

Integrated conservation of Bologna: a categorized analysis of Pier Luigi Cervellati's work

Conservação integrada de Bolonha:
uma análise categorizada da obra de
Pier Luigi Cervellati

Conservación integrada de Bologna:
análisis categorizado de la obra de
Pier Luigi Cervellati



Fabricio Martins

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco - Recife - Pernambuco - Brasil

fabricio.martins@ufpe.br

Abstract: When approaching Integrated Conservation, it is common to refer the genesis of its notion to interventions and the promotion of social housing in Bologna historic center (Italy) in the 1960-70s. However, despite Integrated Conservation having a long experience, a clear concept has not been forged addressing its methods, objects, nor its categories of analysis. This analytical generality as to its nature and scope allowed the Bologna requalification process to be associated with many projects, some of which are frontally opposite in objective and strategy. This article seeks, through the bibliographical review of the works written by Pier Luigi Cervellati and his team – *Interventi nei centri storici: Bologna, politica e metodologia del restauro* (1976 [1973]) e *La nuova cultura delle città* (1981 [1977]) – and related authors, to analyze the experience of requalification in Bologna

requalification in Bologna through four categories: the habitat; the relationship between the historic center and the metropolis; collective property rights and public control of land income; and popular participation in the process. An analysis based on these categories allows, therefore, to clarify their inherent presuppositions and paradigms.

Keywords: Integrated Conservation. Pier Luigi Cervellati. Bologna historic center. Social habitat.

Resumo: Quando se aborda a Conservação Integrada, é comum remeter a gênese de sua noção às intervenções e à promoção da habitação social no centro histórico de Bolonha (Itália), entre 1960-70. Entretanto, apesar de a Conservação Integrada já contar com uma considerável experiência, não foi forjado um conceito claro que aborde seus métodos, objetos, nem suas categorias de análise. Essa generalidade analítica quanto à sua natureza e a seu alcance permitiu que a requalificação de Bolonha fosse associada a uma miríade de projetos, alguns deles frontalmente opostos em objetivo e estratégia. Esse artigo busca, por meio da revisão bibliográfica das obras escritas de Pier Luigi Cervellati e equipe – *Interventi nei centri storici: Bologna, politica e metodologia del restauro* (1976 [1973]) e *La nuova cultura delle città* (1981 [1977]) – e autores correlatos, analisar a experiência de requalificação em Bolonha, com base em quatro categorias: o habitat; a relação do centro histórico com a metrópole; os direitos de propriedade coletivos e o controle público da renda fundiária; e a participação popular. A análise, com base nessas categorias permite, portanto, tornar claros seus pressupostos e paradigmas inerentes.

Palavras-chave: Conservação Integrada. Pier Luigi Cervellati. Centro Histórico de Bolonha. Habitat social.

Resumen: Al abordar la Conservación Integrada, es común referir la génesis de su noción a las intervenciones y promoción de la vivienda social en el centro histórico de Bolonia (Italia), entre 1960-70. Sin embargo, a pesar de que la Conservación Integrada ya tiene una experiencia considerable, no se ha forjado un concepto claro que aborde sus métodos, objetos o categorías de análisis. Esta generalidad analítica en cuanto a su naturaleza y alcance permitió asociar la recalificación de Bolonia a una miríade de proyectos, algunos de ellos frontalmente opuestos en objetivo y estrategia. Este artículo busca, a través de una revisión bibliográfica de los trabajos escritos de Pier Luigi Cervellati y su equipo - *Interventi nei centri storici: Bologna, politica e metodologia del restauro* (1976 [1973]) e *La nuova cultura delle città* (1981 [1977]) - y autores relacionados, analizar la experiencia de recalificación en Bolonia, basada en cuatro categorías: el hábitat; la relación entre el

metrópoli; derechos de propiedad colectivos y control público de los ingresos de la tierra; y participación popular. El análisis, basado en estas categorías, permite, por tanto, aclarar sus presupuestos y paradigmas inherentes.

Palabras clave: Conservación Integrada. Pier Luigi Cervellati. Centro histórico de Bolonia. Hábitat social.

Introduction

Within the scope of heritage management, Integrated Conservation is understood as a mode of conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of old buildings and sites to adapt them to contemporary functions. It represents the debate between the desire for protection and the need to adjust to the present, so architectural heritage is not discarded or turned into a museum piece.

Its manifest ideal remained present in the form of planning rehabilitation of the built heritage in a specific way and adapted to the place's socio-economic, environmental, and spatial conditions (ZANCHETTI; LAPA, 2012). However, according to Zanchetti (2008), although Integrated Conservation already has extensive experience, there was no adoption of a clear concept that addresses its methodology, object, or categories of analysis. Zanchetti takes it as "a way of approaching planning and management of urban cultural heritage." Choay (1999) and Jokilehto also rehearsed a conceptualization but fell into generality. Authors who refer to this notion cite the example of Bologna conveniently as an inspiration, albeit in case studies as disparate as the requalification of Pelourinho (PARISI, 2002), Ribeira do Porto (SAMPAIO, 2017), among others.

This article critically analyzes the urban conservation policy applied in Bologna, based on two works by Pier Luigi Cervellati and others: "*Interventi nei centri storici: Bologna, politica e metodologia del restauro*" (1976 [1973]) and "*La Nuova cultura delle città*" (1981 [1977]). The object justifies the choice of works, which is the Bologna historic center conservation program. Through the lens of the author/technician, the author lends his analysis to build the narrative of the process. This personal bias is mitigated by confronting data presented in the two base works with related literature.

Bologna's urban conservation policy starts from apparently contradictory premises: preserving the architectural and urbanistic material built in the past while maintaining community traditions of the people residing in the present and updating infrastructure to meet the demands of the contemporary quality of life. From this perspective, mass urbanization, the ideology of infinite urban expansion, speculative real estate capital, the loss in the relevance of historic centers, and the prospect of architectural heritage losses emerge as working themes.

heritage losses emerge as working themes.

We propose some analytical categories under the following aspects: the relationship between metropolis and historic center; collective property rights and public control of land income; the idea of habitat; and social participation in conservation. From these categories extracted after the primary theoretical framework, we discuss some paradigms of heritage conservation. The objective is to put in a historical-material perspective the process that forged this policy, articulating it to the social totality – its political, economic, and ideological conjuncture – and its movements. Reference is made to “the thought of Pier Luigi Cervellati” as if he were the only author, although Roberto Scannavini and Carlo De Angelis collaborated on these works. This perception derives from the fact that Cervellati was the principal author of these works. At the time of his participation in the Bolognese municipal administration, he had professional ascendancy.

The habitat, according to Cervellati

The touchstone for understanding housing policy in Cervellati's work is to use it as an element of "social service" (CERVELLATI E SCANNAVINI, 1976, p. 3). This designation has multiple implications – legal, economic, social, ideological – that permeate a system developed to combine heritage conservation with social housing intrinsically. His choice was not random. It was also part of the legal engineering to make social housing viable in the historic center without being held hostage by real estate speculation. It was also a way to unite, in a simple concept, the complexity of the architectural typological arrangement with the idea of collective life domination over isolation and passivity.

At first, the most obvious question was its ideological nature. For Cervellati, the habitat is not limited to the domestic space, which is purely familiar, and it extends to the city through the provision of public services. This expansive and collectivist vision stands as an antidote to "uprooting", whose consequences are the ills of the liberal city: "isolation of families, reciprocal hostility and violence as a means of defense" (CERVELLATI; SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 107). As a post-liberal city policy, the fragmentation of urban land transformed an asset previously

identified as indivisible into merchandise, which allowed the consolidation of the privatist ideological appropriation of the city.

The "new urban culture" is portrayed as a return to the urbanism practiced in times that preceded the industrial revolution. For this purpose, the author brings back Luigi Piccinato's thoughts, to whom "the ancient city was not only a collective expression, it was also the property of its inhabitants, and, as such, it was a public asset used and managed by everyone" (Ibid., p. 42). This conservation policy manifests a profoundly classist cut. It uses the State's direct action to favor a vulnerable social stratum while maintains the historic center's cultural essence: artisans, workers, traditional families, the elderly, students.

A change in social behavior was desired, overcoming isolationism through the rediscovery of collective life. Thus, the concept of the "craftsman's house" becomes an idyllic model of restored habitat. This housing rescues the pre-modern intersection between privacy and work environments, in addition to protecting open spaces, gardens, vegetable gardens, and corridors as "places of collective life". In other words, indispensable elements for creating social relationships like those existing in the idealized spatial organization of the ancient cities. This habitat model would influence all aspects of conservation policy: the typology of dwellings; the proportions between private and public space in each building; the equitable distribution of goods and services across the territory; the type of contract between tenants-municipal-owners; the maintenance of the social characteristics of the neighborhood; and, finally, the democratic dimension of public management.

Behind the criticism of consumerism and the "economy of abundance", a political agenda prioritized public consumption (CAMPOS VENUTI, 1981). Namely, a city structured around collective needs, supported by diversified, accessible public services, evenly distributed over the territory, and adapted to the well-being projections of its time. By this conception, housing would no longer be considered in isolation, and it would correspond to a unit that projects itself in a network of communal facilities. Cervellati proposes a frugal ("satisfactory") housing, complemented by public spaces ("neighborhood equipment"), "in which housing was minimized due to the quantity and quality of different services offered outside of it: street, church, market, square, city, etc." (Cervellati and Scannavini, 1976, p. 58).

Thus, communal (or shared) environments would no longer be a residual and marginal space and would play an organizing role in the city. In turn, Carrion (2007b) defends the conversion of public spaces into a "system of significant places so that they give order to the city and allow the population to meet and integrate". This notion of habitability breaks with the paradigm of modern urbanism: the importance of the private environment over spaces of common fruition.

Campos Venuti (1981) calls this way of life "austerity", as a way to abstain from the excessive. Therefore, it is not related to economic scarcity but with the idea of frugality and conscious consumption, linked to necessity and well-being, not to hedonistic desire. Above all, he defends the centrality of the public and collective service offer as a means to transform the urban environment and the city's way of life. Residential configuration produced by restoration must also be appreciated in terms of the needs of the families that inhabit the old city (CERVELLATI E SCANNAVINI, 1976, pp. 60; 133). Each building would have a combination of possibilities derived from the architectural typology used, according to the number of floors, volumetry, presence of atriums, internal gardens, shops on the ground floor (BANDARIN, 1979, pp. 197-198).

Unlike similar plans, the 1970 Bologna Master Plan based its notion of "habitability" on the collective dimension of urban life – an original idea by Modena (1965) – and thus foresaw 64 m² of public facilities per inhabitant, 30 m² at the neighborhood level (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI E DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 133). The reinsertion of significant monuments (decommissioned palaces and convents) would also carry symbolism, and they would assume daily access functions to the population and not identified with "cultural elitism". Two fundamental principles are present in the reanimation of significant monuments (Ibid., 1981, p. 41): "one is to assess the qualities of monuments according to their context [insertion in the urban fabric], the other according to its use potentials". The new mission of these architectural ensembles would have the create centralities within the neighborhoods and provide social benefits (ibid., 1981, p. 139). "Participatory urbanism" (CAMPOS VENUTI, 1988) was no longer abstract and would acquire "a spectacular spatial expression" (BODENSCHATZ, 2017, pp. 221-23).

Cervellati, Scannavini and De Angelis (1981, p. 32) also highlighted the feasibility of urban conservation from a financial perspective: the overall cost of renovation and preservation

compared to new construction and urban sprawl. They proposed an assessment of the expenses according to the waste that new construction represents, the crisis in agriculture, the cost of urban development, and legal and logistical difficulties.

Hence, it was necessary to adopt a particular non-explicit pricing method to achieve an objective comparison between the price per inhabitant of new construction in suburban neighborhoods and that of rehabilitation of historic neighborhoods: i) the equivalent extra cost for the implementation of primary infrastructure networks and social facilities; ii) the cost of public and private transport services that depend on the location of a new neighborhood concerning the existing urban environment and, above all, job placement; iii) the cost of the investments needed to ensure a certain quality of life for residents; iv) and the costs of additional administrative services for managing a larger city.

Furthermore, there is another aspect that defines the configuration of housing planning: legality. Although little explored in Cervellati's works, the issue refers to two norms: the 167/1962 Act and the 865/1971 Act. Through an extensive interpretation of the 167/1962 Act, a theme worked on by Campos Venuti (1971, pp. 87-95), the municipality of Bologna loosened compliance with the law. Its original purpose was to enable land purchase at a low cost in peri-urban areas to be used for housing developments. However, some municipalities increased the scope of the rule based on a technical legal issue. The hypotheses of the ten-year "Plan for economical housing construction" (PEEP) being a "partial plan" – as it would assume an *ipsis literis* interpretation of the rule – or a "sectoral aspect of the master plan (PRG)" were debated. If it were considered a "partial plan", the municipalities would need to plan interventions for ten years rigidly and detail those interventions at the level of dividing buildings into plots and volumes. However, the extravagant interpretation of the 167/1962 Act – which Bologna adopted – settled that PEEP would be a sectorial provision for general planning. As a variant of the master plan, the municipality would draw up partial plans annually, following current demands once they had chosen intervention areas. This understanding allowed for unprecedented adaptability in housing planning and the possibility of experimenting with different architectural types and construction methods.

For example, PEEP Historic center (1973) developed the methodology of "intervention units", programming sectors, and subsectors, reproducing different forms of association between

housing and collective services and types of preexisting architectural, social structures. As a result, this practice rejected the ordinary policy of standardization (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 107). On the other hand, the PEEP Historic Center (1973) bet on classifying housing as a "public service" to use the expropriation tools provided by the 865/1971 Act to lower construction costs. Although the norm does not foresee expropriation for urban requalification programs, it has become the favored mechanism to guarantee public ownership of buildings to be restored (ULSHÖFER, 2017, pp. 243-244). In general, the form of association between government and homeowners was given by "convention". The city hall agreed with owners to renew the buildings in exchange for strict rent control and restrictions on purchase and sale operations (BODENSCHATZ, 2017, pp. 219-221).

The maintenance of traditional social composition and diversity was also a task of conservation policy. The depopulation of the historic center towards the new suburban neighborhoods was fully felt and identified by urban planners as a method of expelling vulnerable populations. The population density in the city center dropped by 11% between 1961 and 1971 due to degradation of assets and increased rents (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI E DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 133). In 1967, the region was home to 71.000 inhabitants, and the Plan for the Historic Center (1969) admitted a further decrease of 10.000 inhabitants (ULSHÖFER, 2017, p. 241). The PEEP Historic Center (1973) aimed to reverse this trend and return to the population density observed in 1961.

Cervellati established the concept of "conserving the social function of old centers". Protecting these irreplaceable cultural assets is only justified if the human heritage is respected if its population and traditional activities remain in the territory. Without these characteristics, conservation resembles an "architectural and urban landscape decoration", making it indefensible in the long run. Furthermore, the simultaneous presence of diverse social strata in the same neighborhood, sometimes in the same building, would provide proof of a collective and undifferentiated consumption of the city (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 133).

A central aspect in this perspective was maintaining residents in their respective neighborhoods, not only after the requalification but also during construction. The city's wealth resides both in the extension and authenticity of its architectural

heritage and the social and economic relations that residents develop, the product of years (even centuries) of customs, affection, and exchanges.

Why does the city grow? The metropolis and the historical center

Political discourse – especially on the left, with emphasis on the Italian Communist Party (PCI), hegemonic in Bologna – had already incorporated criticisms to the “evils of the modern city” (CAMPOS VENUTI, 1988; BARTOLINI, 2017). Urban sprawl was no longer admitted as a natural, unavoidable, and unquestionable phenomenon but the result of an economic model that rewards immeasurable surplus-value transforming rural land into suburban neighborhoods with deficient infrastructure and dependent on automobiles.

The process of continuous urban growth formed a vicious circle of cause and effect that links suburban sprawl to patterns of land use and value transformation in the historic center. The “moving value” (HARVEY, 1980 [1973]) presents itself both in territorial inequality and as dispossession (Ibid.), in which private, and public investments in support of the private enterprise (entrepreneurialism), increase land value in central areas. The cyclical real estate surplus allows eviction procedures to artificially increase the demand for new peripheral housing, which accelerates the city's expansion.

According to these parameters, the historic center would correspond to a real estate stock whose effects of degradation/appreciation make up a kind of “long-term dividend” (CERVELLATI E SCANNAVINI, 1976, p. 7). It is an idea that dialogues with David Harvey's “urban entrepreneurism” and Schumpeter's “creative destruction”. The ruin of the historic heritage is the anteroom of real estate revaluation made possible by rehabilitation and the realization of differential ground rent (HARVEY, 2013 [1982]), “the excess of profits of certain producers due to their advantageous situation” (Harvey, 1980 [1973], p. 154).

The metropolis' socio-economic and geographic imbalances will not be resolved appropriately, while heritage conservation is reduced to a purely cultural debate. If urban conservation were to

remain an isolated phenomenon, concerning only the fate of the old city, and not as an essential integrated organizing principle of the city, the safeguarding of the old would remain a remarkable fact, "a meritorious cultural work". For Cervellati, the ancient city is a cultural asset and an economic asset that needs to be preserved to ensure its social vocation, linked to the original value of the territory, the place of collectivity. Thus, Cervellati criticizes the choice of purely elitist uses, such as changing the pattern of occupation of real estate (establishment of banks, offices, and luxury commerce), made to exacerbate real estate surplus value.

The excessive growth of suburbs is admitted as inconvenient, both to the management of services and the citizen's own life. They were portraying metropolises as generators of "disease" without being able to promote "true urbanity", nor "cultural and social progress". Therefore, it was necessary to redefine the calling of urban planning, traditionally limited to rationalize the growth of metropolitan-type agglomerations. As a "product of a collectivity, the city cannot be replaced by individual projects, whatever their rationales and pertinence" (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 14). It must be structured according to the requirements of most citizens. This perspective was also present in the works of Henri Lefebvre, for whom "changing life", 'changing society', means nothing without the production of an appropriate space" (LEFEBVRE, 2000 [1974], p. 72). Cervellati proposed that to overcome this urban conservation model, going beyond the punctual restoration of heritage, pursuing a global and integrated ordering of the city, with the historic center being the matrix area (core area) of this ordering. From this perspective, a policy of simultaneous physical and social structures safeguards of the old city can then be applied in other neighborhoods.

Like Giovannoni (2012 [1930]), Cervellati also recognizes a fracture between the "modern city" and the "old city". Both authors couldn't find continuity between these opposing urban models: their spatial forms and organizational principles are irreducibly different. Most modern city functions, mainly bureaucratic and commercial activities, which generate excessive traffic, are incompatible with the old urban fabric and road network. Thus, conservation management requires, first, a global balance of the historic city and its peripheral neighborhoods. It consists of analyzing the real estate fabric of the intervention zone and its population composition, and, on the other hand, in the particular choice of what role this area will play in the metropolitan context (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, p. 40).

The metropolitan planning policy should consider urban centers as elements belonging to polycentric systems integrated. On the other hand, it would be necessary to individualize the historic center's role so that its specific functions are not subtracted or modified (CERVELLATI E SCANNAVINI, 1976 p. 4). On the issue of multiple centralities and the tasks performed by the historic center, Carrion (2007a) categorizes them as "foundational centrality", whose function was initially disciplining and civilizing; the "functional centrality", marked by the need for integration between poles of concentration of uses and services and expanding urban area; and the "thematic centrality", with a role of connectivity in the context of the global and informational city.

The reasoning was as follows: if some activities of the "modern city" tended to disturb or destroy the historic center, a metropolitan organization should encourage the coexistence of different types of centralities. Only a few activities could be in the old center, while the remnants would have to settle in the expanding zones. These assumptions partially converged with Giovannoni's (2012 [1930]) thought about the role of the historical nucleus of contemporary cities without going to the extreme of predicting the marginalization of its position.

Collective property rights and control of land income

In the 1960s, the issue of urban land ownership rose to prominence on the Italian Communist Party (PCI) agenda. Palmiro Togliatti, leader of the PCI (1926-1964), identified the real estate market as a "class force", present in the stage of capitalism understood by the extension of cities, by the change in the industrial profile, and by speculation on the land value. Moreover, it was necessary to introduce expropriation measures to limit speculation (BARTOLINI, 2017, p. 57). Giuseppe Campos Venuti (1971, pp. 1-38) identified "the struggle against differential rent" as one of the critical elements of metropolitan governance.

The alternative to private appropriation of the land surplus profit would then involve the municipality's control over the historic center, initially planned to be direct, through land and real state acquisitions. The expansion of the public real estate stock was already taking place to enhance public facilities. What was

proposed, when presenting the draft of the PEEP Historic Center, in October 1972, was the constitution of a public fund to "translate very quickly into concrete actions the priorities defined by the neighborhood budget, by PEEP and by the communal Plan for public facilities" (CERVELLATI, SCANNAVINI; DE ANGELIS, 1981, pp. 72-73).

Cervellati and Scannavini (1981, p. 75) diagnosed that direct municipal control in the intervention sectors would correspond to more than half of the area in the historic center, considering various convents and palaces, social service centers, gardens, as well as the university area and the municipal real estate park. The artifice to combine the City Hall's budget limitation with PEEPs ambition was to classify, in an extravagant and unprecedented way, housing as a "public service" and, thus, use the capacities present in the 865/1971 Act as a way to lower expropriation costs. The literalness of the norm allowed for land and building expropriation in urban centers to implement schools, parks, and public services in general, at a price equivalent to the value of the agrarian land multiplied by coefficients designated according to its use (BANDARIN, 1979, p. 198). So, the price paid by the administration, as "cleaned of all speculative values", would be significantly lower than the market value.

Expropriation became the favored mechanism to guarantee the public ownership of buildings and enable an original type of real right of use: the "cooperative on undivided property" (CERVELLATI AND SCANNAVINI, 1976, p. 13). The projected system would be structured as such: properties would be expropriated and renovated by the municipality; the administration would accommodate residents in temporary housing in the vicinity of their property; and it would form a mechanism of collective property right, in which the title of homeownership would be common to all its residents, to make it unavailable to the real estate market.

The consequences of this ownership model were not restricted to the uniqueness of the property. Collective ownership would allow cooperative management of the entire intervention area. Each cooperative member would have the right to occupy an apartment for the duration of their life, with a guarantee of fair rent, according to the apartment size. There would be no obligation of financial compensation to the administration from the resident other than rent since the cost of acquiring and restoring a property would be reimbursed through social rent over time (BANDARIN, 1979, p. 199). If applied in all areas of

intervention, it would form a large collective housing park, whose ownership and management would be autonomous and self-organizing, constituting a "self-managed space" (LEFEBVRE, 1991 [1968]). This system would also allow the tenants' mobility within the renovated area, under the family's present needs.

The collectivist and expropriation aspects became the focal point of a heated debate. Opposition from local newspapers and lower-middle-class residents, whose residence often represented the only family property, put technicians and the local PCI in a defensive position (BODENSCHATZ, 2017, pp. 220-221). Opposition was especially vocal in discussions in neighborhood councils, with the program being perceived as discriminatory against a group of homeowners who happened to own properties in the historic center (BANDARIN, 1979, p. 199). The resistance expressed by smallholders – many of them from the lower middle class and members of the PCI – turned the proposed "undivided property cooperative" into a "lost cause" (ULSHÖFER, 2017, p. 245).

Another more practical aspect also came to light: the extensive interpretation of the 865/1971 Act could delay construction due to potential legal challenges over expropriations and purchasing value by the concerned owners. And, despite favorable legal opinions, it was uncertain whether the Constitutional Court would endorse the interpretation of the rule as per PEEP (BANDARIN, 1979, p. 199).

Project miscommunication and, ultimately, disagreement over the issue of the small urban property was not unique to Bologna. The responsibility to govern a plurality of large cities throughout Italy, from the 1970s onwards, brought about an update of the communist discourse about homeownership. According to Bartolini (2017, pp. 70-71), Enrico Belinguer, leader of the PCI (1972-84), admitted "errors of a political line" reflected in the hostility against small urban landowners. The PCI Central Committee attested to this political change in October 1979 when it declared the importance of real estate development and the social value of homeownership as a family investment in stark contrast to the previous party line.

The immediate consequence of this controversy was the abandonment of the collective contractual form and, together with it, the self-managed cooperative management system of the intervention zones. A compromise solution to ensure public control over house fruition without interfering with property rights was established by adopting an instrument called "convention".

This change represented abandoning an anti-capitalist financial design favoring a pacifying solution between residents and the government. Urban renewal would still be able to protect the interests of low-income tenants, as it essentially regulated the relationship between landlords and tenants. The neighborhood committees were responsible for reviewing the construction permits and could control aspects of the work, such as the restoration modalities and the proposed destination. In the end, the proposal resulted in a mix of a real estate rehabilitation program with general rent control measures. The public-private type partnership took place in democratic city management, with the interventions' goals being defined by the residents.

As Fainstein (2014) points out, it is not within reach of municipal governments to carry out structural changes in value and exchange relations. This prerogative rests ultimately on the action of the National States. Aware of these political action limitations, Cervellati, Scannavini, and De Angelis (1981, p. 107) still struggled for the alternative self-managed cooperatives "in the framework of a national Act giving expropriation means, and then entrusting the management of restored properties to cooperatives". For them, the convention would only be a transitory option to respond to a complex socio-economic situation. Bologna was the first to adopt the concept of a convention between public authorities and landlords for building rehabilitation. However, it was strengthened and eventually incorporated into the National Housing Reform Act of 1977. The collective property rights instrument was abandoned as a policy.

Final considerations

It is possible to characterize Integrated Conservation, from the "Bologna model", as a political agenda summarized as follows: for the historic center to exist and be relevant in the context of the contemporary metropolis, its intrinsic functions must be unveiled in a way that is compatible with its structures, that respects the characteristics of its community networks and, for its conservation, that shall never dispense with social responsibility towards its traditional population.

These characteristics are beyond the purely scientific and tool dimension. It is noticed that the actions analyzed sought to plan

the city in a structured way and, above all, with a purpose. It starts from the assumption that the urban environment is a privileged place in which capital is made up and that it influences the capitalist mode of production through its geopolitics and formation. It also starts from the notion that the real estate surplus value can be recovered (at least in part) by the government for the benefit of society, and public action can reasonably safeguard, according to criteria of social justice, the citizens most exposed to speculative fury.

Integrated Conservation, as a “new urban culture”, translates into a call for the appropriation of conservation and urban planning methodological tools to build a society in which capital does not limit, enslave, or discourage human potential. The following public agenda paradigms were observed: urban differential rent control; housing as a social service; public services as an extension of the habitat and welfare condition; historic center as the structuring core of a metropolitan policy and as a heritage ensemble endowed with its significance and sense of historical continuity; and, finally, a democratic approach to city management.

Referências

BANDARIN, F. The Bologna Experience: Planning and Historic Renovation in a Communist City. In: APPLEYARD, D (ed.). The Conservation of European Cities. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press, 1979.

BARTOLINI, F. Changing Cities. An Urban Question for the Italian Communist Party. In: BAUMEISTER, M. BONOMO, B. SCHOTT, D (eds.). Cities contested: Urban Politics, Heritage, and Social Movements in Italy and West Germany in the 1970s. Frankfurt-am-Main: Campus Verlag, 2017.

BODENSCHATZ, H. Bologna and the (Re-) Discovery of Urban Values. In: BAUMEISTER, M. BONOMO, B. SCHOTT, D (eds.). Cities contested: Urban Politics, Heritage, and Social Movements in Italy and West Germany in the 1970s. Frankfurt-am-Main: Campus Verlag, 2017.

CAMPOS VENUTI, G. La Administración del Urbanismo. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 1971.

_____. La Terza Generazione dell'Urbanistica. 2ª ed. Milano: Franco Angeli, 1988.

_____. Urbanismo y Austeridad. Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores, 1981.

CARRIÓN, F. El financiamiento de los centros históricos de América Latina y El Caribe. Quito: Ed. FLACSO-LILP, 2007a.

_____. Espacio público: punto de partida para la alteridad. En Olga Segovia (Ed.), Espacios públicos y construcción social. Hacía un ejercicio de ciudadanía (pp.79-97). Santiago de Chile: Ediciones SUR, 2007b.

CERVELLATI, P.L.; SCANNAVINI, R. Bolonia: política y metodología de la restauración de centros históricos. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 1976.

CERVELLATI, P. L.; SCANNAVINI, R.; DE ANGELIS, C. La nouvelle culture urbaine: Bologne face à son patrimoine. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981.

CHOAY, F. A Alegoria do Patrimônio. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1999.

COMUNE DI BOLOGNA. Assessorato ai problemi urbanistici dell'assetto territoriale del comune del comprensorio. Variante al piano regolatore generale. Piano per il centro storico. Norme tecniche di attuazione adottate con deliberazione consiliare del 21 luglio 1969, n. 74 dell'O.d.G, [S.l. : s.n.], 1969.

_____. Il piano per l'edilizia economica e popolare relativo al centro storico di Bologna (Peep Centro storico), 1973.

_____. Piano Regolatore Generale della Città di Bologna. 1955. Disponível em: < https://www.rapu.it/ricerca/pdf/3_1083.pdf>. Acesso em 03 set. 2021.

FAINSTEIN, S. The just city, International Journal of Urban Sciences, 18:1, 1-18, 2014. Disponível em: <DOI: 10.1080/12265934.2013.834643>. Acesso em 12 Ago. 2021.

GIOVANNONI, G. Vecchie Città ed Edilizia Nuova", Nuova Antologia, vol. CLXV, fasc. 995 (1º de junho), pp. 449-472. Tradução: Renata Campello Cabral e Carlos Roberto M. de Andrade. (2012 [1931]) Disponível em < <https://docplayer.com.br/57343920-Velhas-cidades-e-nova-construcao-urbana.html> >. Acesso em: 15 ago. 2021.

HARVEY, D. Os limites do capital. Chicago [1982]. [Verso, 2007]) Tradução Magda Lopes, São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

_____. A justiça social e a cidade. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1980 [1973] LEFEBVRE, 1991 [1968]. A vida cotidiana no mundo moderno. São Paulo: Ática.

_____. (2000 [1974]). La production de l'espace. 4 ed. Paris: Anthropos

ITÁLIA. Legge 18 aprile 1962, n. 167, Disposizioni per favorire l'acquisizione di aree fabbricabili per l'edilizia economica e popolare.

_____. Legge 22 ottobre 1971, n. 865. Programmi e coordinamento dell'edilizia residenziale pubblica.

_____. Legge 28 gennaio 1977, n. 10. Norme per la edificabilità

dei suoli.

PARISI, R. S. B. Um Olhar de Bolonha: Memória e Identidade na Recuperação dos Centros Urbanos. 2001. 226f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Arquitetura e Urbanismo). Centro de Ciências Exatas, Ambientais e de Tecnologias, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas, Campinas.

SAMPAIO, A. R. Centros Históricos de Bolonha e do Porto: Lições de Reabilitação Urbana para o Debate Contemporâneo. Revista CPC, (23), 40-64. Disponível em: < <http://www.revistas.usp.br/cpc/article/view/128187>>. Acesso em: 14 nov. 2018.

ULSHÖFER, J. From "Vechio Nucleo Cittadino" to "Centro Storico" On Bologna's Preservation Policies and the Social Cost of Urban Renewal (1955-1975). In: BAUMEISTER, M. BONOMO, B. SCHOTT, D (eds.). Cities contested: Urban Politics, Heritage, and Social Movements in Italy and West Germany in the 1970s. Frankfurt-am-Main: Campus Verlag, 2017.

ZANCHETI, S. M. Conservação Integrada e Planejamento Urbano: uma revisão. Cadernos de Estudos Sociais (Fundaj), Recife. v. 19, n. 1, p. 107-124. Jan/Jun, 2003. Disponível em: <<https://periodicos.fundaj.gov.br/CAD/article/view/1312/1032>>. Acesso em: 11 jun. 2018.

ZANCHETI, S. M. LAPA, T. A. Conservação Integrada: Evolução Conceitual. In: LACERDA, N. ZANCHETI, S. M. Plano de Gestão da Conservação Urbana: Conceitos e Métodos. Centro de Estudos Avançados da Conservação Integrada (CECI). Olinda, 2012;