-American Research Agenda*, mimeo, The George Washington University, Washington DC, 1985.
- Garibaldi G. (1982), *Il progetto di deviazione del Tevere e di bonificazione dell'Agro romano*, [The Plan to Divert the Tiber and the Recovery of the "Agro Romano"] (ed. by A. Grattarola), s.d. (32 writings, talks and

- letters from 5-2-1875 al 25-11-1878), 1982.
- Gatti A. (1987), *Il disegno della citta'*, [The Design of the City], Kappa, Roma, 1987.
- Giannotti G (1934), "L'espansione di Roma verso i colli e verso il mare" [The Expansion of Rome Towards the Hills and Towards the Sea], in *Roma*, XII, pp. 9-20, 1934.
- (1935a), *La sistemazione urbanistica della zona tra Roma e il mare* [The Urban Organization of the Zone between Rome and the Sea], in *Atti*, del IV Congresso nazionale di studi romani, Roma, 1935.
- (1935b), "Il cammino di Roma verso il mare" [Rome's Way to the Sea] in *Quadrivio*, n. 2, 1935.
- (1936), "L'espansione dell'urbe verso il mare. Idee e proposte di S.E. Giovannoni" [The Expansion of the City towards the Sea. Ideas and Proposals by S. E. Giovannoni], in *Il popolo di Roma*, 24 ottobre, 1936.
- (1966), *L'analisi ecologica. Panorama della letteratura* [Ecological Analysis. Panorama of the Literature], (introd. by F. Archibugi), Centro di studi e piani economici, Boringhieri, Torino, 1966.
- Golzio V. (1971), *Palazzi romani dalla rinascita al neo-classico* [Roman Palaces from the Renaissance to the Neo-classical Period], Bologna, 1971.
- Grimaldi F. (1887), *Rome apres 1870*, Rome, 1887.
- Griseri A. (1967), *Le metamorfosi del barocco* [The Metamorphosis of the Baroque] Einaudi, Torino, 1967.
- Gross H. (1990), *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment. The Post- Tridentine Syndrome and the Ancien Regime*, Cambridge U.P., Cambridge (UK), (tr. it. *Roma nel Settecento*, Laterza, Roma Bari, 1990) 1990.
- Gruen V. (1973), *Center for the Urban Environment Survival of the Cities*, Litton Educ. Publ. (trad. it. Gorlich, Milano, 1975) 1973.
- Guidoni E. (1987), *L'E42, citta' della rappresentazione. Il progetto urbanistico e le polemiche sull'architettura*, [The E42, City of Representation. The Urban Project and the Controversies on Architecture], in Calvesi, Guidoni e Lux (1987).
- Hall P. & D. Hay (1980), *Growth Centres in the European Urban System*, Heinemann, London, 1980.
- Hellpach W. (1952), *Mensch und Volk der Grosstadt*, Enke, Stuttgart (trad. it. *L'uomo della metropoli*, Etas-Kompass, Milano, 1967) 1952.
- Hirschorn L. (1979), "The Urban Crisis: A Post-Industrial Perspective", in *Journal of Regional Science*, n. 19, 1979.
- Hohenberg P.M. and L. Hollen Lees (1985), *The Making of Urban Europe, 1000-1950*, Harvard U.P., Cambridge Mass., 1985.
- Insolera I. (1960), *Appunti per una storia urbanistica di Roma* [Notes for a

- Town-Planning History of Rome], in L. Piccinato (cur.), *Problemi urbanistici di Roma* [Urban Problems in Rome], Sperling & Kupfer, Milano, 1960.
- (1962), *Roma moderna, un secolo di storia urbanistica* [Modern Rome, A Century of Town Planning History], Torino (1971 2ed.)
- Intermetro Spa (1986), *Roma Capitale. Lineamenti di un progetto di rete metropolitana* [Rome Capital. Outlines of a Project for a Metropolitan Network], Roma, 1986.
- IRSPER/Istituto regionale di studi e ricerche per la Programmazione economica e territoriale (1984), *Roma e il suo hinterland*, Angeli, Milano, 1984.
- Krautheimer R. (1982), *Roma Alessandrina. The Remapping of Rome under Alexander VII, 1655-1667*, Poughkeepsie (N.Y.), 1982.
- Lugli P.M. (1983), *Una politica per i nuovi insediamenti nell'area romana* [A Policy for New Settlements in the Roman Area] Relazione al Convegno del Circolo di Roma sul tema: "L'Area metropolitana romana: un progetto per il 2000", [Report to the Meeting of the "Circolo di Roma" on the theme: "The Metropolitan Roman Area: A Project for the Year 2000] Protomoteca del Campidoglio, 9-10 novembre, 1983.
- (1986), "Analisi e prospettive di assetto dell'area romana" [Analysis and Prospects of the Organization of the Roman Area], in *Lazioricerche*, n. 2, pp. 3-20, 1986.
- Lynch K. (1960), *The Image of the City*, Cambridge, Mass., 1960.
- Mariani V. (1943), *L'Urbanistica dall'antichità ad oggi: l'Urbanistica nell'età barocca*, [Town-Planning from Antiquity to Today: Town-Planning in the Baroque Age], Sansoni, Firenze, 1943.
- (1963), *Le Chiese di Roma dal XVII al XVIII secolo*, [Rome Churches from the XVII to XVIII Century], Bologna, 1963.
- Mitscherlich A. (1970), *Psychanalyse et Urbanisme* (Response aux planificateurs), trad. fr. di M. Jacob, Paris, 1970.
- Nijkamp P. & U. Schubert (1985), *Urban Dynamics*, in J. Brotchie *et al.* (1985)
- Nisco A. (1878), *Roma prima e dopo il 1870* [Rome before and after 1870], Roma, 1878.
- OECD (1990), *Environmental Policies for Cities in the 1990s*, OECD, Paris, 1990
- Orlando P. (1941), *Alla conquista del mare di Roma* [To the Conquest of the Sea], Roma, 1941.
- Patraccone C. (1979), *Le città italiane dal 1860 a oggi* [The Italian Cities from 1860 to Today], Loescher, Torino, 1979.
- Pazienti M. (1987), "Una strategia di intervento per l'area romana" [An Intervention Strategy for the Roman Area], in *Lazioricerche*, n. 2,

- pp.17-20, 1987.
- Perodi E. (1895), *Roma italiana 1870-1895* [Italian Rome 1870-1895], Roma, 1895.
- Pesci U. (1907), *I primi anni di Roma capitale (1870-1878)* [The First Years of Roma as Capital 1870-1878], Firenze, 1907.
- Piacentini M. (1936), "L'Esposizione Universale dell'anno ventesimo e la piu' grande Roma del piano imperiale" [The Universal Exposition of 20th Century and Greater Rome of the Imperial Plan], in *Il Giornale d'Italia*, 14 ottobre, 1936.
- Piazzo P. (1982), *Roma: la crescita metropolitana abusiva* [Rome: Illegal Metropolitan Growth], Officina, Roma, 1982.
- Piccinato L. (1928), *Idee e linee fondamentali per un Piano regolatore di Roma* [Ideas and Fundamental Lines for a Rome Town Plan], in *Atti del I Convegno degli studi romani*, 1928.
- (cur.) (1960), *Problemi urbanistici di Roma* [Town-Planning Problems in Rome], Sperling & Kupfer, Milano, 1960.
- Portoghesi P. (1980), "Ma l'uomo occidentale ha gia' una medicina: tanti piccoli satelliti", [But the Western Man already has the medicine: lots of small satellites], in *La Repubblica*, Dossier; le nuove citta'; quel male oscuro chiamato metropoli, 6 settembre, 1980.
- (1989), *10 idee per cambiare Roma*, [Ten Ideas for Changing Rome] Opuscolo elettorale, 1989.
- Pred A.R. (1977), *City-Systems in Advanced Economies*, Wiley, New York, 1977.
- (1980), *Urban Growth and City-Systems in the US*, Harvard U.P., Cambridge, Mass., 1980.
- Quarra A. (1982), *Urbanistica per il verde pubblico*, [Town Planning for Public Greenery], USPR, Documenti, n. 4, Roma, 1982.
- Rapoport A. (1977), *Human Aspects of Urban Form*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1977.
- Rava L. (1932), "Giuseppe Garibaldi e Alfredo Baccarini per la sistemazione del Tevere urbano e la bonifica dell'Agro romano", [G.G and A.B. for the Systemisation of the Tiber and the Reclamation of the 'Agro Romano'], in *Rivista storica del Risorgimento*, luglio-settembre, 1932.
- Regione Lazio (Comitato regionale per la programmazione) e IRSPEL (Istituto regionale di studi e ricerche per la programmazione economica e territoriale) (1980), *Quadro di riferimento per la Programmazione regionale. Studi preparatori. Rapporto Generale* [Frame of Reference for Regional Planning. Preparatory Studies. General Report], Roma, aprile
- Rodwin L. (1956), *The British New Towns Policy*, Harvard U.P.,

- Cambridge, Mass., 1956.
- Rossi A. (1966), *L'architettura della città* [The Architecture of the City], Marsilio, Padova, 1966.
- Ruffolo G. (1973), *Rapporto sulla Programmazione* [Report on Planning], Laterza, Bari, 1973.
- (1985), *La Qualità sociale. Le vie dello sviluppo*, [Social Quality, The Roads to Development], Laterza, Bari, 1985.
- Samperi P. (1986), *Strumenti urbanistici e trasporti metropolitani: il caso romano* [Urban Instruments and Metropolitan Transport: The Roman Case], in Intermetro Spa, *Roma Capitale. Lineamenti di un progetto di rete metropolitana*, Roma, 1986.
- Sbrana C., R. Traina e E. Sonnino (1977), *Gli "Stati delle anime" a Roma dalle origini al secolo XVII. Origini, consistenze, contenuti* [The "States of Mind" in Rome from the Origins to the 17th Century. Origins, Consistencies, Contents], Roma, 1977.
- Schmal H. (ed.) (1981), *Patterns of European Urbanization since 1500*, Croom Helm, London, 1981.
- Silvagni U. (1895), *Le vicende di Roma durante 25 anni. Appunti economico-edilizi* [Roman Events during 25 Years. Economic-Construction Notes], Roma, 1895.
- Simmel G. (1903), *Die Grosstädte und das Geistesleben*, in *Jahrbucher der Gehestiftung*, tome 9, Dresden, 1903.
- (1922), "Rom, eine aesthetische Analyse", in *Zur Philosophie der Kunst*, Kiepenheuer, Postdam (pp. 17-28), 1922.
- Simoncini G. (1990), *"Roma restaurata". Rinnovamento urbano al tempo di Sisto V*, [Rome Restored. Urban Renewal in the Time of Sextus V], Olschki, Firenze, 1990.
- Sombart W. (1888), *Die Roemische Campagna. Eine Sozial-oelkonomische Studie*, Leiprig, 1888.
- Sutcliffe A. (1981), *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the US and France 1780-1914*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1981.
- Testa V. (1929), *La costruzione di un quartiere lineare a Roma* [The Construction of a Linear Quarter in Rome], in *Atti del I Congresso nazionale di studi romani*, Roma, 1929.
- Tomassetti G. (1910-1926), *La campagna romana, antica, medioevale e moderna*, [The Roman 'Campagna', Ancient, Medieval and Modern], 4 voll., Loescher, Roma, 1910-1926.
- Valenti G. (1890), "A proposito della crisi edilizia nella città di Roma", in *Giornale degli Economisti*, vol. V, fasc. 3, 1890.
- Vittorini M. (1984), "Un nuovo Piano regolatore per Roma" [A New Town-Plan for Rome], in *Mondoperaio*, aprile, pp. 39-42, 1984.
- (1986), "Un nuovo piano per Roma capitale", in *Roma, Parigi, New*

York. Quale urbanistica per la metropoli? etc. [Rome, Paris, New York,. What Town-Planning for the Metropolis?] Gangemi, Roma, 1986.

Zevi B. (1971 2ed.), *Saper vedere l'urbanistica, etc.* [How to See Town-Planning], Einaudi, Roma, 1971.

FURTHER READING

Chapter 5

Mc Kay J.P., *Tramways and Trolleys: The Rise of Urban Mass Transit in Europe*, Princeton U.P., Princeton, 1976.

Portoghesi P., *Roma un'altra citta'* [Rome another City], Roma, 1968, pp. 341.

----- "L'immagine della citta'" [The Image of the City], (interview), in *Mondoperaio*, dicembre 1987.

Quaroni L., "Socialismo urbano. Che cosa e'? Una buona ricetta scandinava" ["Urban Socialism. What is it? A Good Scandinavian Recipe], in *La Repubblica*, dossier: Le nuove citta'. Quel male oscuro chiamato metropoli, [The New Cities. That Obscure Evil called the Metropolis], 6 settembre.

USPE (Comune di Roma), *Roma in cifre. Rapporto 1987 sulla citta'* [Rome in Figures. 1987 Report on the City], Roma 1988.