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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 Irspel 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 gravitates 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 Romani, 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 afference to the sector that we have defined as "external" or "east" or also "Latin".

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 communes (see Map 1). Only in the

---

1 More details and explanations are in the contribution already mentioned from 1985 (Archibugi, 1985).
2 Because 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 afference, the critical mass of which would be nevertheless represented by the users of Rome (Rome municipality).
3 Excluding 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.
Table 2 - Catchment Areas of the Roman Metropolitan System (by thousands of inhabitants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment Area</th>
<th>Rome Municipality</th>
<th>Gravitating Communes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Historic) Centre</td>
<td>450,00</td>
<td></td>
<td>450,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>329,00</td>
<td>131,00</td>
<td>460,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>959,00</td>
<td></td>
<td>959,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>597,00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>637,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>505,00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>546,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Latin&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>481,00</td>
<td>481,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Metropolitan System</td>
<td>2840,00</td>
<td>693,00</td>
<td>3533,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communes outside System</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3696,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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 "roni" 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 area\(^4\), 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.

\(^4\)The 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" University in a single unit, with perhaps over 100 thousand
enrolled/users, 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, supranational)!

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 planning.

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 scale.

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 plusses 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

---

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

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 '60s\textsuperscript{10}, 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 bodies\textsuperscript{11}. 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 city\textsuperscript{12}.

\section*{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

\textsuperscript{10}I am referring to those conceived for the old "equipped axis".

\textsuperscript{11}There 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".

\textsuperscript{12}For further evaluations with regard to the new architectural centres, see the work by
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 city\textsuperscript{13}.

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 "respite", 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 respite 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 greener, 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

\textsuperscript{13}See 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"\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{14}It 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 strategy\textsuperscript{15}.

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 strategies\textsuperscript{16}.

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

\textsuperscript{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)

\textsuperscript{16} For 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 center. And, moreover, it would compromise the residual possibilities of implementing a "strategy for urban greenery" (such as that outlined in Para. 5.5).

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