Chapter 14
A Tentative Scenario of Spatial Reorganisation (By Urban System) in the Four Countries Studied

1. Premise: Meaning and Limits of the Formulated Scenario of Urban Reorganisation

As we have said repeatedly (see Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and Chapter 11), the research has been oriented to providing a first attempt at a reorganisation of urban land use, inspired by the application of the findings, on the theme of optimal centrality in the territories of the four countries studied.

And, as we have also said many times, since the initial research project[1] this first attempt has had the exclusive objective of a "definition of the operational framework of the urban policy", through a reorganisation of the centralities which bears in mind the two following goals:

a) elimination of the possible overloads of the centralities acquired by the great cities;
b) modes of acquisition of centrality for the medium to small sized cities.

In effect (and even this has been said more than once), in the Italian case, the research group at the Planning Studies Centre had an easier time with this research because of the existence of previous studies developed within the framework of another project (Project "Quadroter" of the Italian National Research Council). Therefore the Italian team has already faced and implemented a deep analysis from this point of view. As a result, the proposal for Italian land use and urban reorganisation, inspired by the same principles emerging from our current research, has been facilitated by this already acquired knowledge of the situation. It is deeper than that made possible for the other teams of our research group by the time and means at the disposal of this European research.

However, even for the other countries studied (France, Germany, and Great Britain), it has been proposed since the beginning of the research to close with a tentative scenario which could be an example of the future work to be developed, with more care and attention, inspired by the criteria, principles, and indicators of optimal centrality emerging from our current research.

---

[1] See Chapter 1 of this book.

Each country's scenario is contained in the national reports found in the Actvill report (PSC (1996), vol. III-B). Here we will only illustrate very synthetically the most meaningful and global aspects that from the comparative analysis of the results; results strongly conditioned by the structural and morphological diversities of the urban framework in the four countries.

We will discuss later - in the next chapter of this general report on the third phase or operation of this research - the principles and methods of application of the strategy for urban land use and reorganisation such as they emerge from the research work, including the tentative building of design scenarios as a first approximation.

2. The Structural and Morphological Diversity of the Urban Framework Inherited from the Past in the Four Countries Studied

The structural and morphological diversity of the urban framework of the four countries studied are well known and have been largely treated by the geographical and town planning literature,[2] among which even many studies promoted by the European Commission.[3] Here we will make a summary based on the analysis of our research, referring to individual national reports (see vol. III-B of the Actvill report, cited above).

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.

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.[4] 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*), 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". And 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 self-sufficient for all superior urban services), the idea that a certain amount of the territory must be, necessarily, subtracted by a systemic functionality. This land must be considered a "no mans land", reserved almost exclusively for natural or 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 a urban system policy), but it would be an almost obligatory solution, adapted to the peculiar characteristics of the French territory. But this scenario of

---

[2] A selective reference could be made to Cheshire and Hall (1987),Burtenshaw, Bateman, et al. (1991), Hall and Hay (1980), Maimardi, ed. (1973), Rautsi, ed. (1993), van den Berg, et al. (1998), European Institute of Urban Affairs (1992).
[3] European Commission (1991; 1994; 1996; 1997).
[4] PSC (1996), vol. III-B(1), France; see also Merlin (1976), Scargil (1983).

the abandonment of large portions of the French territory would create, in any case, many 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 assure 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 much later in the future. They are the systems defined as being of uncertain consistency and capacity to be implemented.

An analogous situation to the French one does not exist in any of the other three countries examined[5] (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 and accessibility. But their most important limitation makes the presence of an urban system of doubtful consistency and capacity of implementation more acceptable in this scenario, reducing them in absolute number and giving them an uncertain future.

Thus *Great Britain* – as for France - is marked by the urban hyper-concentration of the capital region in comparison to the rest of the national territory, with the other connected and well known problems which derive from this.[6] But given its minor territorial extension, Great Britain did, however, 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 even in Great Britain).

In *Germany*, oppositely, a strongly balanced scenario (in the sense of the criteria and principles elaborated in our research) of urban structure was already offered at the starting point. 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 practised in this country). But 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 the equilibrium criteria and polycentrism suggested in this research. As a whole, we cannot avoid thinking that the relative balance of the German urban framework could have been an important factor in the elevated performances in this country in the last decades.

Italy presents two very different situations in regard to 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

---

[5] PSC (1996), vol. III-B, Germany, Great Britain, Italy.
[6] PSC (1996), vol. III-B, Great Britain; see also Robson (1986), Simmie, ed. (1994), Cuthbert (1986), European Commission (1996), Hall and Hay (1971).

that of Germany. But it is also strongly altered by the development of a "Milanese conurbation" which has the possibility to involve even Turin and the rest of the Piedmont. This situation risks reproducing the same problems of unbalance 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 to improve the situation to avert the above said risk.

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", Napoli, and its metropolitan hinterland,[7] 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 that we will recall only in the large scale.

Anyhow the occasion is still propitious to recall that the statistical data from which we can extract these statistical relationships are 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 which we are currently making.

1. Data which is more meaningful in this sense could be obtained in two different, but converging, ways:

a) the creation of homogeneous (and therefore, comparable) units of data collecting at a European scale. Even the urban system suggested by the proposed scenario could already be a statistical base for measuring urbanisation that could furnish more meaningful data than that currently in use;

b) 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.[8]

---

[7] Archibugi (1998).

[8] On this point, the European Commission and particularly DGXII, in co-operation with other sectors of the commission (other DGs, Eurostat, and the environmental agency), could do very much.

3. The Proposed Territorial Reorganisation in its Historical National Context

3.1 The French Case

The proposal of reorganisation that concerns the French territory is strongly conditioned by the old, but always alive, problem of the imbalance between the area of Paris and the rest of France. Successive spatial policies in France (overall, those that have been carried out by Datar),[9] 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'equilibre* (metropolises of equilibrium). This policy has been an attempt to strengthen the larger French cities peripheral to Paris in location,[10] 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 of public and private investment - registered some results in the first period after the Second World War (established by the French team report as the 3 decades between 1945 and 1975). The growth of the Paris region (*Ile-de-France*) compared with the rest of the country registered some decline of rhythm and some negative migration balances were even registered. The creation of new jobs permitted a superior proportion of families, that otherwise would have migrated to Paris, to remain in the areas of the *metropoles d'equilibre*. But even if some success in development took place due to the expansion of the industrial investment (on which government had some ruling influence with its regional policy), it has been contrasted by the nature of tertiary evolution in employment which, being based on urban development, always had Paris as the privileged seat of effective settlements.

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

Thus the French policy became aware of this scarce city effect, uncompetitive with respect to Paris, in the *metropoles d'equilibre* policy and also of the impoverishment that the concentration of public effort in the *metropoles* had on

---

[9] Of which there is an appropriate critical panorama in the French national report (PSC (1996), vol. I-B, France).

[10] It was a matter of six metropolises; Lyon, Marseilles, Strassbourg, Nantes, Toulouse and Bordeaux.

the medium and small cities of the general French hinterland.[11] The French *metropoles d'equilibre* policy has since 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 that, although wishing to be integrative to that of the *metropoles d'equilibre*, in practice sings the requiem of it because it 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 annull each other for a lack of systemic consistency.

On the other side, the intermediary cities were not sufficient to satisfy the condition of urbanity or city effect, even if they were strongly helped by investment in infrastructure and economic privilege. Their sizes, mainly the size of their catchment area, were too modest to stimulate an increase of the superior services that produce the city effect. If the policy of the *metropoles d'equilibre* was wrong by territorial excess (which, as we know,[12] 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 Paris area.

And if, in some way, a "decentralisation" of Paris has occurred over time, it has occurred not from political and rational choice, but from the natural "spillover" of the local overloading; transferring the problems of the overcharging from the core of the metropolitan city to it peripheries.

After the Yom Kippur war in the mid 1970s, everywhere in France the hope of governing development collapsed. And in the peculiar zone of French territorial policy, the re-conquest of the concentration of Paris against any foolish aspiration of re-equilibrium occurred.

The institutional-regional strengthening - that 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 of the city effect at the scale of the national territory (especially 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 creating the basis for a theoretical justification of the *laisser 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*

---

[11] Impoverishment has been manifest through the loss of efficiency of these intermediary services already in place in the small and medium sized centres in the past.

[12] See Chapter 5 on the concept of the "urban system" and Chapter 12 on "the requirements of the modern city (or urban system)".

Travaux" in Paris and the research of a "European function" (however, these do not necessarily seem to derive from gigantism).

As has been expressed with efficacy in the report of the French team (PSC (1996), vol. III-B, France), having ascertained the failure (but we prefer to say, rather, the "lack") of any kind of typology of urban policy of the past period, the debate on urban policy at the national scale[13] 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 an access to urban values for all the territory.[14] 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, the supporters of the necessity to concentrate the effort are right when they assert the need for strategic localisation, that is, when they research an efficiency-size of the territorial units on which to base a new urban policy. They promote the larger cities because they research just the "city effect",[15] without which the decentralisation policy would file its goals itself and the means invested in this operation would be wasted.

But the supporters of the necessity to assure a minimum threshold of accessibility to urban services for all citizens and at the same time to try to valorise all the territorial resources of the country are also right.[16] It is a question

---

[13] A comprehensive vision of this debate comes from the papers collected as proceedings of the symposium, *Metropoles e Amenagement du Territoire*, organised in 1993 by Iaurif (Iaurif, [1993].

[14] 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 prevent a repetition of the same superficialities and to supersede them instead, in a dialectic way, with the sure advantage of a designed solution and of the new policy outlines to adopt.

[15] They research such an effect competitive even at a European level (with an unsuppressable 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 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 at the national scale would be less undesirable than that lost or not acquired at the international scale.

[16] This seems to be the official inspiration of a "low orientation for the territorial planning and development" (of February 1995) which established: a) that a national plan to be prepared would assure that any point of the territory would be at a distance 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 *"bassins de vie"* as the territorial unit of reference, organised 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. And, for the

of seeing if it is possible to do both 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[17] has gone, asking for a reorganisation of the urban equilibrium through the creation of certain "life basins" (*bassins de vie*) composed of the urban networks, which seem to be roughly similar in their criteria to the "urban systems" postulated by this research. And, in fact, it is even the effort and direction towards which the first steps of our research have been made.

Therefore we do not have in this case, as in other cases debated politically and 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 conditions to make both positions feasible.

Thus our research has attempted to propose a "system" of urban systems, capable of satisfying the above said requirements.

Leaving aside the level of 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.

3.2 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 London conurbation,[18] that yet goes much 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.

Giving a glance to the British initiative in the matter of organisation (and reorganisation) of the territory,[19] 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

---

moment, the approval of a correct scheme has been postponed. (See the report of the French team (PSC (1996), vol. I-B, France.)

[17] Mentioned in the previous note.

[18] 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 17th century it was said that there were more Welsh in London than in Wales, and this was much more than just a joke.

[19] See on this subject, the report of the British team (PSC (1996), vol. I-B, Great Britain, paragraph 3.2).

plan (a *lacuna* that 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.

And there has 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).[20] The *Regional Economic Planning Councils* (that have worked between 1964 and 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 the counties, 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 instruments more well known and more practised 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 seats for 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 keep the territorial delimitations of the counties (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 different counties together into an urban system (where the urban fabric has been thinner). In fact, this has happened when an individual county was too weak and too far from the critical mass required for the urban system.

3.3 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 that are:
- *historical* (belated unification of many city-states or city-regions into a unique German state.)[21]

---

[20] On the other hand, in Great Britain there are no "regions" that have a political autonomy and elected officials such as in 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, this last opinion could be considered somewhat arbitrary in light of what has happened in the other countries.

[21] A belated unification that, despite all contrary Bismarckian and Hitlerian efforts, has made Germany 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.

- *geomorphological* (vast territories of plains, which seems the ideal situation to test the theorems of the theoretical models of spatial interaction.)[22]
- *spatial planning* (Germany was the country that before any other - from the time of the Weimarer Republic - introduced a system of territorial ordering at different scales: national, regional, and local, in a co-ordinated and comprehensive vision.)[23]

It was therefore also the "easiest" country for us in our attempt to experiment with and concretely verify the research hypotheses the indicators selected.[24] 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:

- 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 the city effect) between all the territorial basins thus identified. These basins therefore assumed the characteristic of appropriate basins of evaluation and planning.[25]

---

[22] We believe that, not by chance, the spatial interaction theories (from Von Thunen to Alfred Webber, until Christaller) have 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-Wurtenberg: as a German, "Christaller" certainly was more of a "realist" than an Italian or British "Christaller" could have been.

[23] Without considering that Germany was also the cradle - at the end of the last century - of town planning. The American (Burnham and Ford), British (Adam and Unwin), Belgian (Buls) and, later on, French and Italian town planners have drawn from the first German scholars of the S*tadtbau* (Baumeister, Stuebber, Sitte, 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 urban growth around the turn of the century, which is a phenomenon common to all these countries). For all these evaluations and others, see Archibugi (1995).

[24] We have also had the luck 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.

[25] More information on the Federal Regional Planning Programme of 1975 is in the Report of the German group (PSC (1996), vol. I-B, Germany).

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. (See the report of the German group, PSC (1996), vol. I-B, Germany, paragraph 3.1 for some explanations given immediately by some authors for the failure of this programme).

But this particular 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

> …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 70's. They are mirrored in the following programmes and plans on different planning levels.

The conception we have limited ourselves to in pursuing this research leads us to say that this is not exactly 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 *Lander*. These guidelines refer to planning as an open process and – according to some colleagues – avoided the concreteness of the 1975 *Bundesraumordnungsprogramm*. They provide objectives and strategies for the spatial development in a unified Germany.

However the co-ordinator of the Actvill study has considered this guideline too weak with respect to the older programme, and, therefore, incapable of implementing an inversion of the trend of a hierarchical distribution of the urban effect in the entire German territory.[26]

---

[26] Dr. Eleanor Irmen, of the Federal Institute for Regional Research and Spatial Planning of Bonn and member of the team of the Actvill research, has made several personal comments regarding the final text of the Actvill General Research Report (on which this book is based) concerning the German case (some of which have been received by the co-ordinator of the research and incorporated into the text itself, but others have not been considered of common consensus and therefore not incorporated into the final text). These comments, however, deserve to be expressed in order to give a deeper evaluation of the different viewpoints which emerged within the same research group.

In general the disagreement concerns what evaluation to give to the official German " *Bundesraumordnungsprogramm* " of 1975, later abandoned by further German governments. Dr. Eleanor Irmen thinks that, *"we should not aim at developing a 'plan', comparable to the Bundesraumordnungsprogramm of 1975, at a European level."* The co-ordinator of the Actvill research thinks, on the contrary, that this kind of approach would the best advancement toward a

3.4 The Italian Case

In Italy, as in Germany, there has been an "historic" experience 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 together with 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 that given here of "urban systems".

In this document the national territory was reorganised into 30 "metropolitan systems" of differing nature and quality, in the attempt to combat in Italy as well, the overloading of some "metropolitan" areas (the Milan-Turin-Genoa triangle that is strongly conurbated and deserves the name of "megalopolis", and the metropolitan areas of Rome and Naples, that are strongly monocentric and likewise destined to undergo higher levels of congestion and environmental malaise.) The *Progetto '80* projections were decidedly "normative", and it proposed to indicate the feasible operational modalities which did not aggravate the gravitation on the metropolitan areas, and also on what conditions the small and medium-sized cities of the Italian hinterland too could reach values of "metropolitan" life, i.e. the city effect which is the subject of our research.

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

---

rational research to achieve a better distribution of the quality of life and city effect at a national scale in the European Union. This difference in opinion comes from the fact that Dr. Irmen has not considered the German experience of 1975 to be an acceptable experience of land-use planning at the national scale in Germany, despite the fact it was approved by a law and by a Committee with the full approval of the individual *Lander*. She explicitly argues that, *"we should avoid the concreteness of the Bundesraumordnungprogramm of 1975"*. She recalls more recent guidelines introduced by the Ministry responsible for spatial planning in Germany, the *Raumordnungspolitischer Orientierungsrahmen,* which was also agreed to by the *Lander* (and also quoted in our text earlier). But the co-ordinator, on the contrary, assesses this document as still very politically and technically weak and of a quality very inferior to the Land-Use Programme of 1975.

The same difference of opinion comes from the Berlin-basin case. Dr. Irmen thinks that the co-ordinator's opinion is the Brandenburg strategy, wanting to somehow ignore that there will be spill-over effects from Berlin onto the closer hinterlands which would need to be steered by planning strategies. Otherwise a total dispersion could be the result. According Dr. Irmen, "the scenario proposed [by the co-ordinator] makes sense in a way, but in the long term it needs to be supported by a network of cities which includes Berlin". The co-ordinator thinks - as was written in the Actvill report - that the territory actually influenced by the city of Berlin becomes more and more polarised by an excessive growth of Berlin, with damage to its ecological and quality of life equilibria With a co-ordinated planning strategy there would be a condition of critical mass to create some "alternative" systems of cities that could be polarised in themselves.

The Italian situation, in comparison to the French one, was characterised perhaps 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 and implement special self-promotion 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, which was the only hope in making 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 happened for the German Programme of Territorial Organisation of 1975). It suffered more or less the same fate as the German document: it only had a "cultural" and orienting influence. Many regions followed the indications of the territorial projections of *Progetto 80*, or at least some of the development hypotheses indicated were implemented. But in the subsequent years the system of intervention for the national territory followed completely different directions. These interventions were very sectorial and in no way co-ordinated, and to a large extent were implemented by the regions without any national co-ordination. The Ministry of Public Works, responsible for the "co-ordination 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 (PSC (1996), vol. III-B, Italy), there have been other sporadic attempts at re-launching an overall vision of urban policy at the national scale:

a) 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;

b) 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;

c) 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 was assumed as the verification basis for this research, and therefore also as the basis for the proposal of territorial reorganisation presented by the Italian group in this research.

4. The Scenario of Urban Territorial Reorganisation

4.1 The French Scenario

On the basis of the considerations made in paragraph 2 of this chapter, a guiding scenario has been attempted for France (see the map and attached table[27]). It has tried initially to resolve, in a reasonable and feasible way, two great problems that everybody is aware of (and which to a large extent are probably historically interdependent):

a) the super-concentration of Paris, in comparison to the entire territory of the country

b) 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[28] 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[29], of the remaining 7 units three constitute a first ring for the entire "core",[30]

---

[27] In the map and attached table of each of the four countries, the "urban systems" indicated are denominated as "City-Regions". Those "urban systems" that are strongly monocentric and are thus to be "depolarised" have voluntarily had their excessive regional "hinterland" reduced in order to create alternative "systems" to them, according to the principles developed throughout this research.

[28] Which - excluding the historic "*Ville de Paris*" where there are more than 2 million inhabitants - approximately constitute around 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.

[29]   The "core" is limited approximately by the "*boulevards peripheriques*".

[30] The city-regions or systems 17-B, 17-C and 17-D, corresponding moreover to the "Departments": *"Haute-Seine"*, *"Seine-Saint Denis"*, and *"Val-de-Marne"*.

and four constitute a second ring.[31] 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 which 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 have 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.[32] Nevertheless, the solutions proposed have seemed to us, in an evaluation of "trade-off" between various advantages and disadvantages of alternative proposals (alternative scenarios) the most favourable. Certainly, it is more favourable than abandoning places and resources which 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 absolutely those of "accessibility"). This solution certainly[33] creates tendential situations which go in exactly the opposite direction to those hoped for, by further strengthening the Paris area. *"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 that - 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.

---

[31] The city-regions or systems 13, 14, 15, and 16, corresponding to the Departments *"Yvelines", "Val-d'Oise", "Seine-et-Marne",* and *"Esonne"*.

[32] This holds true in particular 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); 26 (Limousin City Region); 30 (Savoie City Region); 35 (Valkence City Region); 38 (Roussillon City Region); and of course, 41 (Corse).

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

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

4.2 The German Scenario

The scenario proposed for Germany (map and attached table) obviously reflects the situation - already described in Paragraph 2 - of greater equilibrium of urban weight throughout the territory.

The overall result is that in the German case urban systems (or city regions) abound which 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. In our view these are only the following:

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

b) 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 balanced growth (the former two) or development (Rostock);

c) The basins of the Ruhr (nos. 11 and 17), whose current congestion, combined with phenomena 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 which should instead be preserved; thus the two basins of the Ruhr, when depolarised, could in a short time be aggregated to the category of the cities to be "rationalised";

d) 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) thus risking compromising the urban quality of Munich, already very satisfactorily developed, because of an overloading.

However in Germany, 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 (Mecklenburg, no. 3; Pommern, no. 4; Brandenburg, no. 6; Oder, no. 13; Magdeburg-Dessau, no. 9; Chemnitz, no. 20); and those of the old West which are still peripheral such as Westphalia (Munster-Osnabruck), no. 7;

the "Teuteburger city region" (Bielefeld-Paderborn), n.7bis; Kassel-Gottingen, no. 12; Westerwald and Vogelsberg (Siegen-Marburg-Giessen), no. 18; Wurzburg, no. 24; Bamberg-Bayreuth-Coburg, no. 25; Regensburg-Passau, no. 30; the Black Forest (Schwarzwald), no. 33; and Bodensee (no. 34).

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

4.3 The British Scenario

The British scenario (map and attached table) is, like that of France, dominated by the well-known problem (already commented on in paragraph 3) of the super-concentration of the capital, London. At the same time, this super-concentration is also realised in the other conurbated areas of the country, 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 proposal 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" with 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 habitational requirements).

For this reason, the territorial area of Greater London is regarded as insufficiently extensive to allow definition of these alternative centralities. While its population at the last census (1991) was 7.0 million, its catchment area, 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, which fell substantially in the post-war decades to 1981, has stabilised in recent years), 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 with respect to some overloading factors, such as those relative to daily traffic.

The proposal therefore suggests expanding the area of calculation of the appropriate catchment areas to some 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 (however, notoriously "dependent" on Greater London). Thus a separation has been

proposed for the area of London into a first system called "Inner London"[34] (no. 30), and another four "urban systems" or "city regions" (numbered from 26 to 29) each including a (peripheral) part of Greater London and a (marginal) part of the respective counties.[35]

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), Hartfield, Hertford, Ware, Hemel Hampstead (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 Buckinghamshsire 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, Foringham, Eynsform, 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, Hillington) with all the most important centres of Surrey (Epsom and Ewell, Leterhead, Guildford, Weybridge, Esher, Staines, Reigate, Horley, Dorking, Egam, Shepperton, etc.).

Obviously the proposal should be articulated in detail, 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. But the principle that we wish to affirm here 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 orientate guided policies of the concentration of private and (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

---

[34] 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.

[35] Except for the county of Surrey which would be entirely included in the System proposed as no. 29.

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. For example:

- System no. 7 which we have called the *Lancashire City-Region. C*ombines 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;
- And 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, the appurtenance to a strong cultural tradition, and the albeit sparse presence of 600 thousand inhabitants have led us to propose this area as an autonomous urban system, in the hope that with time it may contrast their traditional and natural gravitationality and dependence.

Something similar has been proposed also for the area of Birmingham (no. 14, 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). This system to be "depolarised" is flanked by some alternative re-equilibrium urban systems or city regions. These include no. 13, 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.

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, such as:

- 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. 1500 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[36];
- System no. 16 (*East Anglia City-Region*), certainly a problematic area traditionally sacrificed and dependent on London, which may reach 2 and a half million users. It may develop in a common network in which internal accessibility should be promoted;

To the South of London, we have:

- the Kent system (no. 22, *Kent City-Region*, with one million three hundred thousand 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;
- the system of the two counties of Sussex (no. 21: *Sussex City-Region*, a million and a half inhabitants), which has strong possibilities of polycentric development in a restricted but qualified number of centres that are strongly growing, but still strongly dependent on London.

For the rest 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. These are the urban systems (or city regions) which depend on:

- Bristol (no. 17) and the conurbated group of Southampton-Portsmouth and Bournemouth, etc. (no. 20) in England;
- Cardiff (no. 23) in Wales;
- and finally, Glasgow (no. 3) and Edinburgh (no. 4) in Scotland.

There are also three other systems that are likewise "to be rationalised". These refer to towns 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*, 1750,000 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. They are:

---

[36] See the report of the British group (PSC (1996), vol. III-B, Great Britain).

- 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).

4.4 The Italian Scenario

The Italian scenario has inspired for longest the approach followed in this research, and perhaps more than any other contains doubts and uncertainties.

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, suggests - for many other very weak urban areas - aggregation into urban systems capable with 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, depolarising the function of the historic centre and reducing the overload is to design alternative centres which absorb part of the functions of centrality and public spaces 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 the opposing result to the one sought for, with a further strengthening of the traditional centre, an enlargement of the disordered and chaotic settlements in the peripheries, 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.

Such areas in the suggested scenario are:

- *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;*

- *Milan* (No.5); an urban system whose catchment area, in the scenario, has been 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 in a single urban system;
- *Naples* (No.25); with a catchment area justifying at least *two alternative centres,* besides the strengthening of *Caserta's* centre in a single urban system;
- *Genoa* (No.12); whose catchment area justifies the strengthening of *Savona* in a single urban system;
- *Turin* (No.2); the catchment area justifies the design of an *alternative centre* within the metropolitan area;
- *Bologna* (No.14); the catchment area justifies the design of an *alternative centre* within the metropolitan area;
- *Florence* (No.17); the catchment area justifies the alternative strengthening of *Pistoia and Prato* in a single urban system;
- *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;
- *Catania* (No.33); the catchment area justifies the alternative strengthening of *Siracusa* in a single urban system;
- *Bari* (No.28); the catchment area justifies *another alternative centre* within the same metropolitan area.

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 be securely placed within the peripheral areas*, in a strategic position and in locations that 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 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 action simultaneous in the programme of actions with the two preceding ones and aimed at the same objectives, consists of *tightly linking together the planning and management of the urban transport systems in the metropolitan areas in question with the pre-chosen strategies of the two preceding designs,* in the same integrated design (we will come back to this in Chapter 18).

In connection with the re-qualification of the metropolitan areas by means of the creation of new centralities, programmes for the restoration of the historical centres that make up the same metropolitan areas are also anticipated.

The relief granted by the other actions will allow the historic centres to be restructured with the aim of *a recovery of their age-old function and of a specific adaptation to their 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 that 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 scenario anticipates 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 thus identified:

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 1,100,000 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 1,200,000 inhabitants that 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 2,500,000 inhabitants that today gravitate almost totally on 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 2,200,000 inhabitants that today continue to gravitate for 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 have to be better infrastructured. The catchment

area is of 3,300,000 inhabitants, and perhaps there is 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 1,200,000 inhabitants and 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 1,400,000 inhabitants that still gravitate towards Milan and Bologna

11. *"City of Romagna"* (no. 15), based on the functional integration of *Ravenna-Forli'-Cesena-Rimini* and their territories; a catchment area of about 1,000,000 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 1,600,000 inhabitants with poor urban quality, even considering the rich values inherited from the past

13. *"Sienese-Maremman 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 1,000,000 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 1,500,000 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 1,100,000 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 1,200,000 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* that have very low urban values despite the noteworthy development of the Salerno area; a catchment area of 1,500,000 inhabitants that 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, reach a potential of almost 500,000 inhabitants, with a very weak urban structure, diffused and without special centralities

21. *"City of the Salento"* (no. 29), based on the functional integration of *Brindisi-Taranto-Lecce*; a potential catchment area of 1,700,000 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 for the little they ask towards Bari and Napoli

23. *"City of the Sila"* (no. 31), including the territories of the provinces of *Catanzaro* and *Cosenza*; an extremely low urban quality and very difficult functional integration, but a catchment area of 1,500,000 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; a modest urban quality but an urban catchment area of 1,200,000 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, Caltanisetta* and *Ragusa* that are hard to polarise and are with difficulty functionally integrated and polycentric, but which represent a potential catchment area of 1,200,000 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 1,000,000 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 still a long way off in the future.

The 27 *"systems of cities"* (or city regions) proposed above are to be realised in different ways and with different lengths of time. But they have potential requisites in common: within the territorial space in question and within the minimum catchment area.

a. 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".

b. 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).

c. 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 failure.

d. 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 that, although in decline, to a greater or lesser extent facilitates recovery.

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