

The metropolitan question in Italy

European horizons of urban integration

Stefania Montebelli, Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Dipartimento di Scienze Umane, Rome, Italy

Received: April 2/2019
Accepted: April 9/2019

ABSTRACT. Starting from the nineties of the twentieth century, in Italy, the first specific tools have been developed to guarantee territorial agreements, in order to deal with the issue of local autonomies and to set the metropolitan areas, by the law 142 of 1990. In 2014, the most recent 'Delrio' Reform tried to list the categories of the metropolitan cities in order to build links and balances between central and local authorities. An effort that has gone hand in hand with that made by the European Union in the field of urban development and which found the principles of a collaborative and integrated Community policy in the 2014-20 Cohesion Policy and in the 2016 EU Urban Agenda for the implementation of a transformed metropolitan area, including various urban frames, namely the most marginal ones.

KEYWORDS: Cohesion policy, Italian metropolitan city, urban agenda, urban integration

Prologue

From 2014-2020 Cohesion Policy to the EU Urban Agenda: Italy between politics and funds for urban development (1)

Starting from the nineties, The European Commission has more and more addressed its politics through competition and cohesion of members countries. In Italy, precisely in that decade, specific instruments were completed to grant territories pacts and to face the subject of local autonomies such as the law 142/1990 art. 17, metropolitan areas. This first reformation of local organizations was not used enough, most of all because local authorities did not always choose the cooperation and team group in the Italian situation, strongly interested by regional centralizations and local fragmentations. The most recent reformation of local authorities (the so called 'Delrio' Reform), born from the DDL and introduced on

the 20th August 2013 by Letta's Government, was then transformed in the law 56 of April 2014. The latter tried to define clearly the categories of competence of metropolitan cities and the effort that must be faced to create connections and balances between central and local requests.

Everything should be realized without forgetting the partnership approach proposed by The European Commission in which every member state in *2014-20 Cohesion Policy* has to empower the competition between European cities and regions, promoting the growth and creating job opportunities through the European structural and investment funds (SIE funds) (Commissione Europea, 2014a). Between these, there is FESR European fund for regional development that was conceived to develop cooperative urban politics coherent in the whole community space. It is able to support, by financing, the integrated strategies of urban development. It finds solutions to new challenges that touch administration, economic, environmental demographic and social fields of the city. This wants to oppose the European urban phenomenon of proliferation of huge polycentric urban regions, connected by a net of small and medium towns lacking a solid politic-functional base, together with: "Growing separation between administrative structures and urban structures so to reduce cohesion and compromising competition because of inadequate governance and infrastructures" (Commissione Europea, 2014b). The political response at national and European level to this need of managing a city, like space of economic, social and environmental of the actual moment has been: "slow and fragmentary, with different sectorial purposes, but scarcely integrated" (Commissione Europea, 2014b). From this point a new necessity became the focus: an adjustment of EU politics and the need to cooperate the development of different urban realities of which Europe is composed, to adapt the intentions through a urban communitarian agenda. That's why EU introduced in *2014-20 Cohesion Policy*, the principles of a communitarian politics of cooperation and integration for the creation of a transformed metropolitan space and including the different urban frames, even and particularly, the most marginal (2). In 2016, two years after the approval of *2014-20 Cohesion Policy*, a need of planning based on new goals and on operational use for urban community politics, led EU to Amsterdam Pact where the main teams of *2016 EU Urban Agenda* (3) were defined. From this we reach what the European Commission defines as an "ambitious" National Urban Agenda which has as a fundamental point, the direct participation of cities in the development strategies (4). The National Urban Agenda of the member states that accepted the partnership, fixes the city priorities such as poverty, demographic change, use of renewable energies and spatial and social segregation that is the aim to integrate the peripheral marginalities in an urban and inclusive background able to overcome the difference center – suburbs. In Italy, the chapter 3.1.3. of the *Accordo di partenariato 2014-2020* (5), between Italian government and European Commission, is thus dedicated to the sustainable urban development and to the processes our Country means to adopt to pursue it. However, right now no National Urban Agenda, able to organize all the actions started thank to the structural fund FESR and to the Operative Programme PON METRO (6) has been approved yet:

The most part of Italian regions, both the least and most evolved, in their operative Program FESR has established an axe of intervention fully dedicated to "Urban development" or integrated plans of wide zone especially dedicated to urban areas [to realize through Territorial (so called urban) Integrated Investment (ITI), with precisely identified financial resources]. The theme of cooperation between national and regional program such as ordinary cooperation politics will be one of the problems of the programming cycle in 2020.

It's sure that what has been realized for PON and POR about the problems of Italian cities can't be defined as complete and that the lack of a urban national agenda in Italy gives no (complete) resolution to many critical troubles of urban development (from congestion, to the energetic effectiveness, from full realization of a digital diary to integration problems, from citizen's security to the opposition to new and old poverties, etc.) (ANCI, 2019).

The metropolitan “issue” in Italy: from urban horizons to redefined in law 167/1992 to the definition of metropolitan area, law 142/1990

The government issue of urban and metropolitan areas has shown its complexity starting from the second post – war and it has grown in time, thanks to the integration of urban Italian system in the European one. In wider terms, the problem of urban areas in Italy has its roots in bureaucratic conflicts within different levels of government, other institutions and functional authorities. As a result, the assignment of adequate financial resources and an efficient provision of public goods cannot be guaranteed. This inevitably led to an unequal distribution of such goods and services in the metropolitan areas. These areas were built during the twentieth century between illegal development and without any durable planning of urban texture, disjointed in its peripheral tentacles. Indeed, the metropolitan “issue” is strictly referred to its peripheral zones grown without any control over all the national territory. That can be ascribed both to the reconstruction post war funds (after the intense industrial development) and the immigration through cities, originally meant as a sign of progress and social integration for definite collective categories. In this panorama the popular estate plan *INA casa* (7) intended to recreate in the great cities a local culture, respecting certain heights for building, adding aggregation spaces. Later in the middle of the great industrial development and the 60's demographic increase, the law 167/1962 (8) it was conceived to expropriate at lower prices, to buy new lands able to receive new estate and more convenient buildings. Starting from law 167/62 the urban structure expands without any strategy, marking the total difference between center and peripheral zones. In this way the new public residential districts became a kind of experiment for new living and architectonic solutions organized in huge buildings able to host a huge number of families. These living experimentations took place in quite external zones of the town, often unconnected and lacking green areas, meeting and free time places and citizen's services. Since now the management of the relation with the town center took the same direction of the legal definition of metropolitan areas, starting from 70's, when the institution of regional districts and mono – function unions between municipalities and provinces has been moving. All these actions create an example of fundamental failure, lack of institutional project that underlined the missing specialization and transformation of institutional solutions, about the same metropolitan problems (Bruzzo, Ferri, 2005).

In the 70's the issue of metropolitan areas was included in the preparatory debate for the institution of the regions. Later, half of 70's the government tried to face the necessities of territorial planning and it's ascribable to the institutions and to some regions. The substantial failure in a long period of comprehensive program (starting from intercommunal plans in Milano, Bologna e Torino, to provincial groups, to intercommunal group institution) was accompanied by positive effects only in the “localization” of health reformation (Ferri, 2009).

The restart of the question by the metropolitan government brought to different innovation phases of local government and it started from 1987 through the creation of urban areas Ministry, followed by the law 8th June 1990 n. 142, *Ordinamento delle autonomie locali*, about a reformation of local authorities. The first appearance of 'metropolitan areas' in the Italian law codex goes back to 1990, with the effectiveness of the law 142/90, approved after a long phase of debates and proposal to the reformation of local authorities started in the 70's, bringing an increase to the functions and competences given to the urban center from suburbs (9). In the 5th paragraph of the law (10) a clear distinction was fixed between the metropolitan areas territory and the territorial authority *Città Metropolitane* (Mobilio, 2017), defining a urban space that from the second postwar was so described:

A wide distribution of the population, with elevated concentration zones and others at low density. Few urban centers able to give services have exercised an extraordinary strength of attraction through small centers that should accomplish their local service functions. The more visible consequence has been that process called "territorial hierarchy", precisely the constant creation of centers and peripheral zones, of strong independent areas, or central conurbation, in which the most important urban function should be merged, and of peripheral zones, fully dependent from the first. It's during this opposition that the *metropolitan area* was born and identified (Recupero, 2001).

As an extension of the pre-determined administration limits the metropolitan area is seen as the result of a strict integration between the central city (the capital), normally wide and multifunctional, and the surrounding conglomerates, composite totality of minor centers socio-economically and functionally related to the central city (Longo, Cicirello, 2015):

It is characterized by a wide urban aggregation around a capital city or to the areas interested in conurbation, relating more pre-existent centers, in each case through a continuum of settlements, interdependence of relationship of life and work among their different parts, and from the presence of the most important and advanced functions and services of social life. The limit of the city walls (defined by Cattaneo as a typical element of the city, part of an only body with the territory) is thus reduced (Mobilio, 2017).

In the reform of the autonomies 142/1990, the metropolitan area is seen as an intermediate organization or territorial entity between the Region and the Municipality, different from the Province, which must be bounded territorially by each region, having heard the municipalities and the provinces, in the arc one year (11). Of course, there must be a strict territorial integration to create a metropolitan area, about economic activities, essential services, social life, cultural relationships and territorial traits between the dominant municipality and the surrounding centers. Furthermore, the art. 18 fixes the articulation of the metropolitan area in the metropolitan city and municipality that often has overlapping functions. In detail, the metropolitan city gets the function of the considered province, creating the decentralization established by the charter about the territorial re-organization, to safeguard the original identity of local community considering the city area as a part of the province (12).

Autonomy of the metropolitan cities: law 56/2014

The major limit of the law 142/1990, according to Giuseppe Dematteis, was the definition of metropolitan areas still on the demographic dimension and not about their effective functional ability (13). Actually, the delicate relation between region and local authorities created various difficulties concerning the reformation of local legal systems because they have not always found the right balances to cooperate. These relations are threatened by the regional power that could be perceived as an excessive catalyst or too feeble to face fragmentations of localizations in our territory, rich in pluralism and differences even on the municipalities point of view. Yet, even if the law 142/1990 represents the first organic discipline about the re-organization of the metropolitan urban space, it has just encountered uneven applications over the national territory thus impeding the realization of a new asset of the metropolitan government in Italy. This has effectively led to a lack of method that has obstructed the interpretation of the idea of metropolitan area as an entity that overcomes the rigid form of the institutional configuration territorially limited. Instead, it shows as a socio-territorial reality continuously evolving, able to overpass the administration competences of an authority. This very lack of consideration: “of the socio-territorial, economic and cultural transformation has been considered essential for a correct preparation of the metropolitan issue, as suggested by the main studies on the metropolitan governance. It is also important because it has signed a path that permits to pass from the law plans to the effective reality” (Mobilio, 2017).

Law 142/90 was followed by the introduction of the law 25 March 1993 n.81, *Elezione diretta del sindaco, del presidente della provincia, del consiglio comunale e del consiglio provinciale*. It introduced in our national legal system not only the direct election of the mayor, but also new instruments of inter-municipal cooperation, such as the union of municipalities, and of some regions. This inter-municipal cooperation was pursued even in the legal decree 18th August 2000 n.267, *Testo unico delle leggi sull'ordinamento degli Enti Locali – TUEL*, with the convention of local authorities, the union between public institutions and the already mentioned union of municipalities. Later, the constitutional law 18th October, 2001 n. 3 for the amendment of Title V of the Constitution, gave the full realization to the article 5 of the Constitution that acknowledges local autonomies such as the metropolitan city, considering them as former exponential authorities to the formation of the Republic. In the following years there were many trials to speed this process of birth of the metropolitan cities, trying to assign them effective powers, but without an effective realization, until reaching 'Delrio' Reform in the DDL introduced 20th August 2013 by Letta's government and then changed in law 56, April 2014 (14). The starting point for a strategic sustainable urban development has exactly been 'Delrio' Reform. It tried to give an order to the urban and metropolitan issue in Italy, even to the marginal urban zones, focusing not only on the local system, but finding different forms and ways to a major responsibility to those who govern the territorial communities. The distinction between province and metropolitan city has been created because of these aims, among which there is a decisive difference. In fact, the legal role of the metropolitan city is well clear and its function well defined. Instead the provinces have few fundamental functions (15). We must consider here the bureaucratic transposition of the metropolitan territory over the provincial one operated by 'Delrio' Reform so that: “Metropolitan Cities have now the fundamental functions of the province and the reorder of provincial functions too” (Legge 56/2014, comma 44).

The need to abolish provinces is clearly expressed in the draft of law of 20th august 2013 n.1542, *Disposizioni sulle città metropolitane, sulle Province, sulle unioni e fusioni di Comuni*, then approved as the law 56/2014 recalling the former purpose of law of 5th june 2013 in which:

The text includes the abolition of Provinces (...) and the practice of their functions according to the central government and the regions (...) actually in these cases (...) we try to delineate an entity of a wider area (metropolitan city) able to exercise some cooperation functions, giving to the local authorities the former provincial activities about government subjects and letting the reason decide in their own subjects, exactly how the provincial functions should be given (16).

So, starting from 2015 metropolitan cities are substitute of former provinces, getting in all the relations and in all the functions, but they also assumed the role of authority of “wide area” and governor of metropolitan areas: “through the functions of comma 44 to 46 and through the general institution: care and strategic development of the metropolitan territory, integrated promotion and management of services, infra-structures, and nets of communication typical of metropolitan city, care of institutional relations at its own level, thus included the European ones” (Legge 56/2014, art.1, com.1). Pursuing this goal is possible through a strategic triennial Plan of the metropolitan territory, whose functions were easily disciplined to grant a wider flexibility for each metropolitan authority to edit it according to their urgencies or needs. Therefore, this instrument is fundamental for the Italian metropolitan city mission, oriented through the cooperation of internal and external political development and through intra and international promotion. Reaching the goals of territorial competition on different levels is strictly connected to the ability of attracting foreign investments in order to improve inter-territoriality and social cohesion. These could exclusively depend on an appropriate reformation of metropolitan governance, caused by self-determination of each single metropolitan city and diversified interventions (17) to realize an appropriate social and economic development (18). The self determination of the metropolitan cities is expressed in a proper national urban plan, able to supply additional resources to encourage the project ability and the consequent interventions on a European, national, regional and local level.

Metropolitan cities and their features: dark sides and horizons of integrated development in the European context

The autonomy of the metropolitan cities is the result of an attempt of the local government to answer to the economic-financial crisis that is still able to influence the destinies of different countries part of EU. Trying to overcome the numerous difficulties of the economic growth and the ability through intra and international competition, the law 56/2014 intended to assign a propulsive role to the metropolitan cities through the development of the economic and productive system considering its functions: “of inserting the most productive areas of our real life in the great net of the cities of the world and most of all of EU and of its plans of development (19). Thus the metropolitan cities must take care of: “institutional relations at their own levels even including those with the cities and European metropolitan areas” (Legge 56/2014, art. 1, com.1). We should consider if and how metropolitan cities can be an effective agent to supply and be supplied on different levels by other local authorities. This must be examined starting from some ideas on the profile of

the metropolitan cities and explained in the law 56/2014. Even if undeniable: “the vocation of the metropolitan authority through cooperation, planning and management of services of a wider area is limited in its function exactly in the institutional asset given in Legge Delrio creating different results on different metropolitan territories irregular for their collocation, territorial conformity, economic conditions, political assets” (Florio, 2016). This depended on some features of the metropolitan cities included in the law 56/2014. Between these, Giuseppe Mobilio (2018b) observed also the *ope legis* institution of metropolitan cities, excluding other territorial levels of government such as regions in the constitutional procedure and the consequent constitutional controversy, then overpassed by the constitutional court through the sentence 50/2015 (20). The second feature has just been mentioned and it is the substitution of provinces with metropolitan cities who lead to a coincidence between provincial and metropolitan perimeter. That can represent a solution that has its risks: “We should consider the perimeter coincidence as a heritage that could make harsher the new metropolitan authorities thus impeding their ability to make nets, main point of these authorities. The issue of boundaries is therefore one of the main reasons that defined metropolitan cities as sort of carbon copies of the old provinces” (Mobilio, 2018b). Other raised and uncertain feature is the indication of not so clear parameters (21) to define a metropolitan city, very different between them and their structure of government, identified in the mayor, the metropolitan council, and the metropolitan conference. This structure could lead to an uncertain attribution of legitimation and responsibility of political authorities of the same power.

Metropolitan cities have in fact been defined as authority representatively limited in which a sort of trade off of democracy and efficiency are verified (...). We should consider the legitimation just thinking about the coincidence between metropolitan mayor and the main county seat authority mayor. He/she is invested in his duties through the support of the citizens of this local authority and not of all the metropolitan citizens. metropolitan population will not be able to get worth any responsibility by the metropolitan council nor by the maior, nor by the election assembly, nor by the metropolitan conference on a political point of view. There's no power of distrust for these authorities (...) there is the tangible risk that this limitation of the authority democracy could represent an obstacle to the ability of leading policies of metropolitan importance (Mobilio, 2018b).

And then the statutory autonomy is another trait that allows each metropolitan city to exercise a significant autonomy of self-organization (22) connected to the administrative functions, main focus for the definition of the metropolitan city *mission*. There is a problem in the fact that both of them are explained in the quoted Strategic plan of the metropolitan territory acting as: “an act of mission for the authority and to exercise the functions of municipalities and union of municipalities in the pre-defined territory and even considering their own competence” (Legge 56/2014, art. 1, com. 44). In the past this strategic metropolitan plan was a volunteer and participative act of the different local administrations defending their own interests. Through the law 56/2014 this has become compulsory, so an act of government, not only of governance. So:

The strategic plan as a law represent a possible risk to be an “obstacle” to procedures, ways, times, and subjects of decisional projects just defined. It can also be placed in a territorial dimension well defined, the metropolitan one, exactly. The risk is to match the metropolitan

boundaries with those of intervention of the strategic plan. The main challenges to face according to the writer are keeping the political action of construction and the consent and assumption of responsibility over strategic selected and shared priorities, such as keeping the dimension of the policy of wide area the focus of the metropolitan strategic plan. This strongly depends on the ability of the metropolitan cities to connote the Strategic Metropolitan Plan (SMP) through this direction, even in the new political situation (Florio, 2016).

Conclusions

On the law level, some of the details seen in the law 56/2014 seem to limit the potentialities of the metropolitan cities and get completely in the European integration process. In this way metropolitan statutes and strategic plans are fundamentally important to define the identity of the supranational base of metropolitan cities. Both the goals of participation to the European integration process and the interest for the supranational dimension are included in all the statutes and statutes charts of the Italian metropolitan cities, also including the strategic plans of the metropolitan Cities of Milan, Florence, Genoa (Mobilio, 2018b). Autonomy and self-determination of the metropolitan cities can't be considered separated from a proper social intervention able to establish and organize its planning through national subjects. For this reason, the *Agenda Urbana Nazionale 2014-2020* (23) was conceived and in which the just mentioned National Operative Program *Città Metropolitane 2014-2020 - PON METRO* (24) is included. PON METRO financially supports the priorities of the National Urban Agenda according to the strategic program of sustainable urban development existent in *Accordo di Partenariato 2014 – 2020*; it is also aligned with the goals and strategies proposed for the *2016 EU Urban Agenda* which conceives in the urban areas the main territories to face the challenges through a clever, inclusive and sustainable growth as in *Europe 2020* (25). Certainly, therefore, the national intent, expressed both in law 56/2014 and in the *Agenda Urbana Nazionale 2014-2020*, is to enhance urban development models consistent with the Union's strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and for achieving of inter-scale economic, social and territorial cohesion:

Always according to the inconsistent approach decided by the State of how facing the National Urban Agenda and the realization of the European purposes, the Government preferred to start a series of events out of the Unitarian situation. That's what has happened with the so called *Bando Periferie*, finalized to the financial support of a long list of projects of urban re-qualification; or through the series of dealt planning instruments that the Government drew up for the single metropolitan cities, even if all these agreements don't see a direct involvement of the metropolitan authorities, but of the Capital districts (Mobilio, 2018b).

It is exactly the lack of a national effective system of *governance* and of a proper coherence and planning through an ordinary goal of urban politics that prevented the new authorities, left alone without the necessary references, from expressing their own institutional abilities. The inappropriate direction from the Government subsequently led to the exclusion from the decisions about planning goals and new European urban politics (26) of the metropolitan cities.

The limits to an active participation to the European Politics take their origin, even from the genetic features of the metropolitan cities, a matter we had just discussed about: the fixed boundaries inherited by the Provinces the effective suitability of some cities defined "metropolitan" from the

law 56/2014 even if they are far from them for dimension and socio-economic features to be considered a real network; legitimation is lessened by the political powers called to rule over such complex territories. We must also consider that such a delicate asset as the Italian one is, keeps moving from government centralization to new regional centralism and local fragmentation. A huge importance is also recovered by the continuous efforts through the balance between new forms of independence and responsibilities of local congregations by all the involved actors wanting to search for cooperative elements, and a massive connection between central and peripheral issues. Such a higher level of criticality in the integration in the European context could be overcome just starting from the analysis of the difficulties appeared in the activity of the government of the Italian metropolitan Cities of the last decades to create a new and effective National Urban Agenda, able to make a treasure of the experience on the fieldwork, giving value to the autonomy and acknowledging the local peculiarities as an essential resource of the country. We should probably start from the leading role of the local authorities and of the nets of local politics, even considering the features of the Italian Urban texture:

It's not and it's correct to say it now, of a local proposal: the problems of the Italian cities can be solved only if we are able to grant effective multilevel *governance* tools and a strong vertical interinstitutional cooperation, starting from the government to the regions. After all a strong proposal of an urban agenda bottom up is based on trust and abilities of the Italian cities to offer possible answers to problems very difficult to solve (Centro Nazionale di Studi per le Politiche Urbane, 2016).

This would promote a new government of intercommunal metropolitan territories made of urban and integrated systems such as requalification of urban areas, particularly the most marginal ones that really need a reconversion of the shared spaces. It will be therefore necessary a reformation of the government of the territory that receives a new multilevel and multidimensional vision of the city representing: "a reference for the structural reorganization, starting from and according to the new model of governance defined by the law 56/2014, structured in different institutional subjects and levels (Metropolitan City, new Provinces, Union of Municipalities, Municipalities), thus investing the whole planning system" (Ricci, 2018). For this reason we need to reinforce the process of transformation of the city into metropolis and the creation of a level of government of local structure and made possible by the local government and all the involved actors. In this way nurturing the metropolitan identity through the promotion of a shared and participated vision through the urban development that must answer to the local needs and at the same time being competitively aligned with the wide European scenario. Consequently:

The objective to define a *vision* of the so called wide area is one of the points of strength of a government able to add and keep processes of participation, discussion, listening through local communities and citizens, active parts not only as a legitimacy of the equity of choice, but even for the contribution to the creation of the orienting sceneries of choices (Mariano, 2018).

Notes

- (1) The translation of the quotations of the Italian text are cured by the author.
- (2) 2014-20 Cohesion Policy proposed to each member State a partnership promoting the growth and competition of European regions and cities through structural funds SIEI. Between these, we find FESR: “destined to reduce the difference between the gap between the levels of development of different regions and to reduce the delay of less favorite regions (Regolamento (UE) del Parlamento Europeo e del Consiglio, 2013). According to this aims, FESR intended to pay attention to the territory specificities, particularly its action is meant to invest in the sustainable urban development, reducing economic, environmental, social problems in the urban areas. The importance of its mission is underlined by the obligation of each member State to destiny 5% of FESR resources through integrated actions of sustainable urban development empowering the same cities (urban authorities) to their management.
- (3) European Commission, 2016.
- (4) It's useful to remember, always in 2016, after about five months from Amsterdam Pact, Conference Onu “Habitat III” was realized at Quito. There, it was decided the adoption of The New Urban Agenda, and address document freely subscribed from members states and to which Italy participated through its own relation. The connection between Onu Urban Agenda and other global frameworks, such as Paris Agreement of Cop 21 and most of all the Sustainable development goals of Onu 2030's Agenda, underlines the global atmosphere of strong interest for sustainable urban development.
- (5) Dipartimento per lo Sviluppo e la Coesione Economica, 2014.
- (6) The National Operative Program - PON Città Metropolitane 2014-2020 was created especially to support the resolution the marginality of peripheral urban areas and has financed intervention on three development drivers: redraw and modernization of urban services for city inhabitants and users; projects and practices to promote social inclusion for the most fragile minorities and needy neighborhoods; reinforcement of city ability to empower fine local portions of global productive chains (Dipartimento per lo Sviluppo e la Coesione Economica, 2014). Moreover, an intervention on progressive level includes even Regional Operative Programs – POR to support the sustainable urban development for those cities that: “are focus points of distribution of essential and elevated services for wide substantial areas (at first the local authorities who are county and region seat)”, (Ibidem).
- (7) Legge 28 February 1949, n. 43, Provvedimenti per incrementare l'occupazione operaia, agevolando la costruzione di case per lavoratori, with which the INA-Casa plan for the construction of cheap housing would be started.
- (8) Legge 18 Aprile 1962, n.167, Disposizioni per favorire l'acquisizione di aree per l'edilizia economica e popolare.
- (9) “Most of all, ‘the personalization’ of such governments – first due to the direct election of mayor, provincial president and then Regions – It has realized a strong relationship between political-elective agenda, inner workings of administration action and production of local politics, thus supporting an answer to the question on who has power on local level. Such transformations are also about forms and instruments of intervention of politics, thus determining a great proliferation of contractual politics, starting from the affirmation of negotiation planning, introduced by the law 7th April 1995, n.104 and the progressive separation between responsibility and planning, services attribution and management responsibility” (Ferri, 2009).
- (10) Legge 142/1990, art. 17, 18, 19, 20.
- (11) The art. 14 of the law 142/1990 fixed the regional metropolitan areas of ordinary charter: Torino, Milano, Venezia, Genova, Bologna, Firenze, Roma, Bari and Napoli and thank to the law 42/2009, even Reggio Calabria. This, considering the strong integration relations with the respective minor centers, on the base of economic relations, essential services, social life, cultural relations, and

territory traits. The metropolitan areas proposed by the special charter Regions were: (according to their legal exclusive competence): Trieste, Cagliari, Palermo, Messina, Catania.

(12) This is based on the art. 18 of law 142/1990, which as replaced later by art. 16 of law 265/1999 n. 265, Disposizioni in materia di autonomia e ordinamento degli enti locali nonché modifiche alla legge 8 giugno 1990 n. 142: “5. The metropolitan city, however is called, takes the functions of the province. It settles the decentralization established by the charter, saving the identity of the former local communities. 6. When the metropolitan city isn’t the same with the territory of a province, there’s a new delimitation of provincial districts or the institution of new provinces, even excepting the plans of the article 16, considering the area of the city as a part of a new province”.

(13) Therefore other cities should have the same or a major title – Ancona, Salerno, Pisa, Livorno, Bergamo, etc. – considering i.e. the presence of universities and because they’re able, in each case, to mobilize important fluxes of people, services and because they’re easily recognizable and crucial in the aggregation of local systems that are highly specialized in production and tertiary activities (Dematteis, 1992).

(14) Legge 7 Aprile 2014, n.56, Disposizioni sulle città metropolitane, sulle province, sulle unioni e fusioni di comuni.

(15) Provinces are different destination authorities, with no specific aim and with few functions because: “The legislator wanted in this case to let decide what are their effective functions and in which way they must operate, according to the regional law of reorder and to the whole regional legislation about wide area. At the same time he wanted the region let define power and function of the other local invested authorities” (Pizzetti, 2015). It is also worth mentioning the intent to remove the provinces from the Constitution (art. 39, com. 4) promulgated by the 2016 ‘Renzi-Boschi’ Reform and not entered into force.

(16) Disegno di legge 20 agosto 2013, n.1542.

(17) On a purely instrumental point of view, let’s think about the importance of the improvement of intermodal cruxes between the different assets of transport characterized by the metropolitan economy (airports, tram tracks, high speed, local and regional traffic) to reach the Intermodal Hub. Technological innovation of digital economy and knowledge are both economic resources and social innovation. About this, in the strategic plan of the Metropolitan City of Florence it has been included: “The realization of a urban platform through the project Sentient City control Room, enabling the aggregation of big data on a metropolitan point of view and supplying Sentient City Services (...). Always according to the economic development the idea of knowledge is never neglected (...) The plan focuses the attention on 2 strategic profiles: interaction between all actors of economy and knowledge, through the implementation of a metropolitan network of high academic training and the interaction through the local socio-economic reality, through the promotion of a training model from and to the territory approaching the system of instruction and training to the needs of the local economic system” (Mobilio, 2018a).

(18) The role of the regional and state legislation will be fundamentally important and also: “important are the problems of resources in favor of the laws of stability and, then, of the budget, as well as of the Regions” (Mobilio, 2018a).

(19) Disegno di legge 20 agosto 2013, n.1542.

(20) We invite you to read the sentence 50/2015 published in <http://www.cortecostituzionale.it/actionSchedaPronuncia.do?anno=2015&numero=50>

(21) There are ten metropolitan cities according to the National law 56/2014, art. 1 (com. 5, 101, 103): Turin, Milan, Venice, Genoa, Bologna, Florence, Bari, Naples, Reggio Calabria and Capital Rome. We can add to these 4 Metropolitan Cities in the special statute regions with regional laws: Cagliari, Catania, Messina, Palermo.

(22) The Metropolitan City: “Through a statute (it) establishes the fundamental law of organization of the power, even the attribution to the authorities and their own competences (...) it organizes the ways and instruments of cooperation of the collective action of government and metropolitan

territory; it disciplines the relations between municipalities and their union belonging to the metropolitan city and the metropolitan city in order to manage and organize the exercise of the metropolitan and local functions. It can also prescribe the constitution of homogenous zones destined to specific functions considering the special territorial features, through cooperation between all the powers related to the metropolitan city, excluding adding expenses for the public finance. It also disciplines the way of cooperation between municipalities in the metropolitan territory can create agreement with the metropolitan city” (Legge 56/2014, art. 1, com. 10, 11).

(23) In the Agenda Urbana Nazionale 2014-2020, four macro-areas have been selected (local welfare and instruction, portability, urban requalification, innovation and tourism; local finance and governance). The main features of a sustainable urban development will be reformulated, according to the three drivers (see note 6). We remind that this three drivers added to a fourth are selected by each region according to their peculiarities and potentialities, always referring to OT5 (Climate and environmental risks) e OT6 (Protection of the environment and promotion of the cultural and environmental resources), represents thematic levels of priority intervention partly integrated; they are also relevant for the supplied basic functions from the city to the widest territory surrounding them (Agenzia per la Coesione Territoriale).

(24) The main recipients of PON METRO are 14 Italian cities, just selected through a National law (Naples, Rome, Turin, Venice, Florence, Bari, Bologna, Genoa, Milan and Reggio Calabria) and through regional law for the special statute regions (Cagliari, Catania, Messina, Palermo).

(25) The European 2020 aims at “smart, sustainable, inclusive growth” with greater coordination of national and European policy. It follows the Lisbon Strategy for the period 2000–2010 (European Commission, 2010).

(26) Just think about the Italian Metropolitan Cities not yet included in powers such as the European Committee of the regions, to the Congress of Local and Regional Powers of the European Council, such as in associations reuniting the urban authorities on a European level such as Eurocity or Metrex (Mobilio, 2018b).

References

- Agenzia per la Coesione Territoriale (2014), *Agenda Urbana Nazionale 2014-2020*
<http://www.ponmetro.it/home/programma/come-nasce/diary-urbana/>
- Associazione Nazionale Comuni Italiani - ANCI (2019), *Le città italiana per l'Agenda urbana europea nella programmazione post 2020*, ANCI
- Bruzzo Aurelio, Ferri Vittorio (2005), *Le politiche territoriali ed urbane della Comunità Europea*, "Quaderno Dipartimento economia istituzioni territorio", N. 24, pp. 1-68
- Centro Nazionale di Studi per le politiche urbane (2016), *Sintesi del Rapporto sulle città 2016. Le Agende urbane delle città*
https://www.urbanit.it/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Sintesi_del_Rapporto_2016-1.pdf
- Commissione Europea (2014a), *Introduzione alla politica di coesione dell'UE 2014-2020*
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/basic/basic_2014_it.pdf
- Commissione Europea (2014b), *La dimensione urbana delle politiche dell'UE – Elementi fondanti di una Agenda urbana UE*
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/consultation/urb_agenda/pdf/comm_act_urb_agenda_it.pdf
- Dematteis Giuseppe (1992), *Il fenomeno urbano in Italia: interpretazioni, prospettive, politiche*, Milano, Franco Angeli
- Dipartimento per lo Sviluppo e la Coesione Economica (2014), *Accordo di Partenariato 2014-2020. Italia*
<http://www.regioni.it/ue-esteri/2014/11/04/dipartimento-per-lo-sviluppo-e-la-coesione-economica-accordo-di-partenariato-italia-2014-2020-29-10-2014-373077/>
- Disegno di legge 20 agosto n. 1542 (2013), *Disposizioni di sulle città metropolitane, sulle Provincie, sulle unioni e fusione di Comuni*. Atti parlamentari. Camera dei Deputati. XVII Legislatura
http://documenti.camera.it/_dati/leg17/lavori/stampati/pdf/17PDL0009111.pdf
- European Commission (2010), *Europe 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*
<http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/pdf/COMPLET%20EN%20BARROSO%20%20%20007%20-%20Europe%202020%20-%20EN%20version.pdf>
- European Commission (2016), *Urban Agend for the EU. Pact of Amsterdam*
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf
- Ferri Vittorio (2009), *Le Città metropolitane in Italia. Una istituzione del federalismo*, "Economia Italiana", N. 2, pp. 367 – 403

Florio Raffaella (2016), *Tavolo ANCI 'Piani Strategici Metropolitan' per ripensare e valorizzare la pianificazione*, "Sole24ore", 14 aprile
<http://quotidianoentilocali.ilsole24ore.com/print/ABYwC2EB/0>

Legge 28 febbraio, n. 43 (1949), *Provvedimenti per incrementare l'occupazione operaia, agevolando la costruzione di case per lavoratori*
http://www.edizionieuropee.it/LAW/HTML/15/zn38_07_00.html

Legge 18 aprile, n.167 (1962), *Disposizioni per favorire l'acquisizione di aree per l'edilizia economica e popolare*
http://www.bosettiegatti.eu/info/norme/statali/1962_0167.htm

Legge 8 giugno n.142 (1990), *Ordinamento delle autonomie locali*, "Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana", N. 42
<http://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/gu/1990/06/12/135/so/42/sg/pdf>

Legge 3 agosto, n. 265 (1999), *Disposizioni in materia di autonomia e ordinamento degli enti locali nonché modifiche alla legge 8 giugno 1990 N. 142*
<http://www.parlamento.it/parlam/leggi/992651.htm>.

Legge 7 aprile n. 56 (2014), *Disposizione sulle città metropolitane, sulle città, sulle province, sulle unioni e fusioni di comuni*, "Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana. Serie generale", N. 81
<http://www.anci.it/Contenuti/Allegati/legge%20Delrio%20.pdf>

Longo Antonino, Cicirello Linda (2015), *Città metropolitane e pianificazione di area vasta. Prospettive di governo territoriale per la gestione delle metamorfosi urbane*, Milano, Franco Angeli

Mariano Carmela (2018), *I modelli di governo per la pianificazione del territorio metropolitano*, in Mariano Carmela, Valorani Carlo (a cura di), *Territori metropolitani e pianificazione intercomunale*, Milano, Franco Angeli, pp. 29 – 40

Mobilio Giuseppe (2017), *Le città metropolitane. Dimensione costituzionale e attuazione statutaria*, Torino, Giappichelli Editore

Mobilio Giuseppe (2018a), *Città metropolitana e sviluppo economico: il caso di Firenze*, "Urban@it", N. 2
https://www.urbanit.it/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/BP_Mobilio.pdf

Mobilio Giuseppe (2018b), *Il contributo delle Città metropolitane italiane al processo di integrazione europea*, "Federalismi.it", N. 6, pp.1-24

Pizzetti Franco (2015), *La legge Delrio: una grande riforma in un cantiere aperto. Il diverso ruolo e l'opposto destino delle città metropolitane e delle province*, "Rivista AIC", N. 3, pp. 1-11

Recupero Bruno Giuliana (2001), *Le aree metropolitane tra L. 142/1990 e il D.LGS 267/2000*, "Diritto&Diritti"

https://www.diritto.it/articoli/enti_locali/bruno.html

Regolamento UE n.1301 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo al Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale e a disposizioni specifiche concernenti l'obiettivo "Investimenti a favore della crescita e dell'occupazione" e che abroga il regolamento CE N. 1080/2006 (2013), "Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea", L.347/289

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/IT/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013R1301>

Ricci Laura (2018), *Il governo della Città contemporanea e la metropolizzazione. Il lungo percorso verso la riforma*, in Mariano Carmela, Valorani Carlo (a cura di), *Territori metropolitani e pianificazione intercomunale*, Milano, Franco Angeli, pp. 9 – 18

