

**XXI AESOP Conference**  
**Naples, July 11-15 2007**

Track:4-4: Spatial planning and economic development

***The multilevel systemic consistency  
of urban planning:  
a tool for the European 'cohesion policy'***

by  
*Franco Archibugi*

**Part II**

*Contents*

**4. A tentative proposal of spatial reorganisation (by 'urban system') in the four countries studied**

***4.1 Premises: meaning and limits of the formulated scenario of urban reorganisation.***

As we have said repeatedly, the research has been oriented towards the provision of a first attempt at a *re-organization of urban land use* in Europe, in spirit by the application of the findings, on the theme of 'optimal centrality' in the territories of the four countries studied. This first attempt has had the exclusive objective of a definition of the operational framework of the urban policy, through a re-organization of the centralities that bears in mind the two following goals:

1. Elimination of the possible overloads of the centralities acquired by the great cities;

Modes of acquisition of a optimal centrality (city effect) for the medium-to-small sized cities;

This scenario has been proposed as an example of the future work to be developed, *with more care and attention*, inspired by the criteria, principles and indicators of optimal centrality emergent in the research in question.

The structural and morphological diversity of the urban framework of the four countries studied are well-known and have been largely treated by geographical

and town planning literature,<sup>1</sup> even including many studies promoted by the European Commission<sup>2</sup>. Here, we will make a summary based on the analysis of our research referring to individual national reports.

What emerges immediately is the great diversity in the relationship between the national territory *as a whole* and the distribution, on the same territory, of the *urbanised areas*.

a. For *France*

For France, the territorial distribution of the non-urbanised areas is the largest in absolute terms, and the concentration level of those urbanised areas is, equally, the largest<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, keeping in mind the level of critical demographic mass (valid for any country and any kind of urbanisation) which the research has highlighted in order to obtain an acceptable level of urban life (i.e. the *city effect* or *cityness*) a strategy of territorial reorganisation, in terms of territorial redistribution of urbanisation, seems destined to meet the largest obstacles, i.e. the greatest historical "impediments". These obstacles can be so large as to suggest that we introduce into the general logic developed in our research (the logic of the urban system, i.e. some territorial units sufficient for all superior urban services) the idea that a certain amount of the territory must necessarily be denied a systemic functionality. This land must be considered a "no mans land", reserved almost exclusively for natural and historical/cultural conservation, but not annexed to any existent or programmed urban system.

This suggestion would evidently contrast with the general logic of the research (that of an urban systems policy) but it would be an almost obligatory solution, adapted to the peculiar characteristics of the French territory. The scenario, however, whereby large portions of the French territory would be abandoned, would create, in any case, other difficulties from another point of view. Such difficulties emerge from the fact that we would force an exodus of the population still settled in these areas (in order to ensure even to this population an acceptable level of urban life).

An alternative – of which the French report shows a scenario – is to imagine some of these as urban systems, with little towns within wider and deserted territories which are most critical in terms of the relationship between catchment area and accessibility. Hence, these systems can achieve their difficult take-off

---

<sup>1</sup> A selective reference could be made to: Mainardi (1973); Hall and Hay (1980) Cheshire et al. (1987 and 1989), Burtenshaw et al. (1991); Kunzmann and Wegener (1991), Rautsi, ed. (1993), van den Berg, et al. (1982, 1998), European Institute of Urban Affairs (1992).

<sup>2</sup> European Commission, 1991, 1994, 1996, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> In regard to those of comparable European countries, the French urban framework remains characterized by the weight of the Capital (with a ratio 7 to 1 between Paris' population and that of Lyons, second city of France), by the relative weakness of the regional 'metropoles' (which do not reach, for ex., the size of Milan, Monaco, Birmingham, or Barcelona) and by the regularity of the dissemination of the medium and small towns. The prevailing model is that of urban multi-municipal agglomerations in rural environment, whilst the conurbations or greater zones urbanized are very rare. (See DATAR, 1988).

only much later in the future, and are defined by their uncertain consistency and difficulty with which they are implemented.

An analogous situation to the French one does not exist in any of the other three countries examined <sup>4</sup>(except for some areas of very limited dimensions: for example, Scotland and some areas of Wales in Great Britain, and the Mezzogiorno in Italy). These areas – even if more limited in size – have reproduced the scarce acceptability of the relationship between catchment-area /accessibility. However, their most important limitation renders the presence of an urban system of doubtful consistency and implementability, but more acceptable in this scenario, which reduces them in absolute number and postpones them for the future.

b. for *Great Britain*

Thus Great Britain – like France – is marked by the urban hyper-concentration of the capital region in comparison to the rest of the national territory, with all of the connected and well-known problems that derive from this.<sup>5</sup> Given its minor territorial extension, however, Great Britain did register the existence of other wider areas of metropolitan conurbation, such as that of the West Midlands and the Northwest which, even at different scales, show this same problem of hyper-congestion. Consequently, the adoption of the same kind of strategy as the London area is suggested. The minor territorial extension of the country, furthermore, makes the infra-systemic accessibility problems less difficult (for those urban systems that are territorially “forced”, present in Great Britain).

c. for *Germany*

In Germany, conversely, a strongly balanced scenario (in the sense of the criteria and principles elaborated in our research) of urban structure was already offered at the outset. This balance could possibly be improved only for the conurbated regions of the Ruhr, (and even here it presents some performance indicators superior to that which we would expect, thanks to the good policy control of environmental impact which is practiced in that country).

However, problems could be created for the Berlin area if its development, re-launched after the reunification of the country, would not be in the spirit of equilibrium criteria and polycentrism suggested in this research. As a whole, we cannot avoid thinking that the relative balance of the German urban framework

---

<sup>4</sup> Even if it can be reproduced, with even more extreme manifestations, in other countries of the Union like Spain or Sweden.

<sup>5</sup> In both countries, the relations between the Capital and the rest of the countries has been the subject of a vast literature that certainly we will not evocate here: we will mention – for France - only the well-known work of Francois Gravier on 'Paris and the French Desert', from which started a good deal of the efforts of the French regional and territorial policy in the last fifty years; and – for Great Britain – a historically resuming essay by B.Robson (1986) 'London versus the rest' (1890-1980). Less radical assessments, but nonetheless explicit, on the subject can be found in Simmie, ed. (1984), Cuthbert (1986), European Commission (1996), Hall and Hay (1980).

could have been an important factor in the elevated performances in this country in the last decades.

d. for *Italy*

Italy presents two very different situation regarding the urban framework, one in the centre/north of the country and the other in the Mezzogiorno. In the centre/north, the situation of the distribution of the urban structure is similar to that of Germany but it is also stongly altered by the development of a "Milanese conurbation" which has the possibility to involve even Turin and the rest of Piedmont. This situation risks reproducing the same problems of imbalance felt in France and Great Britain, at territorial scales closer to the British than the French. A policy and strategy of strengthening the urban systems in this area of the country could have the effect of improving the situation and thus averting the risk mentioned above.

In the Mezzogiorno, on the contrary, the starting scenario of the urban structure is more similar to the French one, even if at a reduced territorial scale. There is a hyper-centralisation and congestion of the conurbated area of the "capital", Naples, and its metropolitan hinterland,<sup>6</sup> and a relative "desert" interrupted by some relatively important urban centres such as Palermo, Catania and Bari. However, in the Italian case, the territorial dimension of the peninsula renders the accessibility of the 'desert' less grave than in France, and the problems connected to the creation of alternative urban systems, therefore, are less insoluble.

From an examination of the distribution of existent urbanisation and the most evident problems in the four countries, the study suggested a strategy (and a consequent scenario) for the territorial urban reorganisation in each, supported by many statistical relationships among urban density and territorial surface, which we will recall only in the large scale.

Anyhow it is still propitious to recall that the statistical data from which we can extract these statistical relationships is strongly conditioned by the statistical base used; that is, the administrative statistical units in every country. Normally they correspond very rarely to the appropriate units for data collecting, measuring and planning which our research has emphasised, and for which a pre-definition is indispensable in giving a more meaningful sense to the discourse on urbanisation, de-urbanisation, sub-urbanisation and even counter-urbanisation that we are currently making.

Data that is more meaningful, in this sense, could be obtained in two different (but converging) ways:

---

<sup>6</sup> As known, for centuries Naples was, after London and Paris, the most densely-populated city in Europe, and in the same time also the Capital of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (corresponding to the present 'Mezzogiorno'). This role has been performed by Naples for a time much longer in the history than the 'modern' one (begun only with the unification of the country at the end of the past century). At the epoch of the creation of the Italian State (1970), Naples' population was three times greater than the Rome's. (Archibugi, 1995a and 2005)

- the creation of homogenous (and therefore, comparable) units of data collecting on a European scale. Even the urban system suggested by the proposed scenario could already be a good statistical base, for measuring urbanisation, which could furnish more meaningful data than that currently in use;
- territorial data collecting of some localised phenomena (for example, residential areas and even all types of natural or anthropic resources) through information and/or telematic technologies (satellites, etc.) which scholars, on behalf of their committed institutions, still have difficulty accessing despite the incredible progress of the technology.<sup>7</sup>

#### ***4.2 The historical national context of the new urban system policy***

##### *a. The French Case*

The proposal of reorganisation that concerns the French territory is strongly conditioned by the old, but recalcitrant, problem of the imbalance between Paris and the rest of France. Successive spatial policies in France (overall, those that have been carried out by DATAR),<sup>8</sup> have been dominated by this problem and have always constituted a response to it (even if of different and sometimes opposite natures).

Thus during the 1950s and 1960s, France started a policy of *metropoles d'équilibre* (metropolises of equilibrium). This policy has been an attempt to strengthen the larger French cities peripheral to Paris,<sup>9</sup> and to make each a pole of attraction for a wide territory, therefore mitigating the attraction capacity of Paris in respect to their own territories.

This policy – together with other initiatives of decentralisation funded by public and private investment – registered some results in the first period after the Second World War (established by the French team report as the three decades between 1945 and 1975). The growth of the Paris region (*Ile-de-France*) compared with the rest of the country registered some rhythmic decline and some negative migration-balances were even registered. The creation of new jobs permitted a superior proportion of families, which otherwise would have migrated to Paris, to remain in the area of the *metropoles d'équilibre*. But even if some success in development took place due to the expansion of the industrial

---

<sup>7</sup> On this point, the European Commission and particularly DGXII, in cooperation with other sectors of the Commission (other DGs, Eurostat, and the Environment agency), could do very much .

<sup>8</sup> Of which there is an appropriate critical panorama in the French national report of the research [PSC (1996), vol, I-B, *France*, para 2.2). The DATAR (*Délégation à l'Aménagement du Territoire et à l'Action Regionale*, since 2005 changed as DIACT, *Délégation interministérielle pour l'Aménagement et la Compétitivité des Territoires*) has been the historic agency of the French government where all hypotheses of a national land use and physical planning have passed (among a vast production of documents, see particularly: 1971, 1974 a e b, 1977, 1993, 1994.

<sup>9</sup> It was a matter of six metropolises: Lyon, Marseilles, Strasbourg, Nantes, Toulouse and Bordeaux.

investment (on which the government had some ruling influence with its regional policy), it has been contrasted by the nature of the tertiary revolution in employment which, being based on urban development, always had Paris as the privileged seat of the effective settlements.

In fact, in the field of urban development and its centrality, the policy of the *metropoles d'équilibre* did not have the same success as the decentralised industrial investments. The hinterlands of these *metropoles* were too vast to make a real shift of their gravitation from Paris to the new *metropoles* possible. Being definitely larger than a "daily size", the hinterlands of the *metropoles* continued to gravitate towards Paris with the same difficulties and distortions (but also with the same advantageous reasons) as before.

Thus the French policy became aware of this scarce 'city effect', competitive with respect to Paris, in the *metropoles d'équilibre* policy and also of the impoverishment that the concentration of public effort in the *metropoles* had on the medium and small cities of the general French hinterland.<sup>10</sup> Thus the French policy of *metropoles d'équilibre* has been integrated (according to some) or shifted (according to others) into a policy of the *villes moyennes* (from 20,000 to 100,000 residents). Thus a policy of assistance and promotion of this new territorial unit has been inaugurated; a policy which, although wishing to be integrative to that of the *metropoles d'équilibre*, in practice sings the requiem of the old policy because the new one creates systemic conditions contrasting to its success. In reality, a policy aimed at satisfying everyone (at the territorial level) has been set up, but it is unable to satisfy anyone because the policies annul each other due to a lack of systemic consistency.

On the other hand, the intermediary cities were not sufficient to satisfy the condition of urbanity or city effect, even if they were strongly aided by investment in infrastructure and economic privilege. Their sizes, mainly the size of their catchment areas, were too modest to stimulate an increase of the superior services that contribute to the city effect. If the policy of the *metropoles d'équilibre* was wrong because of territorial excess (which, as we know,<sup>11</sup> impeded the daily accessibility), the policy of the *villes moyennes* was wrong by territorial deficit of catchment area (which impeded the birth of appropriate superior services). The stalemate between the two policies, and the "spontaneity" that followed from it, could not but continue to privilege the Parisian area.

If, in some way, a "decentralisation" of Paris has occurred over time, it has occurred not from political and rational choice, and not with benefit of a more balanced development of the urban structure of the country, but from the natural "spillover" of the local overloading; transferring the problems of the overcharging from the core of the metropolitan city to its peripheries.

After the 'Yom Kippur war' in the mid 1970s, all over France the hope of governing development collapsed. As a result, in the peculiar zone of French

---

<sup>10</sup> Impoverishment has been manifest through the loss of efficiency of those intermediary services already in place in the small and medium centres.

<sup>11</sup> See chapter 5 of the quoted research book on the concept of the "urban system", and chapter 12 on "the requirements of the *modern city* (or urban system)".

territorial policy, the re-conquest of the concentration of Paris against any foolish aspiration of re-equilibrium occurred.

The institutional-regional strengthening – which had a certain effect in this period – has served to remove certain responsibilities for choices concerning territorial ordering from the national level. It served to make any decision even more decentralised – and, in this case, more chaotic. The problem of an urban policy, essentially a problem of a re-equilibrium if the city effect at the scale of the national territory (overall in countries such as France, that are strongly unbalanced under this profile), has become a regional problem, meaning that it has been cancelled as a problem.

The problems of an international and European “competitiveness” have contributed to the creation of the basis for a theoretical justification of the *laissez faire* of the Parisian hyper-concentration. Some problems of “prestige” and “grandeur”, together with the presumed greater competitive effectiveness (at the international scale) of the large dimensions, justified the concentration of the *Grands Travaux* in Paris and the research of a “European function” (all of which, furthermore, do not seem necessarily to derive from gigantism).

As has been expressed with efficacy in the report of the French team, having ascertained the failure (but we prefer to say the “lack”) of any kind of typology of urban policy of the past period, the debate on urban policy at the national scale<sup>12</sup> has presently been re-launched.

The many positions that, of course, are in contrast to each other are grouped into two models of policy: the first favours the concentration of effort into places that already show a certain competitive capacity; the other favours the establishment of objective standards and thresholds to assure access to urban values for the entire territory.<sup>13</sup> In reality – beyond the verbal and conceptual counter-positions that can also have a seductive value – the deepest arguments to support one position or another do not seem as distant as the counter-positions would induce us to believe. On the contrary, these arguments seem to bring an integration of concepts from which to draw the basis of less superficial policies.

For instance, those who support the efficacy of concentrated effort are right when they assert the need for strategic localisation, that is, when they research an efficiency-size for the territorial units on which to found a new urban policy. They promote the large cities, because they research just the “city effect”,<sup>14</sup> without

---

<sup>12</sup> A comprehensive vision of this debate comes from the papers collected as proceedings of the symposium, *Metropoles e Amenagement du Territoire*, organized in 1993 by Laurif (Laurif, 1993).

<sup>13</sup> Frankly, the present debate does not seem so different from that which dominated all the history of the French *amenagement du territoire*, mainly in the 1960s and 1970s. It seems impossible that among the present authors of this debate, any historical memory of the prior debate could be turned off. The Datar and its archives are yet still in existence! This historical memory would serve to avoid having the same superficialities repeated, and to supersede them in a dialectic way, with the sure advantage of a designed solution and of the new policy outlines to adopt.

<sup>14</sup> They research such an effect, competitive even at a European level (with an insuppressible national prejudice behind the intention); aside from the fact that it is not clear what the European level could be, and in what respect the attention to European competitiveness would be different in nature (and would need to be researched in a different way) from the competitiveness of cities at the national scale. It is, moreover, no easier to understand why the city effect lost or not acquired

which the decentralisation policy would file its goals itself and the means invested in this operation would be wasted.

However, those who support the desirability of assuring a minimum threshold of accessibility to urban services for all citizens and, at the same time, try to valorise all the territorial resources of the country are also right.<sup>15</sup> It is a question of seeing if it is possible to do both of these two things in an efficient way, i.e. a way capable of achieving its objectives. Otherwise there is only a waste of means.

In both cases, it is necessary to *go beyond*, and fix the threshold of feasibility of the two policies. This is the direction in which a recent French law<sup>16</sup> has gone, asking for a reorganisation of the urban equilibrium through the creation of certain “life basins“ (*bassin de vie*) composed of urban networks, which seem to be roughly similar in their criteria to the “urban systems” postulated by this research. And, in fact, this is even the effort and direction towards which the first steps of our research has been made.

Therefore, in this case we do not have, as in other cases which have been politically debated or are present in the town planning literature, a solution corresponding only to one of the two positions discussed above. We need only evaluate which configuration must be carried out for the concentration of territorial systems to be created, and the number of territorial units that offers the best requirements to make both positions feasible.

Thus our research has attempted to propose a “system” of urban systems, capable of satisfying the aforementioned requirements.

Leaving aside the level of the general discussion, we must transfer the discussion to the proposed scenarios and to eventual alternative scenarios in search of that which responds better to the pre-defined goals, which are goals that associate, rather than divide, many positions.

#### b. The *British Case*

The proposal of reorganisation concerning the British territory has been strongly conditioned – as in the French case – by the presence of the greater

---

at the national scale would be less undesirable than that lost or not acquired at the international scale.

<sup>15</sup> This seems to be the official inspiration of a “low orientation for the territorial planning and development” (of February 1995) that established; a) that a national plan to be prepared would assure that any point of the territory would be at a distance no more than 50 km from a highway or from a TGV station, starting from 2015; b) that 65% of the public scientific researchers, the health, cultural and university services, and the networks with an advanced capacity of communication, etc. would be located outside of the *Ile-de-France*, starting from 2005. The law of 1995 established that a “national scheme of territorial planning” (to be presented to the parliament within a year) should be prepared, introducing a notion of *bassin de vie* as the territorial unit of reference, organized by village (for the rural areas) and by urban network. A first draft of the scheme defined the agreement of the multiplicity of actors of the territorial action. For the moment, the approval of a correct scheme has been postponed. See the report of the French team (PSC ,1996, Vol I-B, France).

<sup>16</sup> See previous note.

London conurbation,<sup>17</sup> which goes far beyond “Greater London” (represented by the territory of the county) and extends even into many other nearby counties of the southeast. But Great Britain is different from France, as we have said, in that it must also “depolarise” the other conurbations of the West Midlands (Birmingham) and the northwest (Manchester-Liverpool), which have become excessive from the point of view of the environmental equilibrium.

Taking a glance at the British initiative in the matter of organisation (and reorganisation) of the territory,<sup>18</sup> we must recognise that this may be the country in which a *vision of the problem of the urban policy at a national scale* is more absent than in any of the others examined. Not only is there no national spatial plan (a *lacuna* which is also common in all the other countries examined), but there has never been any attempt to present the problem of a comprehensive vision of urban development and of urban “structure” at the scale of the entire island, as we will see later has occurred in France, Germany and Italy.

There has also not been a meaningful initiative on this matter in Great Britain, even at the regional level (which, according to circumstances here discussed, would not be the appropriate level for the urban re-equilibrium policy).<sup>19</sup> The *Regional Economic Planning Councils* (which were working between 1964 & 1979) were consultative bodies which created regions of jurisdictional territories without much advance study of the delimitations. Furthermore, in the 1980s and 1990s, regional planning was carried forward from the “*Regional Planning Guidance*” published by the national government (Dept. of Environment) into areas normally larger than countries, traditionally entitled to produce “structure plans”. But even in this case the “regional planning guidance” has never faced the problems of urban policy at the general level.

*Structure plans*, in fact, have been the best known and most practiced instruments for spatial planning in Great Britain. Even if they have never been integrated and guided by a policy of urban re-equilibrium at a national scale, these structure plans nevertheless represent the most well-known, consolidated and acknowledged bases for the implementation of spatial planning. This is the scale most close to that of the urban system as conceived by us. Therefore, in elaborating the scenario of spatial urban reorganisation for Great Britain, our attempt tried to retain the territorial delimitations of the countries (as defined in the last reform of 1974). However, in certain cases our conception of the urban system as producer of the city effect obliged us to put centres belonging to

---

<sup>17</sup> Even British history has been dominated by the relation between London and “the rest”. The capital has always been considered a factor of impoverishment of regional human resources, despite (and perhaps even causing) the strong, independence-oriented, Celtic national spirit (Irish, Welsh and Scottish). In the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, at the heart of the Elizabethan era, Sir Francis Bacon, as public administrator, once said that there were more Welsh in London than in Wales, and this was much more than just a joke.

<sup>18</sup> See on this subject, the report of the British team (PSC, 1996), paragraph 3.2.

<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, in Great Britain there are no “regions” that have a political autonomy and elected officials like the other countries examined, and this probably has weakened the capacity to develop a spatial policy at that level. (In any case, this would not be the appropriate level, as said.) However, the last opinion could be considered somewhat arbitrary in light of what has happened in the other countries.

different countries together into an urban system (where the urban fabric has been thinner). In fact, this has happened when an individual country was too weak and too far from the critical mass required for the urban system.

*c. The German Case*

As said, among all the countries examined, Germany is the one that presents the most equilibrated territorial distribution of the urban centrality. There is a confluence of factors for this greater equilibrium, which are:

- *historical* (belated unification of many city-states or city-regions into a unique German state.)<sup>20</sup>
- *geomorphic* (vast territories of plains, which seems the ideal situation to test the theorems of the theoretical models of spatial interaction.)<sup>21</sup>
- *spatial planning* (Germany was the country that before any other – from the time of the Weimar Republic – introduced a system of territorial ordering at different scales: national, regional and local, in a co-ordinated and comprehensive vision.)<sup>22</sup>

It was therefore also the “easiest” country for us in our attempt to experiment with and concretely verify the research hypotheses which the indicators selected.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, as said, the old habit of controlling territorial organisation has meant that more than once in the administrative history of Germany there have been examples of policy-oriented evaluations of the appropriate urban regions. The last, and most significant, was the “Federal Territorial Planning Programme” (*Bundesraumordnungsprogramm*) of 1975, which formulated the distribution in the territory of a number of “territorial basins” (*Gebietseinheiten*), defined according to the following criteria:

---

<sup>20</sup> A belated unification that, despite all contrary Bismarckian and Hitlerian efforts, has made Germany as a country “naturally” federalist and thus, on the territorial level, more equilibrated with respect to the hyper-concentration of power and functions of the Capitals, when compared to the French and British cases.

<sup>21</sup> I believe it is not by chance that the spatial interaction theories (from Von Thunen to Alfred Webber, through to Christaller) found the most favourable breeding ground in Germany; and that Christaller would have very easily found the experimentation field for his theory in the Baden-Wurtemberg: as a German, “Christaller” was certainly more of a “realist” than an Italian or British “Christaller” would have been.

<sup>22</sup> This without considering that Germany was also the cradle – at the end of the last century – of town planning. The American (Daniel Burnham and Geo B.Ford), British (Thomas Adam and Raymond Unwin), Belgian (Ch.Buls) and, later on, French and Italian town planners have drawn from the first German scholars of the *stadtbau* (Reinhard Baumeister, Joseph Stuebber, Camillo Sitte, Theodor Goecke and many others), in order to develop the town planning discipline in their respective countries. (Naturally this was pushed by the urgent need to manage the considerable growth around the turn of the century, which is a phenomenon common to all these countries). For all these evaluations, and others, see Archibugi (1995a).

<sup>23</sup> We have also been lucky in that the German research group was made up of experts from the Federal Institute for Regional Research and Spatial Planning, which has long since collected and analysed the data on the territorial distribution of socio-economic phenomena, thus including those definable as “urban” according to the criteria developed here.

- a unification of the functional areas;
- each basin contained at least one centre of a high order or an area of agglomeration;
- the most extended areas, without a centre of a high order or an area of agglomeration but which contained at least 500,000 inhabitants, were declared territorial basins with the goal of developing a strong centre (in our terminology, a centre “to be polarised”);

The programme was obviously aimed at reducing the differences of urban living conditions (economic, social, etc., amongst which therefore was the city effect) between all the territorial basins thus identified. These basins, therefore, assumed the characteristics of appropriate basins of evaluation and planning.<sup>24</sup>

The 1975 Federal Programme did not last long. From a certain point of view it could be called a failure (like almost all highly innovative programmes, in any place or of any type).<sup>25</sup> But this programme is very similar to the effort made in this research to provide “strong” guidelines for the territorial reorganisation of the urban framework of the countries under examination according to common principles and criteria able to constitute the platform for a new European policy of the city. The following observation in the German group’s report (mentioned at the end of the paragraph above) seems to us very wise and appropriate: regarding the German Programme of 1975, [it]

...was an ambitious attempt to minimise the social costs of functional differentiation and spatial segregation of industrial societies but it never got practical importance. However, the strategic ideas of the decentral concentration of resources in developing centres and axes influenced the development and establishment of the regional planning objectives and strategies on the Länder level during the '70s. They are mirrored in the following programmes and plans on different planning levels.

The conception to which we have limited ourselves in the pursuit of this research leads us to say that this is not at all a failure, but rather a success. And it is properly such a success that we hope to achieve with the proposals in this research.

In any case, we must recall that at the beginning of the 1990s, the Federal Ministry responsible for spatial planning introduced guidelines for spatial planning (*Raumordnungspolitischer Orientierungsrahmen*) which were agreed to by the *Länder*. These guidelines refer to planning as an open process and – according to some colleagues – avoided the concreteness on the 1975 *Bundesraumordnungsprogramm*. They provide objectives and strategies for the spatial development of a unified Germany.

However, in our research we have considered this guideline too weak with respect to the older programme, and incapable of implementing an inversion of

---

<sup>24</sup> More information on the Federal Regional Planning Programme of 1975 is in the report of the German group (PSC (1996), vol. I-B, Germany).

<sup>25</sup> See the report of the German group (PSC (1996), paragraph 3.1 for some explanations given immediately by some authors for the failure of this program.

the trend of a hierarchical distribution of the urban effect in the entire German territory.

#### d. The *Italian Case*

In Italy, as in Germany, there is a history of attempts at territorial planning on a national scale. It is known as *Progetto '80*, a document prepared in 1969 by the Budget and Economic Planning Ministry, in anticipation of the Second National Development Plan 1971-1975 (which was then literally suppressed, as was any form of serious pluriennial planning). The official *Progetto '80* document was accompanied by a study called *Territorial Projections of Progetto '80*, in which the concept of "metropolitan" systems was introduced in a similar way to what is here called "urban systems".

This document proposed that the national territory be reorganised into 30 "metropolitan systems" differing in nature and quality, in an attempt to combat the overloading of some "metropolitan" areas in Italy (e.g. the Milan-Turin-Genoa triangle that is strongly conurbated and deserves the name of "megalopolis", and the metropolitan areas of Rome and Naples, which are strongly monocentric and likewise destined to undergo higher levels of congestion and environmental malaise). The *Progetto '80* projections were decidedly "normative", and the document proposed to indicate the feasible operational modalities that did not aggravate the gravitation towards metropolitan areas and, additionally, the potential conditions needed in order for the small and medium-sized cities of the Italian hinterland to also reach values of "metropolitan" life, i.e. the city effect or cityness that has been the subject of our research and the theme of this paper at multinational scale.

At the time, the way *Progetto '80* suggested of achieving this was to create urban networks between small and medium-sized cities that would *resist* and *prevent* gravitation to the three large areas mentioned, and might even reverse the tendency, if a simultaneous strategy of areas to be polarised and depolarised was adopted.

The Italian situation, in comparison to the French one, was characterised by the presence of some important "medium-sized" cities (for example, Venice, Trieste, Bologna, Florence and, in the south, Bari and Palermo), which had not at the time undergone the attraction of great metropolitan centres, but which would have to be very careful to implement special self-promotional policies, in order to conserve their relative autonomy.

But in other less populated areas of the country (particularly in the centre and south), this advantageous circumstance was not produced. For this reason, it was necessary to implement a policy of urban networks between small and medium-sized cities. This was the only hope of providing the urban quality of life indispensable for the survival of such centres.

*Progetto '80*, despite being the official document of a ministry, was never adopted by the entire government (as was the case with the German Programme of Territorial Organisation of 1975). It suffered more or less the same fate as its

German follower; it had only a "cultural" and orienting influence. However, many Regions followed the indications of the territorial projections of *Progetto '80*, or at least some of the developmental hypotheses indicated were implemented. However, in subsequent years, the system of intervention for the national territory followed completely different directions. These interventions were very sectorial and in no way coordinated, and to a large extent were implemented by the regions without any national coordination. The Ministry of Public Works, responsible for the "coordination of territorial planning", has been completely lethargic and will probably remain so for a long time to come.

As is better illustrated in the report of the Italian group<sup>26</sup>, there have been other sporadic attempts at re-launching an overall vision of urban policy at the national scale.<sup>27</sup>

#### ***4.3 The proposals for a urban system territorial reorganisation throughout the urban system logic***

With this factual and historical panorama, and with the help of the threshold of urban (normative) indicators resulting from the research itself, the participants of the research have tried to outline for each country explored, a proposal creating a national pattern of urban systems, having the potential quality to reach the minimum of city effect, for the desired social and economic cohesion among European citizens.

In **Appendix no.1** are exhibited the four maps that report the scenario, graphically and symbolically outlined, of each country. To the maps is annexed the nominative list of each system: identifying number, a name, and the total population (in 1,000s of inhabitants). Further indicated are the various administrative units (departments, counties, etc.) to which each system belongs, and the name (with relative population) of the main urban centres included in the system.

##### *a. The French scenario*

---

<sup>26</sup> PSC (1996), *Actvill Report*, (Italy).

<sup>27</sup> In 1982, the Minister for Southern Italy again took up the *Progetto '80* study in order to orient the distribution of some special interventions in southern Italy. In 1985 there was another attempt on the part of the Minister of Transport to present a "General Transport Plan", which assumed the urban systems of *Progetto '80*, opportunely re-elaborated and redesigned, as a reference basis for the planning of urban transport. In 1990-92, the Minister of the Environment elaborated a "*Ten-Year Plan for the Environment*" (Decamb), in which a "Programme for the Urban Environment" was included. In this programme, the main inspiring principles of *Progetto '80* were widened to include the problem of identification of urban areas in which the compatibility between environmental "pressure" and the capacity of the territory to recycle and metabolise such pressure was realised. This led to a re-elaboration of the concept of urban systems which became "urban ecosystems" without changing their characteristics in any way (since ecological factors had already been present in the preceding *Progetto '80* studies as well). This last experience, the DECAMB-Urban Environment Program (1992), has been assumed as the basis of control of this research, and therefore also as basis of the proposal for territorial re-organisation presented by the Italian team in this research.

For France, the proposed programmatic scenario has tried initially to resolve, in a reasonable and feasible way, two great problems that everybody is aware of (and which are probably historically interdependent to a large extent):

- the super-concentration of Paris, in comparison to the entire territory of the country;
- the great territorial spaces, in particular at the centre of the country, which have no urbanisation of any particular consistency.

This situation has made any exercise of redistribution of the urban weights, according to the criteria elaborated, obviously very difficult (but, on the other hand, doing so constitutes the purpose and meaning of this research itself).

As far as the super-concentration of Paris is concerned, it should be pointed out that the lines of direction adopted by the authorities in France for the management of the whole “basin” of greater Paris (in practice subject to the “regional” authority of the Ile de France) are not so distant from those which could inspire our research and its parameters.

The whole Parisian basin (Ile de France), with around 10 million “users”, has been subdivided into 8 territorial units<sup>28</sup> which (to be really efficient) should represent an equal number of attempts to constitute complete “alternative centralities” to the historic centre of Paris. Excluding the historic “core” of the city,<sup>29</sup> of the remaining 7 units three constitute a first ring around the core,<sup>30</sup> and four constitute a second ring.<sup>31</sup> However, here we have considered it opportune to accept this subdivision (moreover administratively sanctioned by the French authorities, by means of their constitution in “departments”), although, perhaps, we would have preferred to institute not two rings of alternative centres around the core of the Ville de Paris, but only one. This would have allowed a solution with urban systems (or city regions) in “slices” for the territory of the Ile de France. This solution would be useful in order not to risk creating new “closed” situations “forced” by eventual Parisian urban growth. Rather, situations should be created that are largely “open” to long-term growth, wherever this should take place (inauspiciously for the rest of France).

For the second great problem – the scarcely urbanised territories of central France – the solutions proposed may offer nothing miraculous. They have proposed urban systems (or city regions) that are largely deficient from the point of view of “critical mass” of users (too low), and from the point of view of accessibility (too far) of each settlement to the various centralities indicated.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> In which – excluding the historic *Ville de Paris* where there are more than 2 million inhabitants – constitute approximately a million inhabitants each (and this has created strong differences in the territorial breadth of the units). They have been indicated in the French map and table as the urban systems no. 13 to 17-D.

<sup>29</sup> The core is limited approximately by the “*boulevards peripheriques*”.

<sup>30</sup> The city-regions or systems 17-B, 17-C and 17-D, corresponding to the departments *Haute-Seine*, *Seine-Saint Denis* and *Val-de-Marne*.

<sup>31</sup> The city-regions or systems 13, 14, 15 & 16, corresponding to the departments *Yvelines*, *Val-d’Oise*, *Seine-et-Marne*, and *Esonne*.

<sup>32</sup> In particular, this holds true for the systems or city regions indicated with the numbers 8 (Brest City Region); 18 (Orleans City Region); 19 (Champagne City Region); 25 (Poitou City Region);

Nevertheless, the solutions proposed have seemed to us, in an evaluation of the "trade-off" between various advantages and disadvantages of alternative proposals (alternative scenarios) to be the most favourable. Certainly, it is more favourable than abandoning places and resources that have their own history and a not indifferent social, economic and human capital. (Likewise, it is more favourable to the solution of "concentrating" efforts on more favourable developments of "equilibrium metropolises", which would have resolved the conditions of "critical mass", but worsened those of "accessibility".) These solutions certainly<sup>33</sup> create tendential situations which go in the opposite direction to those hoped for, by further strengthening the Paris area. One thinks: "If accessibility to the centrality costs me so much, I may as well choose the Parisian one."

This consideration has guided the attempt undertaken to "balance" the centralities in the best way possible, whilst respecting to the greatest extent the historical-cultural and administrative ("regions and departments") qualifications of the new "units" proposed. This is apart from those cases where the objective of material conditions of access and living indicates to ignore them. The exercise has been carried out (and this holds true for all the other exercises carried out for each respective country) in the hope of – as we have repeatedly stated – the evolution of income, life-styles and technologies of access to certain superior urban services and may reduce the "critical mass" thresholds of users necessary to create a city effect. Therefore in time the insufficiency of the "critical mass" inherent in the proposal will tend to be mitigated, if not actually vanish.

A more detailed commentary on the proposal can be carried out after suitable discussion and examination with other experts.

#### b. *The German scenario*

The scenario proposed for Germany (see Map 3 and attached table) obviously reflects the situation already described of greater equilibrium of urban weight throughout the territory.

The overall result is that in the German case, urban systems (or city regions) belong (in the proposal of reorganisation) to the category of systems to be "rationalised", i.e. to be reinforced in their structure, but which currently do not suffer either from too much dependence on others or from risks of overloading. And there are, conversely, very few systems to depolarise.<sup>34</sup>

---

26 (Limousin City Region); 30 (Savoie City Region); 35 (Valkence City Region); 38 (Roussillon City Region) and, of course, 41 (Corse).

<sup>33</sup> As past experience has amply shown (see paragraph 3), and as would have been easily predicted if the criteria of rationality recommended in this research had been applied.

<sup>34</sup> In our view these are only the following:

- The Berlin basin (no. 10), still territorially "restricted" in comparison to its current capacity of attraction. The purpose of this relative "restriction" is to give the possibility of alternative growth not only "peripheral" to the adjacent urban systems (Pomern, no. 4; Brandenburg, no. 6; Oder, no. 13), which are very weak and fragile systems, but also to "urbanise" a very vast territory with widespread urbanisation;

In Germany, however, as in France (but without such unfavourable starting conditions), there are numerous urban systems to be developed and polarised – alternatively to the existent ones. These include a large part of the new territories of East Germany<sup>35</sup>, and those of the old West which are still peripheral<sup>36</sup>.

Further comments and details will come following discussion and verification with other experts.

*c. The British scenario*

The British scenario (Map N.3) is, like France, dominated by the well-known problem (already mentioned) of the super-concentration of the capital, London. At the same time, this super-concentration is also realised in other conurbated areas of the country, the West Midlands (the Birmingham area) and the North West (The Liverpool-Manchester area). There are also (again as in the French case, but fewer in number) less developed rural areas which have never evolved substantial urban centres (such as the Scottish Highlands, North Wales, and to a lesser extent, Cornwall).

The scenario proposed has faced the first problem, that of London, by suggesting a division of the administrative area of Greater London, which pays more attention to the possibility of guiding alternative centralities able to "compete", and thus combat that of the old historic London "core". It was necessary to define a "new" catchment area, founded on real centralities with "central business districts", rather than on a division of the more or less residential areas or districts (i.e. founded essentially on the principle of the minimum house requirements).

For this reason, the territorial area of Greater London is regarded as insufficiently extensive to allow the definition of these alternative centralities.

- 
- The Hamburg basin (no. 2), which is on the point of suffering the characteristics of overcrowding but which, on the other hand, should not suffocate possibilities of greater development in the area of Bremen (no. 5), Lubeck-Kiel (no. 1) and Rostock (no. 3), which already have strong possibilities of growth (the first two) or development (Rostock);
  - The basins of the Ruhr (nos. 11 and 17), whose current congestion, combined with the phenomenon of de-industrialisation, is creating a loss of "city-effect" (and thus useless de-urbanisation) to the benefit of a disordered growth of the adjacent territories that should instead be preserved; in this way the two basins of the Ruhr, when depolarised, could in a short time be aggregated to the category of the cities to be "rationalised";
  - The Munich area, which absorbs an excessive urban function, because Bavaria is a region of limited urban density. This damages accessibility to the city for large portions of the urban population (and compromises its cultural development), thereby risking the compromise through overloading of the urban quality of Munich, itself already very satisfactorily developed.

<sup>35</sup> Such as Meckleburg, no. 3; Pomern, no. 4; Brandenburg, no. 6; Oder, no. 13; Magdeburg-Dessau, no. 9; Chemnitz, no. 20.

<sup>36</sup> Such as Westphalia (Munster-Osnabruck), no. 7; the "Teutoburger city region" (Bielefeld-Paderborn, n.7bis; Kassel-Gottingen, no. 12; Westervald and Vogelsberg (Siegen-Marburg-Giesse), no. 18; Wurzburg, no. 24; Bamberg-Bayreuth-Coburg, no. 25; Regensburg-Passau, no. 30; the Black Forest (Schwarzwald), no. 33; and Bodensee (no. 34).

While its population (census of 1991) was 7 million, its catchment area, (even calculated only in terms of commuting and services), is acknowledged to be much larger. This is in part because of the choice made by many families to live outside Greater London (its population lost - from the post-war decade to 1981 - half a million inhabitants), and in part because of new access to activities in the territory of Greater London for residents from outside it. Thus the disequilibrium between the home and the place where it is possible to enjoy the city-effect has become much larger, representing an evident counter-indication for a better quality of life and with respect to some overloading factors, such as those relative to daily traffic.

The scenario proposed, therefore, suggests expanding the area of calculation of the appropriate 'catchment areas' to some territories of the counties adjacent to Greater London, in an attempt to "design" new urban systems (according to the criteria of this research) with catchment areas that belong both to densely populated, albeit peripheral, areas of Greater London, and to territories of the adjacent counties (notoriously "dependent" on Greater London). Thus, a separation has been proposed for the area of London into a first system called "Inner London"<sup>37</sup> (no. 30), and another four "urban systems" or "city regions" (numbered from 26 to 29)<sup>38</sup> each including a (peripheral) part of Greater London and a (marginal) part of the respective counties.<sup>39</sup>

Obviously, the proposal should be articulated in detail, a task which falls outside the scope of this research. It could be opportune - in the case of a surplus of critical mass in the systems proposed - to split them further. The principle that we wish to affirm here, however, is that of a measuring of the minimum potential catchment area for the creation of centralities alternative to the historic centre of London, with which to orient guided policies of the concentration of private and

---

<sup>37</sup> In practice the territory included within the "North Circular Road" and "South Circular Road", thus including the boroughs of the City of Westminster, City of London, South Wark, Camden, Islington, Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Lambeth, Wandsworth, Hammersmith, and Fulham.

<sup>38</sup> These four new systems would be configured in the following way:

- a system of North-West London, (no.26), based on the functional integration of some areas of Greater London (Enfield, Barnet, Harrow, possibly Brent) with some municipalities of the county of Hertfordshire (St. Albans, Welwyn Garden City (New Town), Hatfield, Hertford, Ware, Hemel Hempstead (New Town), and municipalities of the county of Buckinghamshire (Watford, Amersham, etc.). The western limit of this system from the rest of the county of Buckinghamshire could be marked by the Chiltern Hills;
- a North-East London system (no.27), based on some areas of Greater London (Waltham Forest, Redbridge, possibly Chingford and Woodford, Havering, and possibly Barking and Dagenham) with some centres of the county of Essex (Loughton, Harlow New Town, Epping, Bishop's Stortford, Chelmsford, etc. as far as Southend-on-Sea);
- a South-East London system (no.28), based on some areas of Greater London (Bexley, possibly Crayford, Bromley and Sidcup) with some centres of the county of Kent (Dartford, Darenth, Sevenoaks, Swanley, Farningham, Eynsford, Wrotham);
- and finally, a South-West London system (no.29), based on some areas of Greater London (Croydon, Sutton, Kingston-upon-Thames, Richmond-upon-Thames, Hounslow, Hillingdon) with all of the most important centres of Surrey (Epsom and Ewell, Leatherhead, Guildford, Weybridge, Esher, Staines, Reigate, Horley, Dorking, Egham, Shepperton, etc.).

<sup>39</sup> Except for the county of Surrey, which would be entirely included in the System proposed as no. 29.

(direct and indirect) public efforts able to lead to a spontaneous re-equilibrium of urbanisation and to the improvement of accessibility without compromising the quality of the city effect.

For the rest of Great Britain something similar, but on a much reduced scale, has been done for the super-concentrated areas of the Midlands and Greater Manchester. In fact, the logic of restructuring the counties, carried out in Britain in 1974 to create "metropolitan" counties, has been acknowledged. The counties of Merseyside (Merseyside City-Region, no. 10, which concerns Liverpool and the circle of cities conurbated with Liverpool) and Greater Manchester (Greater Manchester City-Region, no. 11, including likewise the city of Manchester and the circle of cities conurbated with it) have been recognised as a system (or city-region). Correspondingly, alternative systems capable of upturning the traditional gravitationality of the centres of Liverpool and Manchester have been proposed.<sup>40</sup>

Something similar has been proposed also for the area of Birmingham.<sup>41</sup>

Around the critical area of London and the South-East, other systems or cities for "re-equilibrium" have been proposed to be used strategically to spread high urban values throughout the territory.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> For example System no. 7, which we have called the Lancashire City-Region. This combines the counties of Lancashire and Cumbria (a critical mass of around 2 million people), with the towns to be polarised of Blackpool, Preston, and Blackburn; (System no. 9), which we have called the Yorkshire City-Region. Integrating the counties of South and West Yorkshire with the cities of Leeds and Sheffield (and their respective conurbations) develops a critical mass which has no need to defend itself from any risk of dependence on the city-effect of Manchester or Liverpool, and even less so of London; finally, the relatively weak system of *North Wales* (no. 25). The towns here (the largest, Wrexham, has 40 thousand inhabitants) gravitate, and will continue to do so for a long time, to the strongly urbanised area of this part of Britain. The long distance, to this area, as an autonomous urban system, in the hope that with time it may contrast their traditional and natural gravitationality and dependence.

<sup>41</sup> Such as

- System no. 14, (to 'de-polarize') the *West-Midland City-Region*, made up of the further addition of the counties of Hereford and Worcester to the metropolitan county of the West Midlands proper.
- System no. 13, (to 'rationalize') the *East Midland City-Region*, which includes the counties of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire and Lincolnshire (total: 3 million inhabitants) and is thus a polycentric system between the cities of Derby (250), Nottingham (300), Leicester (300), and Lincoln (80) which have strong possibilities of balanced development.

<sup>42</sup> For instance:

- System no. 15 (*South Midland City-Region*), which includes the counties of Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire, as well as the part of Buckinghamshire to the north of the Chiltern Hills (approx. 1,500 inhabitants);
- System no. 18, which aims at creating a network of development between the medium-size towns of Oxford, Reading and Swindon, with strong possibilities of development;<sup>42</sup>
- System no. 16 (the *East Anglia City-Region*), certainly a problematic area, traditionally sacrificed and dependent on London, which may reach 2.5 million users. It may develop into a common network in which internal accessibility should be promoted;

To the South of London, we have:

- the Kent system (no. 22, the *Kent City-Region*, with 1.3 million inhabitants), which may "link up" a series of centres of high quality (Rochester, Canterbury, Gravesend, Margate, Folkestone, Dover) in a functional polycentric whole, which will have strong possibilities of development in connection with the English Channel;

For the remaining of Great Britain, the proposal recommends the "rationalisation" (with all the baggage of techniques and methods which this involves) of other already-developed centres with a "city effect" already exercised in the past, but which risk decline unless they are carefully defended or further promoted.<sup>43</sup>

There are also three other systems that are likewise "to be rationalised". These refer to towns that have been relatively "anonymous" in the past and therefore of limited city effect, but which today have all the requirements - if opportunely developed - to reach high levels of urban quality. These are the systems of Newcastle (no. 5: *Tyne City-Region*, 1.7 million inhabitants), Cleveland (no. 6: *Tees City-Region*, 860,000 inhabitants), and finally *Staffordshire* (joined with Cheshire) with Stoke-on-Trent as the main centre of 300,000 inhabitants (no. 12).

There are also an important number of urban systems (or city regions) proposed for areas with limited urbanisation which, as for all the countries studied, must be developed and utilised with strategies of "polarisation" in order to recuperate, in time, a certain level of urban quality.<sup>44</sup>

#### d. *The Italian scenario*

The Italian scenario has provided much inspiration for the approach followed in this research, and perhaps contains more doubts and uncertainties than any other country.

It expresses the general goal inspiring the whole research, to lighten the overloading of some areas (recognised as "metropolitan" in the country) on the one hand, while on the other it suggests - for many other very weak urban areas - aggregation into urban systems capable in time of improving their "urban quality" and thus of providing a more satisfying city effect.

In Italy, the decongestion of metropolitan areas means in particular, decongesting and depolarising the various "historic centres" of the metropolitan areas. And the only strategy possible for contrasting the over-congestion,

---

- the system of the two counties of Sussex (no. 21: *Sussex City-Region*, 1.5 million inhabitants), which has strong possibilities of polycentric development in a restricted, but qualified, number of centres that are strongly growing, though still strongly dependent on London.

<sup>43</sup> These are the urban systems (or city regions) which depend on: *Bristol* (no. 17) and on the conurbated group of *Southampton-Portsmouth and Bournemouth*, etc. (no. 20) in England; *Cardiff* (no. 23) in Wales; *Glasgow* (no. 3) and *Edinburgh* (no. 4) in Scotland.

<sup>44</sup> These systems are:

- systems nos. 1 and 2 in Scotland, the *North Scotland City-Region* (610,000 inhabitants) based on the city of *Aberdeen* (200,000), and the *Central Scotland City Region* (in total 1 million inhabitants) based on the city of *Dundee* (200,000);
- system no. 24 in Wales: *West Wales City-Region* (720,000 inhabitants overall) based on the city of *Swansea* (200,000);
- and the systems no. 8 and 19 in England: the *North Yorkshire and Humberside City-Region* (approx. 1.5 million) with the city of *Hull* (300,000) in a useful functional network with those of *York* (100,000) and *Grimsby* (100,000); and the *Devon-Cornwall City-Region* (1 million inhabitants) with the city of *Plymouth* (250,000) in a useful functional network with those of *Torbay* (110,000) and *Exeter* (100,000).

depolarising the function of the historic centre and reducing its overload is to design alternative centres which absorb part of the functions of centrality and public spaces that have been reserved for the traditional centre.

The amount of the alternative centrality of this type depends on the size of the population (*usership*) which currently gravitates on the hyper-congested centre, and on the standards of size of the catchment areas considered minimum for the functioning of alternative centres. An excessive spread produces an opposing result to the one sought for, with a further strengthening of the traditional centre and an enlargement of the disordered and chaotic settlements in the peripheries (which is a great waste of new resources), and the continuation of degradation in urban quality.

In short, the fundamental constraint which should inspire the design of new "central areas" is to redistribute the function "loads" over a catchment constituting a sufficient "critical mass" for the superior urban services provided beforehand (in a perhaps redundant way) by the historic centres that are to be decongested.<sup>45</sup>

Action for the design of alternative centres in the metropolitan areas coincides largely with another action, linked to this programme of actions, for the re-qualification of the metropolitan areas: that aimed at the re-qualification of the metropolitan peripheral areas.

In fact, the eventual alternative centres would certainly be placed within the peripheral areas, in strategic positions and in locations that would maximise the recovery of urban quality in these areas. It would mean the concentration in the pre-chosen locations of public spaces, (modern) monumental buildings, and

---

<sup>45</sup> Such areas in the suggested scenario are:

1. *Rome* (No.22); an urban system of approx. 3.5 million inhabitants, where there are catchment areas in the metropolitan area that suggest at least four or five alternative centres;
2. *Milan* (No.5); an urban system whose catchment area has been, in this scenario, strongly reduced to develop the alternative urban systems in Lombardy and adjacent regions. Nevertheless, even in its reduced proportions, the Milanese system is configured in such a way that at least three alternative centres are justified, plus an alternative centre dependent on the strengthening of Pavia's historic centre into a single urban system;
3. *Naples* (No.25); with a catchment area justifying at least two alternative centres, besides the strengthening of Caserta's centre into a single urban system;
4. *Genoa* (No.12); whose catchment area justifies the strengthening of Savona into a single urban system;
5. *Turin* (No.2); the catchment area justifies the design of an alternative centre within the metropolitan area;
6. *Bologna* (No.14); the catchment area justifies the design of an alternative centre within the metropolitan area;
7. *Florence* (No.17); the catchment area justifies the alternative strengthening of Pistoia and Prato into a single urban system;
8. *Palermo* (No.35); the catchment area justifies another alternative centre within the metropolitan area, and the alternative strengthening of Trapani and its territory within the confines of the same urban system;
9. *Catania* (No.33); the catchment area justifies the alternative strengthening of Siracusa into a single urban system;
10. *Bari* (No.28); the catchment area justifies another alternative centre within the same metropolitan area.

meeting places, on the scale required by the prescribed catchment areas, and these would be more efficient and direct compared to the previous overburdening of the historic centres. The restoration of equilibrium between supply and demand for central areas, squares and public spaces, surely means initiating a process of recovery and re-qualification of today's "peripheral" areas and zones (besides better management of the balance between the pressures and the available territorial and environmental resources).

An accompanying action to the two previous ones, and aimed at the same objectives, is to restrict the planning and management of the urban transport systems of the metropolitan area in question to the chosen strategies of the previous actions, thereby maintaining an integrated design and programming.

In connection with the re-qualification of the metropolitan areas by means of the creation of alternative centralities, the Italian proposal also suggests programmes for the restoration of the historical centres within these areas.

The relief granted by the other actions will allow the reduction of overload in the historical centres, and allows also their restoration to their most suitable functions, and their adaptation to new functions (touristic, cultural etc.), without overburdening their building or urban structure.

A good urban "restoration" is, in short, essential for their renewal within the modified context of environmental pressure.

The historical centres of the metropolitan areas which deserve the most attention, within a framework of an integrated policy of environmental renewal, are those of Rome, Naples, Venice, Milan, Florence, Genoa, Bologna, Palermo and Catania. Many "actions" for recovery and restoration and special project elaboration are thus suggested.

But, as has been said, the proposal suggests at the same time the design of new "systems of cities" in the non-metropolitan areas. In the proposed scenario these new "urban systems" are identified as merges of small-sized cities individually incapable of reaching the critical mass of citizens and customers necessary to create a good city effect.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> These are:

1. *"Prealpine Piedmontese City"* (no. 1), based on the functional integration of Novara-Vercelli-Biella-Ivrea and adjacent territory (including Valle d'Aosta). The potential catchment area for the "superior urban services" (SUS) would consist of 1.1 million inhabitants that today gravitate towards Milan and Turin with serious social and environmental costs.
2. *"City of the Tanaro"* (no. 3), based on the functional integration of Alessandria, Asti and Cuneo and their territories; the catchment area for the SUS would be of 1.2 million inhabitants, who today gravitate towards Milan and Turin with serious social and environmental costs
3. *"City of the Lakes"* (no. 4), based on the functional integration of Varese-Como-Lecco-Bergamo and their territories; the catchment area for the SUS would be of 2.5 million inhabitants that today gravitate almost totally towards Milan, with very serious social and environmental costs
4. *"City of the Po"* (no. 6), based on the functional integration of the two very near cities (ignored by each other) of Piacenza and Cremona (plus the territory of Codogno); a catchment area for the SUS of about 700,000 inhabitants that today mainly gravitate towards Milan with serious social and environmental costs

- 
5. "*City of the Adige*" (no. 8), based on the functional integration of Trento and Bolzano and their territories; with a catchment area for the SUS of about 800,000 inhabitants today marginalised from the SUS
  6. "*City of the Garda*" (No. 7), based on the functional integration of Brescia-Mantua-Verona and their territories; a catchment area of about 2.2 million inhabitants that today continue to gravitate from the SUS towards Milan and the Venetian area
  7. "*City of the Veneto*" (No. 10), which represents a good example of functional polycentrism between Venice-Padua-Mestre-Vicenza-Treviso (and also Belluno), that need to have better infrastructure. The catchment area is of 3.3 million inhabitants, and perhaps there is here the basis for a division into two complete systemic units: Venice-Treviso-Mestre-Belluno on the one hand, and Padua-Vicenza on the other
  8. "*City of the Delta*" (no. 9), based on the functional integration of Ferrara and Rovigo and linked territories, with 600,000 inhabitants as a catchment area for the SUS
  9. "*Julian City*" (no. 11), based on the functional integration of Trieste-Udine-Gorizia, moreover sanctioned by a special Region status; a catchment area of 1.2 million inhabitants and with many urban values inherited from the past, but with a parochial mentality that creates marginalisation
  10. "*Emilian City*" (no. 13), based on the functional integration, already partly existent and in part to be reinforced, of Parma-Reggio Emilia-Modena; an overall catchment area for the SUS of 1.4 million inhabitants that still gravitate towards Milan and Bologna
  11. "*City of Romagna*" (no. 15), based on the functional integration of Ravenna-Forlì-Cesena-Rimini and their territories; a catchment area of about 1 million inhabitants that are only in part included in an urban system of life and gravitate, anyway, towards Bologna
  12. "*Tuscan-Tyrrhenian City*" (no. 16), already largely in existence with Pisa-Lucca-Livorno-Viareggio and Massa that need to be better functionally integrated; a catchment area today of about 1.6 million inhabitants with poor urban quality, even considering the rich values inherited from the past
  13. "*Sienese-Maremmian City*" (no. 18), based on the functional integration between Siena and Grosseto and their vast territories; about 500,000 catchment area inhabitants with a strong vocation for development and who gravitate for the SUS towards Florence and Rome
  14. "*Umbro-Aretine City*" (no. 19), based on the functional integration of Arezzo-Perugia; a potential urban catchment area of about 1 million inhabitants, today varying in quality and gravitating towards Florence and Rome
  15. "*City of the Marches*" or "*Picene City*" (no. 21), based on the functional integration of Ancona-Pesaro-Ascoli and Macerata (i.e. the Marche Region); a catchment area of about 1.5 million inhabitants with a very low urban quality and ready to split into two urban systems as soon as conditions allow (Pesaro-Ancona on the one hand, Macerata-Ascoli on the other)
  16. "*City of the Tuscia*" (no. 20), based on the functional integration of Terni, Viterbo, Rieti and Civitavecchia; a potential 700,000 inhabitant users that today gravitate towards Rome with serious social and environmental damage
  17. "*Latin City*" (no. 23) or City of Lower Latium, based on the functional integration of Latina and Frosinone and their territories (with the addition of Isernia); reaches 1.1 million potential users who enjoy a limited level of urban quality and gravitate, when they can, towards Rome
  18. "*City of the Abruzzi*" (no. 24); finding it difficult to maintain urban values with a potential catchment area of 1.2 million inhabitants (the entire Region) who gravitate almost exclusively towards Rome
  19. "*City of Internal Campania*" (No.26); based on the territorial integration of Salerno, Avellino and Benevento, which have very low urban values despite the noteworthy development of the Salerno area; a catchment area of 1.5 million inhabitants who continue to gravitate towards Naples with very serious consequences for the Neapolitan urban environment
  20. "*City of the Daunia*" (no. 27); made up of the integration of the cities of the Molise (Campobasso, Termoli) with Foggia and the other centres of the province; with their territories, these reach a potential of almost 500,000 inhabitants, with a very weak urban structure, diffused and without special centralities

They involve about 80 "intermediate cities" that represent a very important part of the urban population which have not achieved modern levels of urban quality and which, in relative terms, are losing urban quality in comparison to the "metropolitan areas".

Without a policy of creation and design of the aforementioned "systems of cities", although the urban environment of these intermediate cities will improve in physical terms, it will tend to worsen in social and cultural terms. Moreover, many of these cities will become "peripheries" of the metropolitan areas (for many rare services they are already thus, while for others they have had to bear the cost of giving them up).

The 27 "systems of cities" (or city regions) proposed above are to be realised in different ways and within different lengths of time. However, they do have potential prerequisites in common, both within the territorial space in question, and within the minimum catchment area.

The absence of such a policy, moreover, will compromise any policy aimed at the decongestion of the metropolitan areas. In fact, without the "polarisation" of the intermediate cities formed autonomously, no "depolarisation" will be able to take place in the metropolitan areas, and any environmental policy in any Italian urban context will be destined to fail.

The 27 new "systems of cities" of the more than 80 "intermediate cities" may be classified and distinguished internally according to their degree of income development, which may to a greater or lesser extent facilitate the take-off of urban quality and the city effect sought, and according to their level of urban values which, although in decline, to a greater or lesser extent facilitates recovery.

For each of the "new system of cities" (as for the new "alternative centres" of the metropolitan areas), "Plans" will have to be elaborated - in agreement with the

- 
21. "*City of the Salento*" (no. 29); based on the functional integration of Brindisi-Taranto-Lecce; a potential catchment area of 1.7 million inhabitants including their territories, who today make do with low urban quality that is mitigated by constant gravitation towards Bari
  22. "*Lucan City*" (no. 30); based on the functional integration of Potenza and Matera, two non-existent urban entities; together with the whole of Basilicata constitutes a catchment area of just about 600,000 inhabitants who today gravitate towards Bari and Napoli
  23. "*City of the Sila*" (no. 31); including the territories of the provinces of Catanzaro and Cosenza; of extremely low urban quality and promising extreme difficulties for functional integration, but with a catchment area of 1.5 million inhabitants
  24. "*City of the Straits*" (no.32); based on the functional integration of Messina and Reggio Calabria, on the prospect of a more stable crossing of the Straits; of modest urban quality, with an urban catchment area of 1.2 million inhabitants
  25. a system of small towns in "*Central or Southern Sicily*" (no. 34), made up of the agglomeration of various small centres of the provinces of Agrigento, Enna, Caltanissetta and Ragusa that are hard to polarise and are difficult to functionally integrate and are polycentric, but which represent a potential catchment area of 1.2 million inhabitants;
  26. a "system of cities" of "*Southern Sardinia*" (no. 37), polarised on Cagliari but extended to the area of Oristano and the Sulcis; about 1 million inhabitants with low urban quality to be reinforced in a concentrated and polarising way
  27. a system of "*Northern Sardinia*" (no. 36), polarised on Sassari but extended to the areas of Alghero, Olbia and Nuoro; a potential catchment area of about 600,000 inhabitants and urban quality that is still a long way from being realised.

regions, provinces and other interested local bodies - that are in part indicative and in part normative, and of a national interest and nature

## References of the Part II

- Archibugi F.(1995a). *The Theory of Urbanistics: Lectures on a Reappraisal of City Planning Methodology* (Summer Course on Development and Conservation Strategies for Very Large Cities, University of Pennsylvania, University of Southern California and the Planning Studies Centre, Rome 1-30 June 1995). Rome, Planning Studies Centre.
- Archibugi F. (2005). *Rome: a new planning strategy*. London, Routledge.
- Burtenshaw D. et alii (1991). *The European City: A Western Perspective*. New York, Halsted Press.
- Cheshire P.C. (1987). *Urban Problems and Regional Policy in the European Community of 12*. Reading, University of Reading.
- Cheshire P.C. et alii (1989). *Urban Problems in Western Europe: A Review and Synthesis of Recent Literature*. London, Unwin Hyman.
- Cuthbert M. (1986). The Concept of Province and Metropolis in British Town Planning. In: *Regional Cities in the UK 1890-1980*. G. Gordon ed.. London, Harper & Row.
- DATAR (1971). *Scenarios d'aménagement du Territoire. Essais Methodologiques*. Paris, DATAR.
- DATAR (1974a). *Sesame. Systeme d'etudes du Schema 'Aménagement du Territoire*. Paris, DATAR.
- DATAR (1974b). *Scenarios europeenes d'Aménagement du Territoire*. Paris, DATAR.
- DATAR (1977). *Schema generale d'aménagement de la France: Bilan d'une experience prospective*. Paris, DATAR.
- DATAR (1988). "Les villes et l'aménagement du territoire." *La Lettre de la DATAR* (119).
- DATAR (1993). *Les Villes, lieux d'Europe*. Paris, Editions de l'Aube.
- DATAR (1994). *Scenarios for the City of the Future*. Paris, DATAR.
- European Commission (1991). *Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of Community Territory* (Directorate-General for Regional Policy, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament). Brussels-Luxembourg, European Commission.
- European Commission (1994). *Toward a Better Liveable City* (City Action RDT Programme, Background Paper). Bruxelles, European Commission,.
- European Commission , (1997), *On the Systems and Policies of Spatial Planning*" Bruxelles.
- European Commission (1999a). *The structural Funds and their Coordination with the Cohesion Fund. Guideline for Programmes in the Period 2000-2006*. Luxembourg.
- European Commission (1999b). *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the EU*. Luxembourg.
- European Institute of Urban Affairs, (1992). *Urbanisation and the Functions of Cities in the European Community*. Liverpool, European Institute of Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University (Formerly Centre for Urban Studies, University of Liverpool).
- Hall P. and Hay, D. (1980). *Growth Centres in the European Urban System*. London, Heinemann Educational Books.

- IAURIF (1993). *Metropoles et aménagement du territoire*. Paris.
- Kunzmann K.R. and Wegener M. (1991). *The pattern of urbanisation in western Europe 1960-1990*. Dortmund, Institut für Raumplanung Universität Dortmund.
- Mainardi R., ed. (1973). *Città e regioni in Europa*. Saggi di analisi dei sistemi territoriali. Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Planning Studies Centre (PSC), (1996), *Activill, French Report* Vol.I-B (France).
- Planning Studies Centre (PSC) (1996), *Activill, German Report*, Vol. I B,(Germany)
- Planning Studies Centre (PSC, 1996), *Activill, British Report*, Vol. I-B, (Great Britain).
- Rautsi J., Ed. (1993). *The European City Today: The Helsinki Round Table on Urban Improvement Strategies*. Helsinki, Ministry of the Environment.
- Robson B. (1986). 'Coming Full Circle: London Versus the Rest 1890-1980'. In: *Regional Cities in the UK 1890-1980*. G. Gordon ed. . London, Harper & Row.
- Simmie James, Ed. (1994). *Planning London*. London, UCL Press.
- van den Berg L. et alii (1982). *Urban Europe: A Study of Growth and Decline*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- van den Berg L. et alii (1998). *National Urban Policies in the European Union: Experiences in Fifteen Member States*. Hampshire, Ashgate.