

A few notes to (re)think the design of public space in the contemporary city

Unas notas para (re) pensar el diseño del espacio público en la ciudad contemporánea

JOÃO RODRIGO COELHO

Silvia Lopes, traductora

Abstract / Resumen

In the onset of architecture mediatization, heralded by the hyper-enhanced image and icon, we note that both city-building and public space materialization endorse, in most cases, generic and functionalist solutions, with prominent consequences to city-structure and its perception. As to theoretical reflection, we find approaches that, for the most part, don't seem even to grant support to a consistent practical knowledge, one bound to tackle the concerns and challenges bred by the city of today. In this article, we aim to assess and reflect on those theoretical premises and intents that, in our view, should steer the development of public space(s) while framing it as a design problem. It is argued that public space should (continue to) be designed and materialized with architectural and urbanistic criteria in mind, i.e., considering morphological attributes and methodologies that in the last decades have seemingly been snubbed or simply discarded.

En el inicio de la mediatización de la arquitectura, anunciada por imágenes hipermejoradas e iconos, observamos que en la mayoría de los casos la materialización de la ciudad edificada y del espacio público avala soluciones genéricas y funcionalistas, con importantes consecuencias en la estructura de la ciudad y su percepción. En cuanto a la reflexión teórica, obligados a afrontar los problemas y los desafíos fomentados por la ciudad de hoy, incluso nos encontramos con enfoques que, en su mayor parte, no parecen apoyar conocimientos prácticos coherentes. En este artículo pretendemos evaluar y reflexionar sobre esas premisas teóricas y las intenciones que, en nuestra opinión, deben dirigir la construcción del espacio público en cuanto problema de diseño. Se argumenta que el espacio público debe ser (continuar) diseñado y materializado con meditados criterios arquitectónicos y urbanísticos, es decir, teniendo en cuenta los atributos morfológicos y los métodos que en las últimas décadas han sido aparentemente ignorados o simplemente desestimados.

Keywords / Palabras clave

Project of public space; urban project; contemporary city.

Proyecto de espacio público; proyecto urbano; ciudad contemporánea.

Rodrigo Coelho (Zamora, Spain, 1971). Graduated in architecture from the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto (FAUP) in 1995, where he teaches since 1996. He is Master in Architecture and Urban Studies from the Polytechnic University of Catalonia and Center of Contemporary Culture of Barcelona (Master "Metropolis 1999-2001). In 2012 he presented his PhD thesis in Architecture at the Faculty of Architecture of University of Porto with the Thesis "Shapes and Designs of Public Space in Contemporary City". His main area of interest and research is the subject of public space on which he published articles and participated in conferences. His PHD thesis was awarded (*ex-aequo*) with the 1st prize of VIII Iberoamerican Biennial of Architecture and Urbanism (2012) in the category of Academic Theses. Since 1994 he has an independent professional activity as an architect.

1. The "loss" of architectural and urban insight in the construction of public space

During this time of uncertainty, when we hear tell of the imminent *death of public space*, of the retreat towards the private, of rising *fear and insecurity instilled by the city*, it comes as altogether surprising – even paradoxical – the sheer number of studies and interventions that focus exactly on *public space* as their specific field of action. Perhaps it could then be argued that never before has as much been *required* and *expected* from public space; never have so many *interventions* and *requalifications* been effected as public space; and certainly never has as much *thinking* and *theorizing* addressed public space.

Conversely, this paradoxical reality hints at a set of contradictions which, we believe, can become significant to the discernment of prevailing key issues, intersectant within a broader reflection on public space design, urban design, and architecture practice.

Remains paradoxical, for instance, the *lack of consensus* bred amongst the different disciplines that effectively *build* public space (architecture, landscape architecture, engineering), as to what *meaning* should this space have, what *shape* it must be, and what role might public space play in city-building, today.

Enforcing adulterated values and concepts, whilst namedropping *politically correct* slogans – "ecology", "environmental", "sustainability" –, most of the latest public space proposals (and particularly those through the last two decades) seem to follow *design recipes* – *generic* strategies that present, largely, a blatant spatial and figurative *standardization*. Moreover, these guidelines entail a simplification or outright dismissal of urbanistic and architectural methodologies and criteria, which were historically held as fundamental to the conception of public space.

Likewise, the enforcement of dissonant programs, ill-fitting in their surrounding urban realities (be that by their *artificial complexity*, *strictly-functional* design guidelines, or *marketing-oriented* intents, prompted by the ever-increasing demand of entertainment and comfort by the user), characterizes an overall generic method of building public space today.

In this sense we'll agree with Manuel de Solà-Morales, when he criticizes this approach as "(...) a new form of autonomous professional practice which sees the precinct where the work is to be done as a free range in which zero-elevation architecture might be invented, an unconstrained exercise in which – relatively – low-cost forms and images can be explored in freedom that could not exist in construction that is constantly submitted to the much stricter requirements of the programme, costs, functions, structure and client"¹.

With its conception seemingly void of strategic insight, this *designed public space* often ends up an unarticulated arrangement of isolated parts – usually self-referential, structurally fragile, undefined in use and scale – leading to the diffusion of meaning and legibility of public space and urban form, detaching it from the tectonic and urban condition that we traditionally recognize to it.

This *febleness*, diagnosed as inherent to this public space, attunes to the nonsustainability of long-term urban design decisions, given the complex interplay of power relations and stepped decision-making processes that make up the management of the city of today. Following Nuno Portas, our time is one of amplification in technical solutions and cultural patterns, which in turn compromise technical, cultural, and disciplinary consensus in the establishment of architectural and urbanistic models to city-(re)building; this is particularly relevant to the rapport between public space outline and urban fabric, decisive to a coherent urban layout².

¹ Manuel De Solà-Morales. "The Impossible Project of Public Space" in *In favour of public space: ten years of the european prize* (Magda Anglès ed.), Barcelona, Actar, 2010, p. 27.

These mounting inconsistencies, induced by a loss of architectural and urbanistic insight into planning public space, turns the most part of the recently built *public space architecture*, into a multi-referenced and diffuse *entity*, devoided of a discernible typological or spatial matrix, and ultimately unable to express civic, aesthetic, functional and social meanings.

While it is true that this *dismal diagnosis* can – and *should* – be nuanced according to each situation in its singular context, we must also recognize that, considering its repercussions to the city, these different approaches to public space design, in our disciplinary area, fail to take into account the structural *support matrix* that, in the past, guided the construction of public space, ensuring its stability, permanence, and continuity.

Considering the enduring *urban deficit*, even in the city sectors we have seen growing in the last decades, and faced with the inconsistencies and unseemliness of these (new) public spaces, it becomes as necessary as it is urgent to question their outset purposes, design practices and methodologies, thus allowing us to implement *a positive reaction to the problem of (re)building public space in the contemporary city*.

Faced with the present urban reality (as staged in most European cities), we believe it becomes significant to wonder: how feasible is to shape the city nowadays? Can we, and if so should we, endeavour to do so, considering how challenging it is to control its overall shape and structure? What instruments must we wield to do so? What role does public space play, in a more desirable prospective process of city redesigning?

2. Thinking public space in the contemporary city

The need to think public space as the main pillar of city-building

Given the penchant for expansion, diversification, and fragmentation of urban open space in the city of today, a critical issue seems to arise for us, architects and urban planners, as to how best to mediate coexistence amid the immense diversity of our urban places; and thence, from our public spaces, materialize renewed social interactions, and new ways of living and commuting.

Moreover, if the *designed public space* has indeed lost much of its historical formal and functional attributes, as previously stated, how then can we (re)build (new) public places that render the collective existence of a city, while simultaneously embodying attributes that may convert them into suitable, memorable, permanent spaces? Or, as Carlos Martí notes, how can we (re)build (new) public places as “landmarks of the city to come”?

Following Carlos Martí, these two issues relate to the incurring difficulty to describe the “public places of our time”; furthermore, they seemingly converge into one nuclear concern regarding the uncertainty of what is – or should be – the contemporary city. Believing these to be two facets of one singular problem, Martí notes that “(...) the presence of public places is what characterizes the city itself and what makes it distinct from mere settlement (...)”³.

The need to consider the *idea of ‘City’* as a means to think public space becomes, in this way, quite decisive. From our point of view, and following Martí’s argument, it is only possible to meaningfully discuss public space by having it take on a role and value that are interdependent of architectural and urbanistic attributes of the physical and cultural aspects pertaining to the urban context in which it operates.

With this in mind seem the arguments of Jordi Borja and Oriol Bohigas even more relevant, as both authors underline the necessary challenge of “making city over

the city” (by perceiving the present city as a set of potentially rebalancing social and territorial centralities), recognizing *recovery of the city, urban mobility, urban fabric*, and, aptly enough, *public space*, as main subjects to address in that challenge⁴. We are therefore interested in a *city model* that allows public space an *intermutual value*, so this might be a product of interdisciplinary action, and where *public space design, urban design, and urban planning* can be instrumental in its development.

The need to think and design the city and its public spaces from accurate scale referents

The lack of correlation between *scale referents* and assigned *fields of study* seems one of the most evident *methodological shortcomings* displayed in current theoretical approaches to *public space*, what can only produce studies and reasonings that borderline on the abstract, generic, and inconclusive.

If we can agree that today’s cities seem to share the same widespread symptoms, then, we believe, a more in-depth study of public space in the contemporary city must be specifically framed within a preset reality and order of magnitude. This seemingly *simple premise*, becomes decisive, given that most of the speculation and conjecture surrounding the debate of “public space in the contemporary city” tend to be based on assumptions pertinent only in very specific contexts (such as in large cities or metropolis) – as these conjectures turn to guidelines, they become the prevailing discourse, take on official value, and ultimately impede more consistent research on public space.

In a time when it seems that the concept of city swells, ever larger, to *dissolve* into the city-region, it is perhaps significant to note that the European territory is composed not of large cities or conurbations, but of medium to small size cities. For this reason, the preset of an *order of magnitude* (and, thus, of a concrete field of study) constitutes in itself a powerful statement of principles, regarding the value (the premise, the objective, the intent) afforded to what we perceive as *city or public space* today. We believe this assertion to be crucial if we intend *public space* to partake in the debate of urban issues – a debate in which remains pertinent to think *city and public space* on criteria of form, structure and meaning.

The need to think and design the city beyond its consolidated limits

Yet, predictably, the contemporary city – even the medium-sized one – breeds such an array of issues, that their very complexity and diversity provoke equally complex and diverse opinions on its *public space*. We believe the main concern should relate to the ascertainment of the *sector or sectors* of the city where the intervention on public space becomes urgent or problematic.

As Nuno Portas makes note, in the numerous requalificative and regenerative interventions of the 80s and 90s (targeting central and preeminent areas of the city), public space is given a key-role, perceptibly holding a certain *status*. On the other hand, this same *status* is not apparent in those interventions developed in the limits, in the outskirts of the emerging city, i.e., in the open and discontinuous city, where we sorely lack, in number and quality, urban concepts and strategies, that may help define consistent paradigms by which to act.

We believe this to be a consequence not only of the lack of a more comprehensive and integral city-wide proposal, but of the likely resistance, in architectural and urbanistic disciplines, in complying with any necessary and inevitable losses and paradigm shifts, that come with the transition to a more heterogeneous and open urban reality.

Thus do we stand, in need of models and strategies by which to think and act upon the outmost, less consolidated urban areas, which is where the ‘future of the city’

² Nuno Portas. “Planeamento Urbano: Morte e Transfiguração” in *Arquitetura(s): teoria e desenho, investigação e projecto*. Porto, Faup publicações, 2005, pp. 64-65.

³ Carlos Martí Aris. “Lugares Públicos en la Naturaleza”, Conference held at Faculdade de Arquitectura do Porto em 18-11-02, policopied author’s edition, 2012, p. 1.

⁴ Jordi Borja; Zaida Muxi. *El espacio público: ciudad y ciudadanía*, Barcelona, Electa, 2003, p. 57.

JOÃO RODRIGO COELHO

A few notes to (re)think the design
of public space in the contemporary city

[Figs. 1-2] Bairro da Malagueira (Évora, Portugal). The public space as *ordering* element of urban expansion.

[Figs. 3-4] Nou Barris (Barcelona), The public space as *reconstruction* element of the *unplanned* city.

takes place nowadays, and reflections on the conceptualization and materialization of the public space become increasingly demanding.

We do recognise, additionally, that the current theoretical debate on the city and public space (within our discipline) has often been swayed by the bipolarization between *good* and *bad* city, between *good* and *bad* public space, which usually leads to strict and dogmatic assertions regarding the interpretation and ability to intervene in the city, and design its public spaces.

Therefore, it is not uncommon to find polarized viewpoints, between those who call for a mimetic (albeit uncritical and reducing) return to the more *legible* and *reassuring* types of the traditional city – the public space characterized by a *nostalgic* and *outdated* architecture, preached and enforced in the *new urbanism à la Krier* (as remarks Nuno Portas) – and the proponents of a *city without form, generic and indomitable*, that denies public spaces their *ordering vocation*, their ability to commit standards of clarity, order, and hierarchy to urban space.

3. Public space as a design problem

The need for purposes, while intervening in the city from public space

As Bernardo Secchi rightly points out, “(...) the image of the contemporary city is a city that already exists, but is waiting for a project.”⁵ In developing this idea, Carlos Martí suggests that this *project* is not only an inquiry into the meaning of things, but also an intellectual procedure, allowing us to operate on the world whilst understanding it⁶.

Following these arguments (and recalling those aforesaid, urging *strategic significance* and *concrete city size* as premises in interpreting and planning public space), we believe a more rich and operational research of urban reality to be possible, granted we can, discerningly, select those spaces, places, and projects adept in condensing the urban design issues that affect the city as a whole.

For an increasingly thorough, accurate analysis and intervention in the public space of the contemporary European city, we would propose as *starting point hypothesis* the pressing need to further investigate, selectively, those areas of the city (perchance of different scale, form, and use) that allow us to perceive them as prospective



[Figs. 5-6] Porto and Strasbourg Tramway. The public space as *restructuring* element of the metropolitan city.

[Figs. 7-8] San Sebastian (Waterfront and Peine de los Vientos). The public space as an *exception* component of geographical scale.

ordering elements of urban form, and potentially significant spaces in a collective experience of the city.

This hypothesis must therefore be understood as a comprehensive *analysis matrix* that is also selective or multi-targeted, allowing for the identification of ‘*vectors*’ and ‘*topics of analysis*’ that we deem relevant to a *re-valuation* of urban insight in the projects of public space⁷.

From this set matrix, we simultaneously recognize both the recurrence of the same invariable themes, and the contemporary city with its different parts, as projects in themselves, apt to be tackled as specific and concrete problems within a different reality (like Bernardo Secchi and Carlos Martí suggest); therefore, we believe fundamental a clear distinction of four main purposes or problems for public space:

- The public space as an *ordering* element of urban expansion;
- The public space as a *reconstruction* element of the unplanned city;
- The public space as a *restructuring* element of the metropolitan city;
- The public space as an *exception* component of geographical scale.

These four purposes (attuned to more operative topics of analysis, and specific project-related issues) are not established just as statement of principle, in recognizing the importance of public space in the current city; they also allows us, from the outlook of design and analysis, to individualize and clarify the assorted roles that, in our view, public space can or should fulfil.

Furthermore, in terms of methodology, we believe important to distinguish the intermediate urban design scale as the more consistent and appropriate approach, while intervening in the city through public space⁸. As stressed by Manuel de Solà-Morales (highlighting the long tradition of urban design), this approach consists on operating “(...) *from the geography of a given city, on its requests and suggestions, and, with architecture, introduce language elements that shape the site (...) it is also working inductively, generalizing the particular, the strategic, the local, the generative, and the model*”⁹.

The need to design public space as significant built form. Two general principles

Assuming, as above-stated, that we hold the outlining of purposes (or, specific problems) as indispensable to the thinking (and design) of public space today, it

⁵ Bernardo Secchi quoted by Carlos Martí in “Public Places”, Conference held at the Colegio de Arquitectos de Madrid on 26-04-2001, policopied author’s edition, p. 1.

Joan Busquets supports this understanding of Bernardo Secchi, when he stresses the need to think the [master] plan as the “(...) container project capable of providing an overview, but also of decanting consensus regarding basic criteria, that may be developed by interventions or projects of times very distinct, but able to open new procedures on unpredictable topics” Joan Busquets, “Presente y perspectivas del urbanismo”, *Sociedade e Território*, n.º 37-38, 2004, p. 55.

⁶ Carlos Martí in “Public Places”, Conference held at the Colegio de Arquitectos de Madrid on 26-04-2001, policopied author’s edition, p. 1.

⁷ Mindful of this, Joan Busquets stresses the need to rescue the idea of “project, or medium-term vision plan” from the intervention on “some spaces, in certain systems, or on certain strategies,” which, as he states, implies the necessity to study “almost everything” and extensively. This vision is, according to Busquets, directly related to the requisite of recovering the “(...) conceptual and abstract [determination] of the master plan, as a way to address the issue of urban form, without having to fall into the fallacy of designing all its parts (...)”. “Entrevistas: 20 visiones” in *Papers. Regió Metropolitana de Barcelona*, n.º 43, Junho 2005, p. 26, 27.

⁸ Joan Busquets is one of the authors who have more consistently upheld the “high degree of operability” of the intermediate scale urban project, as privileged instrument of intervention in the city. In his view, this instrument corresponds to a “(...) type of urban project that accepts working from the urban fragment, understanding that, from it, it becomes possible to tackle general questions of the city “facing”(...) varied programs where the idea of integration (between infrastructure and city, between public and collective spaces) becomes the fundamental concept”. On the other hand, Busquets stresses the importance of the intermediate scale as the most apt in thinking on “inbetween relationships”, as it ensures the recognition and enhancement of “propositional ideas in an abstract layer, making them adaptable to different programs and changes in the course of the project. Joan Busquets, “Presente y perspectivas del urbanismo”, *Sociedade e Território*, n.º 37-38, 2004, pp. 51-52.

⁹ Manuel De Solà-Morales. “La segunda historia del proyecto urbano”, *UR* n.º 5 (1987), p. 22.

is as decisive to correlate public space design to a set of attributes, values, and requirements, that are relatively ageless (and often forgotten) and, under every circumstance, allow for the recognition of public space as *legible spatial system*, able to take part and support the diversity and instability that characterizes the contemporary city.

The somewhat elementary nature and generic character that, at first glance, we may perceive in these attributes, should not diminish their importance as key-criteria in the design of public space. The upholding of these principles, which ensures a substantial part of the consistency and significance of public space interventions, intersects with many of the aforementioned arguments, calling for a consideration of a complex network of potential relationships between elements of different nature.

Acknowledging the ongoing expansion and fragmentation of urban space (and indeed the difficulty in recognizing a hierarchy or in setting shape and limits in the present city), the consideration of a shape constitutes, perhaps, one of the most difficult challenges to public space design in the contemporary city. Undoubtedly, the issue of plausibility in proposing a shape for public space is a controversial one – not only does it partition the different disciplines that research on public space, it also begets an inconclusive debate within our own. This primarily addresses the relevance, pertinence, and terms by which (as we experience urban dispersion – with no form or limits) architecture and urbanism may or may not shape and organize the urban space, so as to make it legible, liveable and lasting – particularly considering its scale and formal qualities.

Bearing in mind the countless AND? complex issues that may constrain the project and design of public space today, us architects will hold that public space is and will continue being a *matter of building form*, able to structure the urban space and the city's own collective life. To that extent, we will state that there are *no significant shapes without purpose*, as it is impossible to express *purpose without a significant shape*.

This *principle of interdependency with context* unfolds as equally crucial, in the identification of a strong and consistent intervention in public space, as it seemingly is to the achievement of a richer and more meaningful spatial synthesis. Likewise does the consideration of *memory* and *History* remain as decisive in today's public space design. Paraphrasing Alexandre Alves Costa, we always *build with and upon the built* – and reality – and we *cannot build without memory*.

This claim does not intend to restrict the much needed *sense of transformation*, or *invention*, which we believe must guide any project or intervention in public space. On the contrary, it means to uphold the importance of accepting reality as starting point, in a cultural and design practice that may (be able to) control or restrain the craving for a permanent expression of novelty (and presumed originality), evinced in many of the most recent public space interventions. It additionally means to adopt an “ethically responsible” (and critical) approach to the valuation and interpretation of the particular specificities of a given urban reality; which is, incidentally, what warrants Álvaro Siza and Manuel de Solà-Morales's admonitions that there are no ugly cities, only realities that the architect must cherish, and to which should retribute some of its hidden qualities.

4. Final considerations: on the need to strengthen the consistency and objectivity of public space design

Mindful of the aforementioned arguments, we believe it crucial to perceive public space as fundamental *urban matter*, insofar as it represents open spaces that can

yet be planned, and those that have been subject to intervention lacking a *global vision*, but are still capable of undergoing change.

Lastly, we credit such worth to public space (design) because it can *reattach* (yet again) the practice and disciplinary knowledge of architecture to “city building and planning processes” (that, as already stated, have become increasingly more fragmented and uncertain, from a technical, economical, and political standpoint).

We believe this claim directly related to the significance that urban design and architecture should wield in moments of design synthesis. This certainly does not dispute the need to consider design and construction of public space as an outcome of several insights and experiences, or as result of assorted interpretations. Our reflection means only to stress, ultimately, the appeal for greater exaction and commitment of architecture to those *moments of synthesis*, decisive, as we well know, in the planning and design of public space.

Our argument is not a claim for the autonomy of Architecture in city building and urban intervention processes; on the contrary, it intends to claim, for the project of public space, a further consistency able to centralize decisions, so that coherent synthesis can be achieved, which is, in most cases, what we believe Architecture is most well suited to perform (overwriting the purely functional, opportunistic urban design approach, understood, in many cases, as a sum of several technical projects).

Only with this *demand of control* over public space design and project, devised from the scale “1:1000 to 1:1”, we believe it possible to ensure an accurate materialization, that is capable of rendering the precision of its outset purposes, and integrating the tangibility, measurability, and usefulness that have always made and will continue to make the city and the urban.

In this sense, we are claiming for the disciplinary assertion of architecture in the construction of public space, so as to recover an urban design culture and methodology based on a more unitary, articulated vision of urban space, practiced until the mid-twentieth century.

We are therefore interested in those urban proposals and interventions in which public space takes on objectives that exceed the reasoning behind many of the recent urban proposals, where public space is primarily understood as ‘equipped urban fragment’ (which tends to distort its urban, civic and collective dimension, and undermines its ability to give meaning and coherence to the city).

To undertake our intent, we must recognize an urban and architectural value to public space design, as one that looks at the city as a whole, ascribing it structure(s), order(s), and shape(s). A design that rates and ranks the complexity that comes with a variety of interests, and is forced to take sides, seeing as not everything holds the same value. Ergo, a design that can not dissociate itself from the complexity of the real, or from the desire to (re)build cities and public spaces where urban experience encapsulates the multiplicity of its actors, users, and architectural and urban references.

Acting on the headroom that each project allows, *city and public space makers* are thereby asked to build a coherent, dense, and meaningful design or *urban materiality*. A design made possible through the control of measures, distances, scales and textures of objects and urban voids, making public spaces significant and referenceable in relation to the context(s) in which they operate.

In summary, architects, urbanists and landscape architects are urged to materialize a public space design prone to generate a candid but powerful transformation of the city, allowing it to take root and *produce future*, and ensuring its liveability and sustainability – its primary key purposes.

In “The Great City History” Charles Delfante states:

“There is no law that allows one to be sure of achieving an urban composition. There is also no law ensuring that one writes a good book, even if it is perfect in terms of style, syntax and grammar. As a starting point we have to talk about Art. We are well aware that art is the set of means and regulated procedures that tend to a particular purpose. It implies knowledge and rules of action in its particular domain, but also a certain skill. Urban composition [or, *the architecture of public space*] can be perceived, to some extent, as the combination of an abstract knowledge (Science) with an applied knowledge (Art). (...) The applied knowledge requires an enlightened intervention, then, a certain talent, i.e., a gift, a skill, hopefully remarkable. Above all, requires a clear, both global and detailed vision”¹⁰.

Perhaps this can be, now more than ever, the eventual pathway for the design of public space.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ÁBALOS, Iñaki. *Atlas pintoresco. Vol. 1: el observatorio*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 2005

ASCHER, François. *Les Nouveaux Principes de l'Urbanisme*. La Tour d'Aigues, Éditions de l'Aube, 2001

AYMONINO, Aldo; MOSCO, Valerio Paolo. *Contemporary Public Space. Un-volumetric Architecture*. Milano, Skira, 2006

ACEBILLO, Josep Antonio. “Struttura e significato dello spazio urbano” in *Spazi Pubblici Contemporanei. Innovazione e identità a Barcelona e in Catalogna*. Quaderni di AU, 1989, pp. 28-36

BOHIGAS, Oriol. “La Ciudad como Espacio Proyectado” in *La Arquitectura del Espacio Público: Formas del Pasado, Formas del Presente*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía - Consejería de Obras Públicas y Transportes e Triennale di Milano, 1999, pp. 21-24

BOHIGAS, Oriol. *Contra la incontinencia urbana: reconsideración moral de la arquitectura y la ciudad*. Barcelona, Electa (Diputació de Barcelona; Xarxa de Municipis), 2004

BORJA, Jordi; MUXI, Zaida. *El espacio público: ciudad y ciudadanía*. Barcelona, Electa, 2003

BUSQUETS, Joan. “Presente y perspectivas del urbanismo”. *Sociedade e Território*, n.º 37-38, 2004, pp. 46-60

BUSQUETS, Joan. “Entrevistas: 20 visiones” in *Papers. Regió Metropolitana de Barcelona*, n.º 43, Junho 2005, pp. 26, 27

BUSQUETS, Joan; CORREA, Filipe. *Cities X Lines : A new lens for the urbanistic project*. Cambridge, Harvard University (Graduate School of Design). Nicolodi, 2006

CAPUTO, Paolo. “Las arquitecturas del espacio público entre el cuidado del lugar y las figuras de la traición” in *La Arquitectura del Espacio Público: Formas del Pasado, Formas del Presente*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía - Consejería de Obras Públicas y Transportes e Triennale di Milano, 1999, pp. 13-20

DELFANTE, Charles. *A grande história da cidade: da Mesopotâmia aos Estados Unidos*. Lisboa, Instituto Piaget, 2000 (col.O homem e a cidade; n.º 3)

DELGADO, Manuel. *Memória y Lugar: Espacio Público como Crisis de Significado*. Valencia, Ediciones Generales de la Construcción, 2001

GABELLINI, Patrizia. “Il progetto dello spazio pubblico: fondamento e problema del piano urbanistico” in *Idee di spazio, lo spazio nelle idee: metropoli contemporanee e spazio pubblici*. Milano, Franco Angeli, 2002, pp.125-135

HUET, Bernard. “La Città come spazio abitabile. Alternative alla Carta di Atene”, in *Lotus* n.º 41

HUET, Bernard. “Tre questioni a proposito della forma urbana” in *Questioni di forma... urbana. La composizione dello spazio pubblico nel rinnovo della città*. Firenze, Alinea, 1999, pp. 5-9

INNERARITY, Daniel. *El Nuevo espacio público*. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 2006

MARTÍ ARIS, Carlos. “Lugares Públicos en la Naturaleza” in *La Cimbra y el Arco*. Barcelona, Fundación Caja de Arquitectos, 2005, pp. 55-72

MARTÍ ARIS, Carlos, “Lugares Públicos”. Conferência no Colegio de Arquitectos de Madrid em 26-04-01, Edição policopiada do autor.

MARTÍ ARIS, Carlos, “Lugares Públicos en la Naturaleza”. Conferência na Faculdade de Arquitectura do Porto em 18-11-02, Edição policopiada do autor.

MARTÍ ARIS, Carlos. “la Construcción de los Lugares Públicos, Notas para una Etimología de la Forma Urbana”, in *Arquitectos* n.º 152, Información del Consejo Superior de los Colegios de Arquitectos de España n.º 99/4, V Bienal de Arquitectura Española, pp. 52-57

PARCERISA BUNDO, Josep; VENTÓS, Maria Rupert de. *La Ciudad no es una hoja en blanco: hechos del urbanismo*. Santiago de Chile, Escuela de Arquitectura de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 2000.

PORTAS, Nuno. “Espacio público y ciudad emergente” in *La Arquitectura del Espacio Público: Formas del Pasado, Formas del Presente*. Sevilla, Junta de Andalucía - Consejería de Obras Públicas y Transportes e Triennale di Milano, 1999, pp. 55-57

PORTAS, Nuno. “Planeamento Urbano: Morte e Transfiguração” in *Arquitectura(s): teoria e desenho, investigação e projecto*. Porto, Faup publicações, 2005

PORTAS, Nuno; DOMINGUES, Álvaro; CABRAL, João. *Políticas urbanas : tendências, estratégias e oportunidades*. Lisboa, FCG, 2003

ROWE, Colin; KOETTER, Fred. *Cuidad Collage*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1998 (1ªed. 1978)

ROSSI, Aldo. *La arquitectura de la ciudad*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1982. (*L'architettura della città*, 1ª ed. 1966)

SECCHI, Bernardo. *Prima lezioni di urbanistica*. Roma, Laterza, 2000.

SECCHI, Bernardo. “Land design 2” in *Contemporary Public Space. Un-volumetric Architecture*. Milano, Skira, 2006, pp. 287-291

SIZA, Álvaro. “Exterior Ciudad” in *Sileno*, n.º 14-15 (No ciudad), (Dezembro 2003), pp. 52-56

SIZA, Álvaro. “Il quartiere Malagueira a Évora”. *Casabella*, n.º 478 (Marzo 1982), pp. 2-15

SOLÀ-MORALES, Manuel. “La segunda historia del proyecto urbano” *UR*, n.º 5 (1987), pp. 21-27

SOLÀ-MORALES, Manuel. *De cosas urbanas*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 2008

SOLÀ-MORALES, Manuel. “Los Vacíos de la metrópolis” in *La ciudad, de nuevo global* (Luciano G. Alfaya, Patricia Muñoz, ed.). Coruña, COAG, 2009, pp. 129-140

SOLÀ-MORALES, Manuel. “The Impossible Project of Public Space” in *In favour of public space: ten years of the european prize* (Magda Anglès ed.). Barcelona, Actar, 2010, pp. 24-32

The Public Chance, New urban Landscapes, A+T In common series, 2008

¹⁰ Charles Delfante. *A Grande História da Cidade: da Mesopotâmia aos Estados Unidos*. Lisboa, Instituto Piaget, 2000, pp. 402-403.