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Our group studied the Europa district of Eur for two months, from February to April 2013. We studied the neighborhood’s history and development, and analyzed statistics to enhance our findings. With the help of our professors and teaching assistants, we conducted four key stakeholder interviews covering working professionals and residents that have a variety of interests in the neighborhood. We also talked to people who work and/or reside in Eur, and performed street interviews and mapping activities to discuss their conception of the neighborhood based on the work of urban designer Kevin Lynch. This study presents our findings on a part of Eur facing conflicting interests over its development. We conclude that the future will continue to present challenges for how Eur-Europa can continue to grow and balance the needs of its residents with the growing commercialization of the area.
1. Introduction
Examine Neighborhood Identity

Esposizione Universale Roma, commonly known as Eur, is a quartiere found in the southern periphery of Rome. It was intended as the birthplace of a new and grand city to celebrate the 20th anniversary of fascism, but today is an area with a mix of residential and commercial activities. To get an idea of the dynamics of the neighborhood, our group looked specifically at the district of Eur which immediately surrounds Viale Europa. Over the course of our study, Viale Europa was described as a significant street within the greater Eur area, as a hub for commercial and social activities. The borders of our study area, designated as EUR-Europa, were chosen as a result of our initial visits with slight modifications to be more inclusive of areas that the group felt were necessary to analyze.

EUR-Europa represents a small but prominent microcosm of the phenomenon changing and shaping the Eur area as a whole. The EUR-Europa area is closely tied with the grander history of EUR, which very much shapes what the neighborhood is today. This paper focuses on many of the present issues by first examining the history that shaped the neighborhood.

The Connection between the Planning and Execution of EUR

Eur is unique in the sense that it is a fully planned and regulated area. Since its inception, it has been closely monitored by its own government agency Ente-EUR, now Eur SpA, which set forth regulations for development including building construction and lot management. Previously a vision set forth by Mussolini and those under him, the masterplan for Eur intended to create a well-managed urban space that offers all the amenities of a city center in an area which at the time of its construction was a large distance away. However, despite the well-planned nature of Eur and it being very regulated, there have been instances where new building construction differed from the original vision. The question then that our group proposes for our study is: how does the area of Eur (specifically Eur-Europa) of today exemplify or differ from its original plan? To answer this question, our group has chosen to focus our analysis based on three themes – Monumentalism, Commercial Interests and Densification.
Our three themes of analysis are based on our group’s observations and discussions with residents, professionals and other actors within Eur-Europa. These interrelated themes often connect with many of the present conflicts in the neighborhood.

**Monumentalism**

In its plan and development, Eur as a whole was originally purposed for creating a lasting “monument” to Mussolini and Fascist Italy. As such, in its architecture and general urban form this monumentality can be seen in the various parts of Eur and most especially the area within and around Eur-Europa. The representation of Eur under the period of fascism has a legacy that differs greatly from other neighborhoods that surround the Rome city center, and thus helps to influence the neighborhood identity. Our group looks into the ways in which present-day Eur Europa was influenced by its large and well-documented history and how its monumental nature still manifests itself today.

**Commercial Interests**

As a planned community with the amenities of green space, good public and private transportation connections, and high-quality buildings, Eur has become a desired location for many commercial activities, most noticeably office and retail endeavors. With the strong presence of commercial interests Eur, especially Eur-Europa, has become the center for high-end retail, including various international brands and companies. From our interviews, we find that commercial interests in Eur have shifted the focus away from social concerns for the existing residents in the community. Our group studies how commercialization affects the neighborhood of Eur-Europa and also the dynamics of the actors that either support or fight this phenomenon.

**Densification**

Originally, Eur was planned to include amenities, green spaces and high quality architecture and buildings that create an ideal and pleasant lifestyle for the area. However, as commercial and governmental interests have recently greatly increased development in the area, Eur has experienced a wave of densification, changing the social dynamic of the neighborhood as a whole. One of the larger problems that residents point out is the growing traffic within the area as a whole. In addition, densification has occurred without the increase in amenities for residents. Our group analyzes the dichotomy between those who are directly benefitting from the growing commercial structure causing the densification and those who feel Eur is no longer maintaining the same standard of social and community life as before.
Methodology

After an initial visit to the area to gather general observations and street surveys, we went back and conducted research on standard building typologies, selecting a few that we thought were relevant to Eur-Europa and creating a survey based on those typologies. However, we realized during subsequent visits to Eur-Europa that the classifications we had chosen could not adequately represent the buildings of the neighborhood in their entirety. As a result, after several discussions and consideration of Italian building typology (although information on this was limited), we modified our survey and came up with three general building typologies to cover all the buildings in the area: the Hybrid Block, Slab Building and Palazzine.

We assembled an extensive 5-page survey to quantify and describe each block of street within the neighborhood boundaries. Sections of the survey included details on street frontage, landscape design, use, level of repair, traffic intensity, noise level, and details on commercial uses. In order to quantify our observations, number scales were used as markers of intensity of descriptors, with a group agreement on what those numbers meant. In addition, we drew street profiles and street layouts for each block. The surveys are all included in the appendix of this document. From this data, the group was able to divide streets and buildings into typologies, and devise descriptors for each of them. For each street typology, a street profile was created to create a visual example for the template for the typology.

The group drew up a general list of land use types, based on our personal knowledge of land use and as well as information taken from land use research. We classified the land uses in Eur-Europa as such: Residential, Commercial, Educational, Service/Infrastructure, Recreational and Cultural. This list was then incorporated into our building survey visits, in which the use(s) for each building were identified from observing building details, such as plaques or address boxes. After our visit, the list was then reduced to Residential, Commercial, Educational, and Service/Infrastructure. Commercial was then broken down into two categories -- Office and Shop, to differentiate between the kinds of activities taking place and the space’s function. Office indicates tertiary work and business spaces while Shop focuses on consumer activities.
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Most of the data for our statistical analysis comes from the 2001 ISTAT census tract data for the neighborhood of EUR-Europa, supplemented by more recent data from the official Rome website whenever possible. This allowed us to make direct comparisons of Eur-Europa to the rest of Rome to illustrate what the data means in comparison to the entire metropolitan area. However, at the time this report was written, the 2001 ISTAT data is for the most part the most updated data available due to a delay in the reporting of the 2011 data. Therefore, this report relies on extrapolation, while carefully avoiding misrepresenting the current situation. Migratory statistics are not included in this report as we believe they do not accurately capture the real number of migrants and the flux in their numbers since the last census study. In addition, economic indicators such as workforce participation rates are largely avoided due to a large change in the economic situation of Italy since 2001. Other statistics for the most part are assumed to remain fairly constant. Education levels, household size, age demographics, and gender rates are likely to have stayed relatively similar over the past decade due to the long periods of housing tenure commonly in Italy, resulting in little change in the residents composing the neighborhood. Green space data is at the scale of Municipio XII, as the data source is Roma Capitale Open Data, and this is the lowest level of analysis possible, which is a large limitation of the data. Real estate data comes from the Agenzia delle Entrate.

In terms of obtaining the Lynch maps, our group was able to get people’s views of the EUR-Europa area through informal discussions and formal interviews. While our informal discussions mostly took place on the street and lasted only a couple minutes, our formal interviews were either in office or work spaces and lasted one to two hours each time. As for the demographics of our interviews, our group tried to cover every age bracket from teenager upwards, sectioned by gender for each bracket. We were able to talk with the three predominant groups of the area – residents, office employees (who do not work in the area), and immigrants who service the area or commute to the area to meet up with a larger community.

With the help of our teaching assistants, we scheduled four interviews over the course of three Thursdays. We talked to the President of the Via Europa Shop Owner’s Association, Mr. Massimo Cinti, at his high-end wine shop, Le Sommelier, to discuss commercial interests. In order to obtain an alternative perspective different from the shop owners’ association president, the following week we proceeded to meet with two individuals who have worked in the area, Arch. Francesco Innamoratti of Eur SpA, and Massimo Allulli, a researcher who had studied participatory practices within the area. Allulli then put us in contact with Mrs. Lattanzi, representative of the Comitato Salute Ambiente Eur, who shared her views on the transition of Eur in the last fifty years.

In addition to these scheduled interviews, with the help of our professors and teaching assistants we conducted several informal interviews. These gave us perspectives of what was important to citizens. We approached people of various age groups and genders, from high school students to elderly men.
II. Topics of Study
Development History of Eur
Esposizione Universale di Roma, a quartiere that has its origins in the fascist era, provides a stark contrast to the other developments that surround Rome. Mussolini declared in 1925 that it was time for Rome to once again shine forth its ancient splendor through becoming an ideal fascist city (Marcello 2010). It was in 1936 that the first ideas for an international exhibition in Rome located in the area to the southwest of the historic city as a mid point to the port city of Ostia. It was Rome’s governor Giuseppe Bottai, a passionate fascist and crucial player in Italy’s educational and economic reforms, who discussed these original ideas. At the time this development was to be called E42, which it later would be changed to what it is known today as EUR. E42 was envisioned to celebrate all that was ideal about Italian culture, society and science (Marcello 2010).

This new part of Rome, E42, was expected to be inaugurated in 1942, which would coincide with the twenty-year anniversary of Fascism. It was to be built in the Greco-Roman cross-axial style where the highway Viale Imperiale (today Via Cristoforo Colombo) would connect Eur to Piazza Venezia. In order to be the ‘ideal’ city, one that was functional and symbolic of the fascist period it had to already be born monumental. Its monumental nature would be inserted prior to the construction of the rest of Eur (Notaro 2001). Several well-known Italian architects were to be in charge of the design of the project: Libera, Minnucci, Quaroni, Guerrini, La Padula, Romano, and Moretti. One of the most prominent and earliest structures in EUR, the Palace of Italian Civilization (commonly known as the “Square Colosseum”), was constructed between 1938 and inaugurated in late November of 1940 and stands today as a testament to the monumentality of Eur.

Another prominent building is the Basilica SS. Pietro e Paolo. It was the first church in EUR. Prominently located on top of a hill, it stands as a very visible landmark from Viale Europa. The basilica was part of the E42 project. It was meant for the opening and closing ceremonies of the exhibition, and was to serve as an “iconographic exhibition of Saints Peter and Paul”. In 1938 construction of the church began, however, due to the war the temple stood only partially finished after three years of work. It was not until 1953 that work was taken up again to finish the church (Storia della Basilica, 2013). The war interrupted the
efforts undergone to develop EUR leaving the entirety of the planned and partially constructed site of EUR in complete abandonment.

It was realized by Rome’s political leaders that the demolition of what already there would cause tremendous economic damage to the state. Under the guidance of Virgilio Testa, Special Commissioner of Ente EUR from 1951 to 1975, there was the completion of several of the projects planned at the center of EUR. The project of financing, selling land and development rights to private development interests was undertaken to fund what was already done. EUR was chosen as a new administrative district.

For the Olympics of 1960 an artificial lakefront was developed. Several prominent buildings were completed for the Olympics such as the Palazzo dello Sport, which still remains one of the most well recognized multifunctional structures in Europe for sporting events, congresses, and music in Europe (Valerani & Innamorati 2012). The metro line was also built to connect EUR to the rest of Rome. The metro stops of Palasport and Fermi opened in 1955 to the public.

The period from 1960 to 1970 is the greatest development period for EUR, with the end of this decade bringing an end to the large-scale potentially risky state interventions (Valerani & Innamorati 2012). The most significant development in the city occurred in the Southeast quadrant of Eur. This new development occurs south of Eur Europa took the form of private low-density residential development. This construction in the south of Eur took inspiration from the Garden City movement under Ebenezer Howard (Valerani & Innamorati 2012).

Currently this area remains a very wealthy part of the Rome region. This area increased investor confidence for the area of Eur because of how it was housing for high-income people, allowing for the development to be easily financially supported. However, to the perspective of others it meant a gradual loss of architectural quality for the area in terms of a city that was more and more tied to increasing speculation and overbuilding.

From the 1980s the periphery around Eur started to develop. It was also in the 1980s that the trend of increasing office spaces in the district began to take hold. Mainly poorly designed modernist buildings
were constructed during this time period that greatly detracted from the existing built fabric of Eur. Innamorati (2012) refers to it as providing a picture of poor and foolish contemporaneity when describing the new Poste Italia, Banca di Rome, and Confindustria (although less bad than the others). By 1990 the entirety of Eur had been almost completely filled in. Starting in 2008 there was a new master plan where Eur was categorized as a historical center. This designation was to preserve the important architectural styles used in the development of Eur.

The neighborhood continues to be presented with the challenge of competing uses for residential and office spaces. Eur never truly developed with a residential definition, as it was born more for municipal and administrative functions. The current situation in Eur is the continual loss of residential spaces for commercial spaces that has been a trend spanning several decades. Eur never truly developed with a residential definition, as it was planned more for municipal and administrative functions. Today, there continues to be a conflict with its official plan and new construction taking place.

One of the newest pieces of construction under pressure to become finished is the new Centro Congressi designed by Massimiliano Fuksas. This building will clearly present a new chapter in the identity of Eur. It stands as one of the most important projects in Eur in continuation of the somewhat lost tradition of architectural excellence in Eur since its greatest period of monumentalism from 1940 to 1960 (Valerani & Innamorati 2012).

One project that has been in the development stage that is now stalled are the Renzo Piano towers. Within the community these towers are highly controversial as they will have direct impacts on traffic, density, and the feel for the area. These towers are situated across from the EUR Fermi metro station. Within the towers is the planned construction of 300 residential apartment units ranging in size of up to 300 m2. Also planned to be incorporated into the building complex is an underground 3-storey parking garage (Toti 2013). Currently the project is stalled, but the conflict between citizen groups and the business and developer interests remains.
Infrastructure
Housing Background

Building age is one way to measure infrastructure within a neighborhood. Age indicates level of maintenance required, as well as structural issues which may need correcting. More than two-thirds of the buildings in Eur Europa were constructed between the years of 1946 and 1961 and the remainder were constructed between the years 1962 to 1971. While a higher rate of Rome’s buildings come from these two time periods compared to earlier and later time periods, Rome by comparison has a much wider interval of housing ages with much more of an even spread throughout (See graphic: Building Ages Comparison Between EUR Europa and Rome). Clearly the very planned nature of Eur explains the narrow time-period of construction for the entire neighborhood, and it also helps to explain why new construction surrounding the neighborhood is so contested and controversial.

Household composition is another important aspect which impacts community and infrastructure in a neighborhood. The size of households in Eur Europa is relatively similar to Rome. The average household size is 2.42 persons per household compared to 2.37 persons per household in all of Rome. Most one-person households are located in the area between Viale America, Viale Europa, Ludwig Van Beethoven, and Pasteur. In that census track, 18% of households are single-person households. However, by comparison the census track inhabited with residents with the lowest rate of one-person households in the area has 9%. Household sizes differ somewhat between census tracks, but for the most part the differences are not very substantial, and it would be difficult to draw any conclusions based on the data. However, when connecting the neighborhood to the rest of Rome, the same pattern is found with household sizes of five or more persons. This is fairly uncommon, as the vast majority of households have one, two, three, or four persons.

Building heights play an important role in the look and use of space. The ISTAT data confirmed our conclusion from walking around that the vast majority of buildings in the area are four or more floors (71%). There is also quite a large percentage of one-story buildings (17%), but that is because of the interesting building types very unique to Eur. Along Viale Europa and Viale America there are many one-story shops with residential buildings set behind them.
In our survey of Eur-Europa, three different building types stand out: hybrid blocks, slab buildings, and palazzine. While initially based on our observations, this breakdown was later supported through our interviews with residents and officials in the area.

As defined by our study, hybrid blocks are complexes that consist of two or more building types. Within the context of Eur-Europa, the mix of buildings includes a multi-story tower with an extended one to two story base. Often, as these buildings are found adjacent to one another, the bases form a continuous facade facing the sidewalk. Typically, the hybrid blocks are found along the main commercial streets of Eur-Europa, namely Viale Europa and Viale America, where function calls for mixed-use but connected spaces. Activity within these spaces is the highest in the area.

Slab buildings within Eur-Europa are flat buildings with a controlled depth and often are greater than four stories in height. Usually, the units within the slab buildings are arranged along a corridor with single or multiple cores, depending on the length of the building. Slab buildings are centered just north of the area where hybrid buildings are concentrated, far enough to provide a distinct office area but still connected to the hub of activity in the immediate area.

Palazzine are multi-story (of a range of 3-6 stories) free-standing buildings with multiple units found per floor. They make up the majority of buildings types in Eur-Europa, and were originally intended to have residential functions. Most of the palazzine have balconies and roof terraces, which are often transformed into garden spaces. They may be aligned or set back from the sidewalk and have grilled walls on their perimeter, which provides a sense of security and privacy. We break down the palazzine typology based on the number of stories they had to highlight certain trends in the neighborhood.

The majority of 3-4 story palazzine is found in the west side of the study area, where development in Eur-Europa first started and subsequently progressed down the hill from west to east.

The 5-6 story palazzine are found in the center to center-east of the study area. These buildings are set just west of the hybrid block and slab building concentrations and serve as an introduction to the highly residential space when entering from the east.

There is only one 9-story building in the study area, found in the southwest corner along Via Eufrate. It is an outlier in comparison to its immediate surroundings and represents much more recent development. We keep it under the palazzine typology because it has the characteristics of a palazzine, with the only difference being its tall height. It should be noted that the building would technically be designated as a palazzo.
Land Use

Eur presents five different categories of land use: Religious, Educational, Service/Infrastructure, Residential, and Commercial, which is broken down into Office and Shop Spaces. From the categories, the dominant uses were residential and commercial with the other uses concentrated into certain sections within the neighborhood. The most prominent of these concentrations can be seen in the northeast corner of Eur in which Service/Infrastructure and Educational are predominantly located. Religious is the least prevalent land-use type, as it can only be seen in 2 of the 106 buildings in the area. Another predominant trend within the Eur is mixed use, most prominently between the residential and commercial categories. Mixed use can be seen in two different ways throughout the neighborhood. As represented in a gradient pattern, there is a mix of uses that are within each individual building. There is no definite separations of uses, either by floor or area, but predominately offices are located on the bottom floor. The mix of commercial-office and residential spaces is predominantly in apartment building types. Within Eur Europa, this can be seen on the west side of area, between Via Eufrate and Viale dei Santissimi Pietro e Paolo. On the other hand, as represented with the separation of colors within buildings, the different uses can be kept apart to certain areas of the buildings. From observation, this case happens most often with commercial-shop with occupying the buildings' street-level extensions on the first and second floor levels, and residential is directly separated from the street level uses. This case is greatly seen on Vial Europa, in which much of the area’s high-end and stores are located, as well as Viale America, where many cafes and bars can be observed. In some cases in Eur, this mix of uses goes beyond to three or four categories, in which educational is paired with residential and commercial.

In reflection, the land use typology of Eur shows a large residential space that is highly impacted by commercial activities. This accurately fits the description often described by locals, and later observed by our group, as office- or workspace-oriented. With the exceptions of residential and religious, most of the uses are oriented toward working-hours (8:00-17:00), reflecting a high level of use during the day with low level use at night, despite the numerous bars found in the area. Additionally, the level of use also changes accordingly to time based on the working population that interacts within the spaces, coming in the morning and leaving in the early evening. The concentrations of uses also reflects presence of population with the working population concentrating in the northeast, within the service/infrastructure land use category area.
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The market values of residential and commercial properties in EUR are lower than those in the center of Rome, but higher than other peripheral neighborhoods (we chose Villa Gordiani as an example for comparison). The table above shows the minimum and maximum values for each typology. The residential buildings along Viale Europa are valued between 4300-6400 €/sqm, while shops and offices are valued 100 €/sqm higher, between 4400-6500 €/sqm. This is roughly 25-50% lower than the rates in the center of Rome, and 50-70% higher than the rates in Villa Gordiani. The higher values for commercial spaces in EUR and hence, its rental yield, perhaps explains why there is a trend of residential spaces being converted into commercial spaces in the neighborhood. By contrast, the value of shop spaces in the center of Rome and Villa Gordiani are 200-300 €/sqm lower than residential spaces. EUR’s situation is thus a unique one, and reflects its status as an administrative and commercial hub rather than a residential neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>EUR Viale Europa</th>
<th>Roma Centrale (Via Del Testo Marcello)</th>
<th>Villa Gordiani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Buildings</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>5900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>6300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Rent prices in EUR, Roma Centrale, and Villa Gordiani (Agenzia delle Entrate, 2012)
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The Built and Natural Environment
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Street Typology

Street typology within Eur reflects uses within the neighborhood. Within each typology there is room for variation, because all development is private, and sidewalk design varies, especially for apartment street frontage. Some of this is based upon the master plan and architectural competitions for building design.

Residential streets are defined by having low and medium levels of traffic. Street decoration includes single species street trees on both sides of the street. Streets and sidewalks are generally shaded as a result of these trees. Street frontage may include benches or bicycle racks, particularly when near intersections with commercial streets. Wide sidewalks and wide grass areas make dog walking appealing here. The majority of streets within Eur-Europa fall under this category, consistent with the fact that this is the most residential part of Eur.

Commercial streets are defined by heavy flows of traffic, both automobile and pedestrian. Wide paved sidewalks are common here, but grass patches are uncommon here in order to maximize room for pedestrians. In these areas, restaurants will often have outdoor seating areas. Occasionally planters can be seen. Because of the heavy traffic flow, these streets may include informal double parking areas.

Boulevard streets have divided lanes of traffic to support medium to high car traffic. High levels of informal parking occur here. Italian stone pines, native to Rome, characterize these streets and give them a grandiose style. Sidewalk width varies along boulevards depending on land use (commercial-office/residential or commercial-shop/residential). They serve as major arterials to reach farther areas.

Avenues have two lanes of low volume traffic. Parking occurs on both sides of the street, but this is regularized parking. Street design has a more fascist influence, including cobblestone streets, plentiful street trees, and wide sidewalks.

The institutional streets are condensed into a small corner of Eur Europa, a sign of the fact that the neighborhood developed around a master plan. These streets are essentially parking lots, they are not constructed to cater to the pedestrian. However, because of proximity to key services such as the high school and Poste Italiane, there are large numbers of people walking here.

Photos (left to right) : Boulevard, Commercial, Avenue, Institutional, Residential Streets. Photography by Hannah Brockhaus
Maintenance of sidewalks is very good in Eur Europa. Viale dei Santissimi Pietro e Paolo has a highly manicured sidewalk and street design, even though the sidewalks are not wide and there is not much pedestrian traffic. Viale Europa with heavy foot as well as car traffic is well maintained and contains attractive tree-lined areas along the street.

There is a rather impressive amount of public and green space in the neighborhood, considering how privatized and gated the community is in Eur Europa. This includes planned piazzas such as Piazza dei Caduti sul Lavoro and also simple street frontage and shaded wide sidewalks with benches where people gather. There is variation in the use of these spaces, however. This is complemented by two grandiose public stairways to connect the hilled west section of our neighborhood with the commercial streets down below.
Green Space in EUR

Our street surveys showed a large amount of green space within Eur, especially considering the neighborhood’s importance as a center of commerce within Rome. Since available data on green spaces and facilities is specific only to the municipio in Rome, our analysis is based on that level of specificity. We compare Municipio XII (which EUR is located in) to the rest of Rome, and find that EUR has a larger area of street furniture, parking space, neighborhood green space, large urban parks, and protected space than the Roman average. Compared to Rome, EUR has a smaller area of historical and archaeological space, and special green space. A limitation of this data is that it does not define what exactly these variables include, for example, what special green area is defined as. Nevertheless, it provides a useful overview of the official classifications of green space and their values across different municipios.

In terms of the breakdown of green space in Municipio XII, the vast majority of Municipio XII’s green area falls under the Protected Area category (94% of its green space is protected). Neighborhood green spaces and large urban parks make up 3% of the municipio green space each. The other categories of street furniture, parking space, protected space, and historical and archaeological space as a proportion of the municipio green space are negligible.

Using STATA, we performed a 2-sided t-test to analyze if the averages for Municipio XII are statistically different from the Roman averages for the listed variables (See Figure A1). Our results indicate that Municipio XII indeed has larger areas of green space compared to the Roman average for the variables of Green Areas of Neighborhoods, Large Urban Parks, Protected Areas, and Total Non-Farm Green Areas, and that this result is statistically significant at the 5% level.

In terms of Total Non-Farm Green Area as a percentage of the total municipio area, Municipio XII ranks 7th with 36%, or roughly one-third, of its land being green area. For Large Urban Parks and Green Area of Neighborhood, it is also the 7th highest municipality in terms of percentage area (0.94% and 0.93% respectively). It ranks 10th for Street Furniture (0.16%), and 12th for Parking Area (0.10%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (m²)</th>
<th>Street Furniture</th>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Green Area of Neighborhood</th>
<th>Green Historical and Archaeological Area</th>
<th>Large Urban Parks</th>
<th>Special Green Area</th>
<th>Protected Area</th>
<th>Total Non-Farm Green Area</th>
<th>Area of Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipio XII</td>
<td>283,864</td>
<td>190,080</td>
<td>1,697,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,724,660</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>62,552,700</td>
<td>66,461,388</td>
<td>183,296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome Mean</td>
<td>138,881</td>
<td>98,170</td>
<td>504,930</td>
<td>310,590</td>
<td>1,022,439</td>
<td>14,723</td>
<td>21,500,000</td>
<td>23,600,000</td>
<td>58,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connectivity

The area of Eur-Europa is very well serviced by the Metro. The Rome Metro Line B extends to Laurentina from Rebibbia. Eur is serviced by three stops along the Metro Line B: EUR Magliana, EUR Palasport, and EUR Fermi. The neighborhood of EUR Europa is especially well serviced by EUR Palasport. Due to the frequency times of metro trains arriving in the station around every four minutes during peak commuter hours and limited delays, the Metro is a highly attractive option for commuters who do not use a car. Regional rail is another way of getting to Eur through public transit. The regional rail connection is through EUR Magliana, which connects people from the periphery of Rome to Eur. Buses are a third option to get to Eur for public transit users. For local travel and travel in areas that are far from metro lines and regional train connections buses are the preferred mode. However, with the buses they can be faced with long traffic delays, especially along the street Cristoforo Columbo. Bus schedules are often not followed, the routes are confusing for the average citizen to navigate, and the ATAC website is inaccessible and confusing for the average to use. For these reasons, buses are not used extensively for daily traffic.

Traffic is a large concern for Eur because of the amount of cars and buses that travel through the area during peak hours. Since Eur has such a large business and office dominance, roads are extremely congested during the morning and afternoon hours. Despite the high amount of road congestion during peak travel times, the area is extremely well serviced by high-capacity roads and highways like the GRA. Eur is an especially attractive area for businesses because of its proximity to GRA and other major collector roads that link it to the rest of Rome as well as the accessibility to the Metro and regional train system.

Within the area of Eur-Europa, traffic is for the most part light compared to Cristoforo Columbo. However, along major collector roads there is a large traffic flow in EUR Europa. Viale America, Viale Europa, Viale Ludwig Van Beethoven, and Viale Umberto Tupini experience a high traffic intensity measure by over 600 recorded vehicles/per hour during non-peak morning conditions. The medium intensity roads include Viale dei Santissimi Pietro e Paulo, Vale dell’ Astronomia, and a section of Viale Luigi Pasteur as determined by calculations that between 300 and 600 vehicles per hour pass by along these streets. The remained or the streets have light traffic intensity, serving as residential streets, and have less than 300 vehicles per hour during non-peak morning travel conditions. The area faces a large parking problem. Double parking and informal parking is extremely prevalent throughout the neighborhood.
Demographics
The neighborhood of Eur Europa had a population of around 2,061 residents in 2001 as measured by ISTAT. The boundaries of the neighborhood are based on census tracks, and include the part of Eur that is centered around Viale Europa. The defined area has a population that is predominantly women, with 55% women compared to 44% men. By contrast, Rome’s gender ratio is more balanced, with 53% women to 47% men. In terms of the age breakdown of the neighborhood, much of the distribution of ages in the neighborhood is similar to Rome. The main exception is with residents who are over the age of 75. Compared to 8% in Rome, 13% of Eur Europa residents are over the age of 75 (Figures A16-A18). With such a large elderly population, careful attention should be dedicated to ensuring adequate elderly care facilities. This of course is an issue that has not been properly dealt with. The elderly community in Eur Europa is currently very much underserved, which may be a large reason behind the large participation of older residents in several of Eur’s neighborhood associations.

A majority of the younger residents (those under the age of 15 years old) in Eur Europa are concentrated in the western portion of the neighborhood, from the street Umberto Tupini to Via Eufrate (Figure A16). Residents that are within the age bracket of 15 to 24 are mainly located in the area enclosed by Via del Giordano, Viale Europa, Viale Luigi Pasteur, and Via dell’Elettronica (Figure A16). From our informal neighborhood interviews, it appears that the youth living and studying in Eur Europa travel outside the neighborhood for entertainment. The areas of Eur Europa where a largest percentage of young people reside are not actively used by them due to what they find to be a lack of activities in the area. Most adolescents can be spotted in the afternoon leaving high school and waiting for the buses along Viale Ludwig Van Beethoven to hang out in the nearby shopping centers.

The most underrepresented age population in Eur Europa compared to Rome are those between 30 to 34 years old. In Eur-Europa only 6% of the people are in the age category of 30 to 34 compared to 8% in Rome (Figure A9). Since this segment of the population is underrepresented, more can be done to attract this demographic group to Eur Europa to inject vibrancy into the neighborhood. Possible strategies to pursue are to make the neighborhood more conducive for young families to live in, and to create a more active night scene in the area.

In Eur a majority of residents have at least a high school diploma. Compared to the rest of Rome, the area has more than double the percentage of college graduates (36% compared to 14%) and a slightly higher percentage of residents with a high school diploma as the highest certificate earned (35% compared to 32%) (Figure A12). From the above average education rates for the neighborhood, it can be assumed that the employed residents command higher salaries than the rest of Rome on average. Businesses and offices in Eur reflect this assumption. Many of the businesses offer high-end retail, such as jewelry, expensive clothing brand stores, and high-end wine shops. A considerable number of offices are involved in medicine, dentistry, law, and medical support, which involve professions that are very highly-skilled and well paid.

Figure 6: Age Distributions within Eur and Rome (ISTAT). Graphic by Elliot Sperling
The very high education levels for Eur Europa clearly makes the area an attractive area for offices and businesses. Businesses are especially finding it an attractive place for office space, even despite the high rents. Such high demand for office space, also, clearly creates conflict in the neighborhood. While the rest of Eur is mostly commercial, the Europa section still remains mostly residential. However, over time the neighborhood is shifting towards becoming even more commercial. Existing residents are feeling the impacts of a changing neighborhood, and the community continues to face and debate many conflicting visions for the future.

General Conclusions: Statistical Analysis
The community of Eur-Europa has a large percentage of people who are highly educated according to 2001 ISTAT data. From this it can be hypothesized that those employed from Eur make considerably higher salaries than the Rome average. Also the 2001 ISTAT data is rich with demographic data showing that a majority of residents are women, which percentage-wise is comparatively higher than in the rest of Rome. The community is mostly made up of middle-aged residents with a large percentage of elderly people over the age of 75.

Data on residential dwellings in Eur show that they are mainly occupied by people with ownership capacities, with a minority (34%) of the community under rental contracts. There is an 87% occupancy rate for residential dwellings. A majority of residential dwellings were built from 1946 to 1961 and the vast majority have four or more floors. A majority of families are one, two, and three persons. Roughly 5% of residents, based on 2001 data, have foreign origin and a majority of them come from other parts of Europe and Asia. From more recent data, Eur has larger areas of green spaces compared to the Roman neighborhood average, and lower residential and commercial rents compared to the center of Rome but much greater rents than most other areas outside the center.

Overall the data show that Eur-Europa has positive attributes such as a highly educated populace, high occupancy rates, a well-maintained housing stock, and a large availability of green space compared to the rest of Rome. However, the data also show that the community faces present and future challenges. While the positive attributes of the area make it attractive for living and working, they also create problems for the neighborhood such as densification, commercialization, and rising rents from future expected growth. The growing senior population also presents a challenge for the area. With a lack of amenities catering to their needs, elderly residents will find it increasingly difficult to live in Eur. More attention will need to be paid to senior needs and the possible creation of facilities that assist with senior living.
III. Issues
Cognitive Mapping

The Lynch Maps that were received from people in the area of EUR-Europa reveal a lot not only to the immediate context of our study area but also the larger context of EUR as a whole. For the Lynch maps it is important to consider the peoples biases coming into this section of the project. Our group’s view of the neighborhood was greatly enhanced by what was told and shown to us, including the consideration of boundaries for the area. We used Kevin Lynch’s five elements in order to organize areas of the neighborhood and its citizen’s interactions with the space. These include landmarks, paths, nodes, districts, and edges. We were then able to look at these elements in the context of our three themes of analysis.

Among all the aspects, the landmarks for EUR-Europa were the easiest for all people to identify. Consistently, people pointed out the Basilica dei Santi Pietro e Paolo and the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana (also known as the Colosseo Quadrato, Square Colosseum) as the major landmarks of the immediate area. The readily identifiable nature of these buildings supports the original ideas upon which these two buildings were built – monumental structures to symbolize EUR. Both structures are placed on top of hills which then slope down to create commanding views and as a result, are consistently within what people see as EUR.

As seen in the high level of car-traffic and the orientation of the neighborhood for cars, the major paths seen in the study area were streets, many being major boulevards of the area. The streets often cited were Viale Europa and Via Cristoforo Colombo. The first, cited previously as a zone of commercial activity, also was described as major thoroughfare for pedestrian, car and motorcycle traffic. It is the street which people use to access the smaller, residential and office streets. On the other hand, while Viale Europa is a central street in our study area, Via Cristoforo Colombo is out of our particular study area but is recognized as an essential street for the larger Eur area. It is also vital in providing connection to the streets of Eur Europa, such as Viale Europa or Viale America.

Throughout the interviews, one district – a high-end commercial and luxury shopping street centered on Viale Europa -- was pointed out time and time again. Many people cited the high-level of activity and traffic (pedestrian, car and motorcycle) created by the various clothing and accessory stores as well as cafes and restaurants that then make Viale Europa essentially the center of not only EUR-Europa but EUR in general.

In terms of significant nodes in the EUR-Europa area, many people identified places that were regular hangout spots – McDonalds on Viale Europa and the Laghetto (the lake and park area, formally referred to as the Parco Centrale del Lago or Parco Lago dell’EUR). As described by the interviewees, these locations regularly provided spaces to socialize and relax either alone or within a group. Both McDonalds and the park were evident focal points for people in the neighborhood, whether in actually visiting the space or simply passing through.
By far, the least consistently identifiable aspect of the EUR-Europa and EUR as a whole was the edges. From interview to interview, the perceptions of the boundaries of the area changed scale from describing only extents found between the Basilica and the Square Colosseum to finally the larger EUR bounded by Via delle Tre Fontane to the north and Viale and Viale dell’Oceano Pacifico/Viale dell’ Oceano Atlantico to the south with Via Laurentina and Viale Egeo to the east and west, respectively. These streets come together to form a unique pentagon shape, which connects to the original intention of the shape of EUR in its initial master plan. However, it must be clarified that professionals working in the area and who have a particular historical knowledge of the area only recognized these last set of boundaries. In terms of the EUR-Europa area specifically, locals and workers at various times pointed out the park as a southern boundary, the Square Colosseum to the north, the Basilica to the west and Viale Cristoforo Colombo to the east. These markers form a relatively clear rectangle. But based on people’s apprehension to draw boundary lines, these can be seen as soft boundaries at most.

**Densification**

In our street interviews, while people indicated Viale Europa and Via Cristoforo Colombo as major thoroughfares, they were also considered major areas along which a high level of development was taking place and as a result, the area as a whole was densifying. Some (professionals or shop owners working in the area) cited these changes along these streets as positive, as the economic possibilities would only help the area. Others, including some local residents, seemed adamant and misgiving about the densification as it would change the essential face of the neighborhood as they saw and still see it.

**Commercial Interests**

Along with the issue of densification, commercial interests seem to have a strong presence in EUR-Europa and the area as a whole as interpreted from people’s perception of the major activities of the area. Citing Viale Europe repeatedly as a commercial zone, people note the high interest of investors and shop owners in the area, as it is a highly serviced area in comparison to its immediate neighbors. In one interview for example, office spaces were described as bringing in wealth in that they demand a higher rent than residential spaces so causing some to move out or not move in as they cannot afford to live in EUR. This illustrates the way in which people recognize the gradual changes being made to the area by commercial means.

**Monumentalism**

People’s immediate identification of EUR’s landmarks as focal points in the neighborhood, such as the Basilica and the Square Colosseum, reflects the significance of monumentalism to their perception of the neighborhood as a whole. It provides a view into the general knowledge that residents have of EUR’s history and development. Even though these landmarks are accepted as representing EUR’s historical circumstances, new monumental development in the area, such as the “Cloud” by Fuksas, are rejected as representing the neighborhood. This resistance to new “monumental” building in EUR may be seen as a rejection of a redefinition of the fascist monumental character of the area. The interviews, both street interviews and formally scheduled ones, discussed several key issues which clearly are on the minds of Eur residents. The research group conducted four interviews over the course of three weeks, as well as gathered more casual street interviews throughout their time in the neighborhood.
Citizen Interviews

We conducted four in-depth interviews with people who work and live in Eur. Mr. Cinti, President of the Viale Europa Shop Association, owns a specialty wine shop; Architect Francesco Innamoratti of Eur SpA, and Massimo Allulli, a researcher at Cittalia, and Mrs. Lattanzi of the Comitato Salute Ambiente Eur as well as street interviews.

Commercial Interests in Eur

Today, more than half of the residential units of Eur-Europa have been converted to commercial. This is not surprising, given how expensive buying space in the neighborhood seems to be. However, the main commercial district along Viale Europa and Viale Ludwig von Beethoven was not always so competitive. According to Shop Owner’s Association President Mr. Cinti, when his father opened the shop, it sold bulk wine and olives. His store was part of a full service area where all of the community’s needs were met: there was a hardware store, several food shops, as well as a range of retail and clothing shops.

Over the years, as shopping malls and large super-markets have continued to open, shops have needed to specialize with high-end products in order to survive.

Much of the commercialization of Eur has been a result of the market-oriented approach of Ente Eur, the public organization in charge of shaping the neighborhood. In recent years, its style of management has become more business-like to cover its operational costs. According to Mrs. Lattanzi, the organization was originally in charge of controlling building quality in Eur according to typology. During the late 1990s, Ente Eur was transformed into Eur SpA, which changed its procedure of development. While properties under the organization’s control remain publicly-owned, the procedure for building them is privatized. The new mission of Eur SpA is to increase the value of its properties. Becoming essentially a real estate company, the organization engages in public-private ventures to construct buildings in Eur such as the new Fuksas Congress Hall.

One aspect unique to Eur is the lack of a public market in the area, which according to two young architects we met on the street, makes the neighborhood not function coherently. There has never been a market in the area, and the closest one is in Ostiense. In several of our informal interviews this was brought up as reasoning for Eur not being a “real neighborhood.” Another aspect which relates to the idea that Eur is not functional as a neighborhood is the fact that there is a lack of evening activity. Mr. Cinti mentioned this related to the differences between the street activity during business hours and in the evenings and weekends. There is no cinema or theater, and there are not many restaurants around. However, both he and Architect Innamoratti mentioned the increasing interest in these types of businesses. Architect Innamoratti mentioned this in the context that Eur is an inviting business environment.

Issues of commercialization in Eur have led to traffic problems as well. According to Mrs. Lattanzi, car traffic has increased with the higher number of office spaces, so mobility has become a major issue for EUR. The Comitato has proposed several ideas, requiring underground tunnels anywhere from two blocks long to the whole of Cristofo Columbo.
higher number of office spaces mobility has become a major issue for EUR. Several proposals have been made by the comitato but these have been repeatedly rejected or ignored. The master plan itself has presented three different solutions, all involving underground tunnels anywhere from two blocks long to the whole of Cristoforo Colombo. Whatever form, these tunnels have still been identified as too expensive to even attempt and does not address the problems of the area. In general, there has been a loss in quality of life with the neglect of the needs of those who live in the area. The gradual transformation of the use of spaces seems to also be relating largely to the lack of transparency and arguments between private companies, Ente EUR and the municipality (as discussed by Allulli).

Monumentalism

Eur was constructed from a strong vision to display how a new section of Rome could be born monumental. As a consequence, the neighborhood has become an important part of the history of Rome and explains why it was given redesignation as a historic center in the 2008 Rome Master Plan. The extensive planning that went into giving Eur a strong recognition is the reason the neighborhood is still operating under a vision of creating a center of culture, museums, and Ministries for Rome according to Innamoratti (2013). Consequently, Eur is known for large projects and monuments, but the construction of these projects can create a lot of dissent among citizen groups when they feel underrepresented. Historical and recent projects and monuments in Eur include the Fuksas Congress Hall, Renzo Piano Towers, aquarium, Square Colosseum, National Archive Museum, and the Velodromo (recently demolished). Details can be found on Eur SpA’s website at http://www.eurspa.it/la-societa/patrimonio.

Eur was planned as an example of how fascism could work, which is why it is so formally planned. The neighborhood was centered on a pentagonal shape, with a cardus, Viale Christoforo Colombo, and several decumani. Buildings were laid out on intersections, so that the area would be symmetrical and well organized. As a result of this planning, Eur has clearly defined districts: the “Garden City” style villas in the South, the Viale Europa center of commerce, ministerial buildings in the North along the cardus, and more dense residential areas within the area of Eur Europa (Innamoratti 2013).

Part of the reason Eur is considered so high quality of a neighborhood inside Rome is through its maintenance and generally good appearance. This is because of the fact that compared to other districts of Rome where speculative growth occurred, the municipio traditionally played a large role in the development of Eur. The municipality takes care of the neighborhood and maintains public spaces and services like schools. Residents need to pay extra fees for those services. For example, if a resident lives in a big building, he or she would need to pay for the cleaning of common spaces. Mrs. Lattanzi (2013) thinks EUR can be used as a model of urban planning in Italy. Other neighborhoods have bad architectural quality and lack urban facilities and quality public transport; also, the builder buys bad land and builds poor quality buildings. Residents pay a little more in EUR but have a better quality of life, so EUR was a happy island in the urban disaster that surrounds it according to Mrs. Lattanzi.

As a result, citizens have strong opinions on the development projects that have occurred in Eur. Some residents are generally dissatisfied with the construction of the new monumental buildings (such as the Fuksas Cloud), but for varied reasons. Two older men discussed a lack of connection to the old fascist architecture (in fact, a blatant disregard for preservation of the old neighborhood), and people have varied ideas.
about the connection between politics and architecture in Eur, clearly related to the neighborhood’s founding.

**Densification**

The researchers went into the interview process knowing that there has been large scale construction going on, and this has led to citizen dissent over densification in Eur. As a consequence, everyone interviewed was asked about this densification process. The citizens’ responses varied on their involvement in the neighborhood, as well as their interests. The President of the Eur Shop Owner’s Association, for example, is in favor of these developments because they will benefit his wine shop. There is also conflict over the intentions of the project. Architect Innamoratti of Eur SpA assuredly mentioned that Eur never had a residential identification. From the start it had been planned as a center for museums, culture, and the ministries. He gave several reasons for this. The atmosphere of Eur does not cater to residential interests. People choose to live in areas that are less congested, generally. Eur is surrounded by more residential development on its edges, which leads to huge congestion and long commuter times. After 17:00 the area empties out, reflecting the office atmosphere of the neighborhood of Eur Europa. The costs of living in Eur are high. The price of an apartment in Eur, according to Innamoratti, is around eight to fifteen thousand euros per square meter. From the data collected on neighborhood rents it seems that this number is quite inflated and may thus only reflect the price of the more newly constructed apartments for the area.

The interview with Massimo Allulli, of Cittalia gave a very different perspective of the neighborhood. For his Ph.D dissertation, he researched citizen activism and the Renzo Piano towers. He gave insights into the process and politics of the situation, as well as the time scale for construction and planning. The partially-built towers have remained in the same state as two years ago. Some citizen groups have been opposed to the entire process, and have articulated arguments and presented counter proposals. The towers, as planned now, will include one provincial building and one luxury high rise apartment building. Developers have argued that this densification is not necessary, and instead, construction should be focused on created services for the neighborhood. Citizen groups include skilled professionals who have technical degrees, such as Georgio Biuso, a former Eur SpA engineer. Proposals have included creation of a corridor for mobility, and advocating for the original plan, a hotel. Allulli also noted that Eur SpA is unresponsive to the concerns of citizens even though the project is under its purview, so activism is very much left to the citizens who are against this densification but at this point are not being heard.
The People of Eur

One of the problems encountered over the interview process was finding residents of the neighborhood, as opposed to people working in Eur. The interview with M. Allulli gave an overview of the residents which confirmed previous suspicions based on statistics and descriptive surveys. Later, the interview with Mrs. Lattanzi of the Comitato Saluti Ambiente Eur, gave slightly more information about a wider demographic.

Within EUR, there are three types of inhabitants according to Mrs. Lattanzi. The first type consists of people who complain about the new projects that are changing the face of neighborhood, but do not do much more than complain or acknowledge the changes. The second group are those who are contributing to the changing face of the neighborhood by changing the flats they own in the area from residential apartments into tertiary office spaces, which, while illegal, is gradually occurring throughout the neighborhood. The last and smallest group are those who are still actively fighting the transformation of the neighborhood, most making up the various comitati of EUR. These descriptors, while inherently political, give a better understanding about the changing face of Eur. These three groups are supplemented by Allulli's description of the activists: they are citizens who are active because they have a lot of time. For example, retired people or women who don't work. The area also includes experts who live in the area but who do not necessarily work in the area. These people often have technical skills and credibility which allows them to better articulate their objections and ideas (although to a large extent this has not helped since the privatization of Ente-Eur).

These activists are concerned with the projects that are being developed, but also about the current lack of services supporting residents. One of their ideas was the Corridor di Mobilita – Mobility Corridor. It was to be a peripheral street for cars with a public transportation BRT (bus rapid transit) lane. This was also suggested to be put in the last master plan of Rome, but this never occurred. In general, good ideas by the residents are not being realized. Rather, the plan is changing to accommodate other projects. Greater transit, more services, and more schools are what is really wanted by many residents opposing the current paradigm of development in the area.
There is a scarcity of services catering to the day-to-day life of residents in the area. Eur-Europa lacks an open-air market, a fixture typical to many neighborhoods in Rome that would not only provide the community with goods and fresh produce, but also a social network for community members. Options for night activities in Eur-Europa are also lacking, an observation echoed repeatedly by many of the residents in the area. They say that after the offices close and workers go back home the neighborhood empties out and becomes dead creating prospects for illicit activities to occur, such as prostitution. Even in the daytime, there is a dearth of places for young people to socialize. When teenagers studying in a school in Eur-Europa were asked where they hung out they mentioned places outside of Eur-Europa, such as RomaEst. Eur-Europa, they griped, was “boring.” Moreover, the elderly population in the neighborhood is underserved by facilities catering to their age-group, such as elderly homes and senior centers. Thus, Eur-Europa would benefit from the addition of more services for different members of the community to augment the residential side of the neighborhood.
Residential and Developmental Conflict

A recurring issue is the fissure between the official plan for EUR and the desires of the neighborhood. EUR was created to be a model showcase for development, but the drive to achieve that vision has impinged on the community’s wish for more services and attention to be paid to their welfare. The desirability of EUR in terms of its location, infrastructure, and potential for development has attracted investment which has had its positive and negative impacts on the neighborhood.

Chief among the concerns of EUR’s residents is the densification of the neighborhood. They worry that the opening of new retail and offices in EUR will bring an onslaught of traffic, human and vehicular, that would transform the fabric of the neighborhood. Our interviewees were unanimous in their separate accounts of this trend occurring. Mr. Cinti noted the occurrence of big supermarkets outside of the area taking over family shops. Mr. Innamoratti mentioned how the ministry and office buildings led to large amount of the congestion and that they are becoming an even more substantial part of the area. Mr. Alluli described how increasing densification would bring even more traffic. This was substantiated by Mrs. Lattanzi, who spoke in detail about the detrimental effects of commercialization and densification on the urban and green environment for the area.

The response of the neighborhood to this phenomenon has been mixed. Some, like Mr. Cinti, are in favor of the additional day and night-time traffic in the area since they anticipate that it will bring increased economic opportunities for the neighborhood. Others, like Mrs. Lattanzi, who spoke in detail about the detrimental effects of commercialization and densification on the urban and green environment for the area.

One question that can be asked is whether this implies a greater chance of success in the fields of contention that the community is currently embroiled in. Mr. Alluli thinks the answer to this question is “yes”, but Mrs. Lattanzi, a representative for one of those groups, is not so optimistic. It remains to be seen whether EUR as a neighborhood will over time align more closely with the goals of the neighborhood associations opposed to this current paradigm of development or that of EUR SpA.
IV. Conclusion
Throughout a ten week period, we focused on the Europa part of Esposizione Universale Rome (Eur). The quantitative and qualitative research collected shows a neighborhood with promise, but also significant hurdles to tackle. The rich history of the neighborhood demonstrates a heavily planned area. Despite this grandiose structure, it faces large conflicts in what is its identity, its vision for the future, and competing interests between what is the residential and business makeup of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood has highly identifiable monuments due to well-documented planning of them during the fascist Italian era and their eventually finished construction after the war, but the entire area continues to struggle with the challenge of addressing the needs of a small and shrinking residential component of Eur.

The nature of Eur continues to make it a very well recognized neighborhood of Rome. The identity of Eur is a clear, well-defined image with consistent edges, monuments, and places of interest. However, recently new haphazard additions have occurred against the master plan. This conflicts with Eur’s history of being heavily planned for as it was envisioned. Many of these structures are being created out of the need for a larger business environment in Eur. With the densification of the neighborhood having no improvements in available amenities it is making the neighborhood even less livable for residents and even more intended for commercial interests.

EUR has a large percentage of older residents, according to ISTAT data. The vast majority of the residential buildings in the neighborhood were constructed in the 1950s, making this the oldest housing stock within EUR as a whole. Due to the large percentage of residents over the age of sixty five it can be inferred that a majority of these residents moved to the neighborhood when it was first developed. The neighborhood was clearly attractive then. As Mr. Cinti says, there was a large variety of shops (although never a market), so people could access food, hardware, and a variety of retail. According to Mrs. Lattanzi, attention was given to the design of green spaces in Eur. In addition, the process of development was highly restricted: there were standards for individual properties and groups of buildings. Ente Eur functioned as a zoning code, and this led to a high quality of life in Eur.

EUR was created to be a model showcase for development, but the drive to achieve further commerce and cultural center has led to recent projects where the community's wishes for more services and attention for their welfare have been ignored. The desirability of EUR because of location, infrastructure and potential for development has attracted investment which has had its positive and negative impacts on the neighborhood. Chief among the concerns of EUR’s residents is the densification of the neighborhood. They worry that continuing commercialization will bring an onslaught of traffic that would transform the fabric of the neighborhood. This not only effects traffic; it has been detrimental for green space. However, individuals like Mr. Cinti are happy with this because it should bring more business. Members of the community who share her sentiments have self-organized into groups to try to reverse what they perceive as reckless changes to the face of their neighborhood and offer alternative proposals to the privatized Ente EUR, EUR SpA. The expertise of the members of these groups, which consist of retired professionals, is unique to EUR, which itself has a higher than average proportion of college-educated people compared to the rest of Rome. This debate begs the question: is Eur a desirable neighborhood for residents today? And, how much do residential interests matter if Eur’s mission has been as a cultural, governmental center for Rome?
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## I. Statistical Analysis

### Figure A1: STATA T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Street Furniture</th>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Green Areas of Neighborhood</th>
<th>Green Historical and Archaeological Area</th>
<th>Large Urban Parks</th>
<th>Special Green Areas</th>
<th>Protected Areas</th>
<th>Total Non-Farm Green Areas</th>
<th>Area of Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>205.048</td>
<td>126.192</td>
<td>97.827</td>
<td>795.512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190.300</td>
<td>134.258</td>
<td>5.522</td>
<td>14,509.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>206.430</td>
<td>107.686</td>
<td>105.126</td>
<td>2,463.446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155.480</td>
<td>253.826</td>
<td>3,560.975</td>
<td>13,724.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>167.622</td>
<td>45.500</td>
<td>31.403</td>
<td>145.607</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>198.600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2,145.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>96.932</td>
<td>66.261</td>
<td>62.762</td>
<td>38.481</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.481</td>
<td>96,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>128.038</td>
<td>102.267</td>
<td>1,072.557</td>
<td>1,355.132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,235.132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,737.188</td>
<td>48,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>115.838</td>
<td>69.969</td>
<td>108.767</td>
<td>358.480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>406.547</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,565.786</td>
<td>4,065.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>127.188</td>
<td>33.186</td>
<td>92.824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>587.575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,699.786</td>
<td>19,439.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>191.272</td>
<td>67.866</td>
<td>141.372</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,209.639</td>
<td>131,878.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.822</td>
<td>34.574</td>
<td>112.433</td>
<td>106.858</td>
<td>300.213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,404.930</td>
<td>8,108.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>175.861</td>
<td>103.977</td>
<td>452.622</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>355.795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,146.730</td>
<td>4,756.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>204.991</td>
<td>151.304</td>
<td>702.972</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>653.350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,429.901</td>
<td>47,145.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>283.064</td>
<td>159.000</td>
<td>1,677.684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,726.600</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>62,550.706</td>
<td>46,411.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>173.743</td>
<td>172.510</td>
<td>917.488</td>
<td>26.700</td>
<td>11,000.000</td>
<td>199.886</td>
<td>133,333.333</td>
<td>133,784.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.296</td>
<td>42.609</td>
<td>265.105</td>
<td>55.548</td>
<td>636.888</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,795.406</td>
<td>31,772.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.788</td>
<td>43.262</td>
<td>77.123</td>
<td>1,807.174</td>
<td>351.549</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>30,272.050</td>
<td>75,072.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.914</td>
<td>33.641</td>
<td>17.104</td>
<td>96.772</td>
<td>273.650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,645.720</td>
<td>5,795.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49.362</td>
<td>16.747</td>
<td>210.545</td>
<td>88.952</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,524.420</td>
<td>5,381.604</td>
<td>66,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.553</td>
<td>12.370</td>
<td>285.175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.138.705</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,060.454</td>
<td>131,528.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.254</td>
<td>12.458</td>
<td>143.418</td>
<td>37.900</td>
<td>1,380.795</td>
<td>7.400</td>
<td>16,189.795</td>
<td>193,305.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure A2: Green Spaces Nominal

### Figure A3: Green Spaces Percentages
III. Geographic Information Systems: Spatial Analysis of Eur

Figure A14: High School Graduates

Figure A15: College Graduates
Figure A16: Resident Age: 15-24

Figure A17: Resident Age: 25-34
Figure A18: Resident Age: 65 and older

EUR-Europa: Percentage of Residents Over 65 Years Old

Legend:
Percentage
0.00
0.01 - 13.00
13.01 - 24.47
24.48 - 27.70
27.71 - 35.38

Figure A19: Household Size: 2 Person

EUR-Europa: Percentage of Two-Person Households

Legend:
Percentage
0.00
0.01 - 6.34
6.35 - 12.32
12.33 - 14.89
14.90 - 18.46
Figure A20: Household Size: 3/4 Person

Figure A21: Household Size: 5 or more
IV. Lynch Maps

Lynch Map by Team Member: Hannah Brockhaus
5 March 2013

Lynch Map by Team Member: Wanpaga Chutatape
5 March 2013
Lynch Map by Team Member: Vernice Arahan
5 March 2013

Lynch Map by Team Member: Elliot Sperling
5 March 2013
Lynch Map by elderly men along Viale Europa
7 March 2013

Lynch Map by High Schoolers (boys and girls, around age 16)
7 March 2013
Lynch Map by young women studying Architecture at RomaTre
7 March 2013

Lynch Map by women who work in Eur (on V.le Ludwig von Beethoven)
7 March 2013
**Stakeholder Interviews**

**President, Eur Merchants’ Association**

We spoke with Mr. Massimo Cinti on the morning of February 7, 2013. The interview was focused on his experiences as a shop owner and resident of Eur.

Mr. Cinti owns a wine shop, and was quick to say that when his father had owned it, it was a bulk wine and oil shop. This process of specialization has occurred throughout Viale Europa- originally there was a whole range of shops including food shops, a butcher, hardware store, and a range of retail and clothing. These family shops closed when big supermarkets came in, and in the last ten years 52 shopping malls have been opened within the city of Rome. There are no longer neighborhood shops which cater to all needs, because politicians choose investment based upon voting alliances, etc.

At this point, there is a lack of evening activities in Eur- there is no theater or cinema, and very few restaurants. Also, he says that housing used to be significantly more residential, but now the apartment spaces are at least half occupied as commercial spaces. Now, the Congress Hall will be opening, and the aquarium is under construction as well now. There is also a growing effort to develop evening activities. He brought up the fact that 16 km tunnels were built for military reasons by Mussolini, and that the mausoleum of Mussolini is around. There are a lot of older residents, and this is one visual sense of the difference between Monday through Friday walkers and weekend strollers. There is a movement against densification in Eur, but he likes it because of his commercial interests.*

Mr. Cinti was able to point out a couple of positives about the neighborhood, such as a lumination that happens at Natale. However, there are bad relations with the municipio, because according to him, they have no interest in the neighborhood. This is compared to Eur SpA, which is connected to the Ministry of Economy, and a public/private organization devoted to the development of Eur. There is currently changing leadership of Eur SpA and questions of transparency. Plans to increase commerce in Eur include the Fuksas Congress Hall, aquarium, Renzo Piano Towers. There has never been a market within the neighborhood. However, in this economy, people are not spending: they recognize that politics is a mess and economics are uncertain. When we brought up questions of minority groups, he said the Filipina immigrants are well respected.

**Architect Francesco Innamoratti**

We met with Architect Innamoratti Thursday, February 14th. Our interview with him was centered on design and development of Eur.

Architect Innamoratti, who has spent years researching Eur development, gave us three stages of this. The first stage of development was the monumental stage. The exhibition, planned for 1942, was supposed to be a trigger for the development of a new sector of Rome. Particularly, the goal was to create something permanent from the temporary use. The plan was to connect the historical center with the city, to create an axis of development towards the south. This implementation happened between 1924 and 1942. Città di fondazione created units of control for the whole area.

The Master Plan of 1931 was not just constitutional, but a legal program of territorial planning. It imposed rules for the development of Eur, the first establishment of “urbanistic law” for design and land use. The PRG chose its location at the border of the area, which changed expropriation law. The problem was that all the land was owned by a small collection of important families of Rome. Between 1942 and the 1960s specific laws were created for this. 20 years after the 1922 Mussolini March on Rome, Eur was to be created as a magnificent symbolism of fascism. This was important down to the day the exhibition was to begin: April 21st. The design was to mimic ancient Rome. Streets were laid out along a cardus and several decumani. Buildings were placed according to specific patterns. This accounts for the placement
of Piazza Imperiale, Lake, Palazzo for Agricultural and Beautification, Basilica, Archive Museum. A grand arch was to be built out of aluminum as an entrance into Eur. The top of the arch was to be a restaurant connected to the ground by a system by cable cars. This is an example of how extravagant everything was to be. Examples of these structures include Palace of Water and Light, and a Pavilion.

The second phase of development was the post war phase and included what actually happened in the development of Eur. World War Two caused abandonment of the project. This was chaotic: people and even Roman construction companies stole building materials. It became a political turning point: either demolish the building or reconstruct what was left. To demolish would have caused serious monetary damage to the state. So, in 1951 a new state institution was created (by the state) to buy the property from the government. It was called Ente Eur. This institution became the territorial authority, and commissioner for control of Eur. Its charge was to develop the neighborhood. The president of the authority was named Vigilio Testo, who had a vision for the place. He created project financing before the fact. He sold the area to private developers to have money to finance what had already been constructed. He created a program to dislocate government ministries into Eur. There was to be a piazza created for non permanent buildings. This would harken back to the original mission of Eur and serve as a fairgrounds.

A subsection of this phase is the time period from 1960 to today. The 1960 Olympics had a special connection to Eur, because specific buildings of the neighborhood were created for that purpose. Some of its former green areas were converted into stadiums, such as Palazzo della Sport, Olympic Velodromo, and Piscina Roa. The Velodromo was demolished in 2009 and was politically dangerous. Also the building was not antifascist.

During the 1960s and ’70s a lot of development of other ministries occurred, as well as the construction of the majority of the neighborhood. The northern portion became densely residential, and the South was dominated by one or two story villini. Arch. Innamoratti described this area South of the lake as a take on a Roman “Garden City.” The Eur-Europa section was mostly developed between 1950 and ’60. 1970 to present has been a consolidation of all private development, most-
not invest in Eur. It is perceived as far away, however as a town it is new and different. He suggests there is a booming young business/entrepreneurial culture, with bars, clubs, and restaurants beginning to open up. The majority of jobs are private versus state employees (through the ministries). There are currently 171,000 people living in Eur, but with the new complexes this will jump to 380,000. There are events happening in Eur, and he argues that it is becoming more like Testaccio or San Lorenzo. For example, there is an electronic fest, and a book fair.

Massimo Alluli, Cittalia researcher

Massimo Allulli is a researcher of Cittalia (a research office for the national center on municipalities), who had studied the towers of Eur. Through his research, he has interacted with all the other projects in the area, though his study was completed approximately two years ago. His research focused on citizen organization in the neighborhood. We talked to him on March 14, 2013.

Citizen groups have arisen out of problems with the Fuksas “Cloud,” the aquarium, and the demolition of the Velodromo. There is conflict between these grandiose projects and the services needed by citizens. The most intense of these has been the protests against the demolition of the Velodromo and the densification within Eur. Although the Velodromo did have toxic material, they argued that Rome does not need more houses, but more services. Another project has been the former mayor’s push for a Formula1 Racetrack in the neighborhood, which would support the construction of new houses and streets.

He said that the government is trying to destroy the towers and their support is purely for these large projects. However, there has been no support however for local neighborhood projects -- improving mobility, public transport, service, etc. Massimo was clear that these projects were formulated under leftist government, and also there is a high level of connection between public and private interests in Eur.

M. Allulli has been the first person we have talked to who pointed out that recently the city has redefined municipality borders, so what used to be the 12th municipality is now the 9th. This was based on consolidation of some municipalities. One theme that he brought out was the several systems of categorizing neighborhoods within the city. People do not identify themselves by their district, because they are so large and encompass so many neighborhoods. These government districts do not necessarily align with neighborhood boundaries.

Within Eur, there are big transformation processes going on. People within the area do not only protest, but also have ideas. These activists are linked with experts to help create counter-proposals. Their proposals are different because they are unlike mayor and politicians who have links with strong economic interest—there is heavy interest in the mixing of public and private affairs.

In 2002, the area including the towers was sold and ministry of economy was moved. This marked the end of work on towers. First, these were thought to make hotels, then private condominiums. Fintecnca was the real estate company recruited, which is mostly run by the state. Lamaro, owner of Fintecnca, and Mr. Totti created another half public/private company: Alfiere. Through this, they were able to pay Renzo Piano with new buildings and luxury apartments.

However, more densification would mean more traffic. The towers were classified as cultural good and historic, in order to get funding for this development. This is similar to the other area projects, which do not exist in the master plan. This has been accommodated through a national law from the 1990s called Accordo di Programma, which allows for local governments to modify master plans. They can invent stories to prove public interest in a project. Many objects all along Cristoforo Colombo are a result of these “fake” public projects. This was highly skewed, though: there was a regulation on citizen participation—assemblies could be made but work would go on as usual (political moves). A totally different project was created and proposed--office/service space for the regional government and/or have hotel. The citizens proposed that companies have to pay taxes for planning services to accommodate growth. They think that local government gives present of 28 million Euros to private companies by not making them pay taxes. They worked to find solution for traffic density. Giorgio Buso, a former engineer for Eur Spa also part of group who were trying to come up with alternative proposals. One idea was to make a subway/tunnel from lake to piazza agricoltura. For all of these proposals there was no real acceptance from local government. The towers now remain, half demolished. Citizens have made alliances with local
district politicians. But even the district has played in favor of the projects. This is related to the fact that Eur Spa is mainly private now. According to Allulli, the organization doesn’t seem to mind if it is not in its property. This means that citizens are the only ones really invested.

We asked about the people who are involved in this citizen organization. He said the people involved are citizens who are active are people with a lot of time -- retired, women who don’t work but also experts who live in the area but do not necessarily work in the area.

One of their ideas was the Corridor di Mobilita -- Mobility Corridor. It was to be a peripheral street for cars with a public transportation - a BRT lane. This was also suggested to be put in the last masterplan of Rome but this never happened. In general, good ideas by the residents are not being realized. Rather, plan is changing to accommodate other projects. Transit, services, and schools are what is really wanted.

These committees of the area don’t have official places. Projects are on and off -- as financial crisis has hit the city, country and world. This is partially because projects are becoming more and more expensive. On the project front, the Cloud is still being kept while the towers are not being touched.

Eur mirrors the idea of perfect city. Most of Eur is actually built after fascism, but it contains idea of Mussolini. The planning law of area and city is still fascist law. Reform was then created to implement planning fee. Entrepreneurs now pay for services. Overall, Eur is a unique case in Rome. The citizens hold government accountable. When there is conflict over this, many times, citizens win. -- example, administrative tribunal (even though this process is slow). Citizens are not always provoked to protest.

Mrs. Lattanzi, Comitato Salute Ambiente

Members of the research group met with Mrs. Lattanzi, representative of the Comitato Salute Ambiente Eur on the 28th of March, 2013, at 10:30am, at the Giolitti Cafe, one of the most well known cafes of Eur. She gave a history of Eur from the residents’ point of view.

History of EUR

Eur used to be a private piece of property in the countryside. Mussolini bought the land and built the land for the exposition of 1942. The land needed a lot of improvements because property was not well maintained, for example the lakes used to be polluted and stagnant. Mussolini built monumental buildings to showcase the power of the Fascist government, and the style was neo-classical and monumental. Cristoforo Colombo was named Via Imperiale then. There was an interruption in building because of World War Two. After the war, Italy became a democratic state, and the government was scared of Eur because its fascist origins reminded them of fascist ideas, so they had the problem of deciding what to do with it.

The new role of Eur & the formation of Ente EUR

People came to Rome and Rome expanded to the sea; Eur was in-between so the municipality gave new administrative status to the neighborhood. The Olympic games of 1960 gave Eur its new role. Existing public buildings were used for the games, and new ones were also built. Ente EUR, a public organization in charge of shaping the neighborhood, was formed. It was in charge of controlling the building quality of new buildings in Eur, which can be classified into three main types: 1) residential, not luxury but more bourgeois; 2) tertiary, administrative buildings, and 3) Olympic buildings.

Residential buildings of the 1960s and 70s were not really luxury buildings; they were built by cooperatives. Tertiary buildings were designed with 60s trends, e.g. glass windows, and the most important buildings built for Olympics were the lake, Palasport, the Velodrome, the swimming pool, and the tennis courts. Attention was also given to the design of green spaces, so in Eur there was a high presence of green spaces that are well maintained. The 1960s and 70s were the best years for the neighborhood. Many people came to Eur to find a new style of living, as they could live in their own villas and there were plenty of green spaces in the neighborhood.

Ente EUR was strict in the control of who was building and what they were building. There was also quality control in design and construction. When Ente EUR sold land, it still controlled these things. Mrs. Lattanzi showed the researchers a historical piece of document specifying laws that say that when you buy land, you also have the right to control the property of your neighbor. The document also controls private gardens inside of building complex.
Difference of Eur compared to other neighborhoods

There was speculative growth in other parts of Rome. You could buy your own house but you wouldn't have streets maintained by the municipality, nor schools. In Eur the municipality takes care of neighborhood and maintains public spaces. You need to pay an extra fee for those services, like if you live in a big building, you would need to pay for the cleaning of common spaces. She thinks Eur can be used as a model of urban planning in Italy. Other neighborhoods have bad architectural quality: they lack urban facilities and public transport such as sidewalks and electricity; also the builder buys bad land and builds poor quality of buildings. Residents pay a little more in Eur but have a better quality of life, so Eur was a happy island in the urban disaster that surrounds it.

The privatization of Ente EUR

Ente EUR owned many high-value plots of land, which became attractive to private investors. Examples of these are the plots where the velodrome, tennis courts, parks and small theme park were situated. At the end of the 90’s, Ente EUR became a private company called Eur SpA. The property under its control remained public, but the procedure of building it was privatized. In that year, residents started organizing and forming a group because they knew the positive aspects of living in Eur under a public administration and they were afraid of this new private management.

When Eur was under a public administration, the concilio was a spontaneous organization created by Eur residents. With this concilio, they could talk to Ente EUR and bring proposals to them. However, when the privatization happened, the concilio tried to bring suggestions to them. The residents tried to stop the privatization of Eur because they knew the most important thing of Eur was the unified management of the three types of properties by the public administration.

In the process of privatization, streets and public spaces that were the property of Ente EUR fell under the municipality of Rome. Rome municipality became the part owner of these properties. In 1933, the municipality of Rome decided to build a congress center, and the design contract was given to Fuksas. She thinks that the place is too small, that it should be in another space big enough to accommodate hotels and other facilities.

Conflicts between Eur SpA and the Concilio

The velodrome was not used for 20 years and was in a bad condition. Ente EUR decided to use it in another way. It wanted to build bars, restaurants, and nightlife facilities in these kinds of unused empty spaces. The issue was to give new value to these spaces, but Ente EUR and the residents defined this “new value” differently. Ente EUR wanted to build new buildings, while the residents wanted new services not in a speculative way. They focused on the quality of life. She says that the most important value of Eur was the connection of urban facilities (the three types of buildings defined earlier), and trying to modify this, such as by putting buildings in green spaces would destroy the fabric of Eur. It would make it less valuable.

In 2004, the minister stressed the importance of the monumental buildings in Eur and likens them to those in the center of Rome. There was a desire to maintain views of the landscape, for example, the view of the Colosseus building from Christoforo Colombo, but the skyscrapers that were built destroyed this view. When Ente EUR was privatized, its mission was to give value to the property. It became a real estate company, and its meaning of giving value was to give economic value to the area. It used money and properties to construct new buildings not only in Eur but also in other areas. It used money to build the congress center, and not to maintain green spaces, so its mission was changed from the original goals.

In 2005, the concilio was still in action, but political parties became part of that concilio (comitato di quartiere). With the comitato salute e ambiente, there was no political connection. Its mission was to maintain the quality of living in Eur and the environment, as indicated by its name. Its tagline was to “maintain your neighborhood with the same care and love as with your home”: They fight for the maintenance of green spaces in Eur as they are now.

One of the most important changes now being fought by the comitato is the construction of an aquarium and its parking space and the consequential modifications it is making to the face of the lake and park. First recommended in the 1990’s, the aquarium was initially
rejected by Ente EUR, as the Teatro Verde (the former name given to the specific plot of land where the aquarium was planned to be built) was their property and did not necessarily want a private project to suddenly change its face. However, as described by Mrs. Lattanzi, towards the end of preparation, the last master plan of Rome totally contradicted this decision and allowed this specific area to be changed. Now, the shape of the lake is vastly modified, retaining almost none of the original green space of the Teatro Verde. Additionally, the quality of the lake water is now expected to change as the water, which formerly used to service only the parks, will be used not only for the aquarium but also for the cooling and heating of the Fuksas buildings. Seeing this as a clear transgression on the maintenance of Eur, the comitato has spent a number of years protesting the aquarium but to no avail.

The Various Role of EUR Inhabitants

In the view of Mrs. Lattanzi, within Eur, there are three types of inhabitants. The first type consists of people who complain about the new projects that are changing the face of neighborhood, but do not do much more than complain or acknowledge the changes. The second group are those who are contributing to the changing face of the neighborhood by changing the flats they own in the area from residential apartments into tertiary office spaces, which, while illegal, is gradually occurring throughout the neighborhood. The last and smallest group are those who are still actively fighting the transformation of the neighborhood, most making up the various comitatos of Eur.

The Major Issues of EUR

Due to car traffic increasing with the higher number of office spaces and lack of public transportation within the area, mobility has become a major issue for EUR. Several proposals have been made by the comitato but these have been repeatedly rejected or ignored. The master plan itself has presented three different solutions, all involving underground tunnels anywhere from two blocks long to the whole of Cristofo Colombo. Whatever form, these tunnels have still been identified as too expensive to even attempt and does not address the problems of the area.

The loss in quality of life with bad maintenance and management
not privately, which gives it more legitimacy. However, when persistent, they did acknowledge the prostitutes. They were less in favor of the architectural divide in the city, which they linked to politics. The men said it needs order. They described the new buildings such as the Fuksas Congress Hall as communist, and felt that these buildings do not fit with the neighborhood, going as far as to say that these buildings violate the fascist character of the neighborhood. They are, however, in favor of the aquarium design.

These men also described Eur as not a real neighborhood: there is no market, for example. There is significant conflict over development in the neighborhood, on both sides. These men discussed a Formula 1 racecar track that was planned for the neighborhood (but did not come to fruition): they said it would have brought high end tourism, which would have benefitted Eur. They also did not seem to be pleased with oversight in the district: according to them, SpA does not do much, but the Municipio doesn’t really either. Overall, Eur has good design, but bad material repair. They referenced Luna Park, an old amusement park which went bankrupt. Although it was once popular, all that stands now is the ferris wheel from Christoforo Colombo. They also discussed an old bicycle track which is being torn down, they are in favor of building luxury apartments there. In contrast to many other interviewees, the men do not like the Laghetto; they said it was where the immigrants hang out. Near the end, they mentioned Romolo Vasi-li, who was a real estate owner and strong fascist hero.

Later in the afternoon, the team approached a group of women in their mid 30s-40 that work along Viale Ludwig von Beethoven. One woman stayed to talk, although she admitted she did not know much about the neighborhood. The Laghetto is very important to her understanding of the neighborhood, and she described it as a definite positive aspect of Eur. She said that there is little space and the neighborhood is very dense, and agreed that she contributed to this: she commutes to Eur for work but leaves as soon as work ends. She noted that people that work in Eur do not know the people that live in the neighborhood. According to her, Eur is known for its business and shopping (admittedly for a segment of the population), and one of the largest and most well known employers is Poste Italiane. She would like to increase the parking availability.

On Thursday, February 14th researchers explored the other side of Colombo, outside of our specific section of Eur. Crossing Christoforo Colombo is very dangerous, and there is an immediate change in the atmosphere. Walking by the Renzo Piano towers, where construction is still halted, the next stop on the metro line is below an immigrant market, and a large Filipina community is selling and eating street food and hanging out in the park. The first person interviewed was in his late twenties, and listening to music and eating before he was stopped. He confirmed that this gathering happens Thursdays and Sundays because of work schedules (Thursdays are half days and Sundays are off.) People get there as early as 1pm and may stay as late as 11pm, or whenever the last Metro comes. In fact, there are more people at night (after 6pm). They felt safe, because it is a public park. This young man had been in Rome for a year, and was currently without work.

The group then moved to a group of slightly older men. They described the people that gather here as coming from all over the city, as far as north of Piramide. This may be part of the reason why there was a lack of people who specifically work in our study area, at least in terms of those interviewed. Even though most of them don’t even work in Eur, they are used to coming, and everyone here is considered family, like “cousins.” There is clearly a strong sense of community in this area.
## V. Typology Tables

### Street Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Commercial Street</th>
<th>Avenue</th>
<th>Institutional Street</th>
<th>Residential Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Boulevard Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Commercial Street Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Avenue Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Institutional Street Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Residential Street Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium to high car traffic</td>
<td>Wide sidewalks with street trees but less sidewalk embellishments such as grass patches. Cobblestone sidewalks Occasional planters, may have pedestrian benches High car and pedestrian traffic</td>
<td>Low volume car traffic Two lanes Parking both sides of street- low levels of informal parking Wide cobblestone material sidewalks</td>
<td>Little to no sidewalks, made of asphalt No landscaping Medium volume car and pedestrian traffic High levels of informal and formal parking</td>
<td>Single species street trees on both sides of the street Streets and sidewalks shaded Sidewalk embellishments including benches and bicycle racks are usually present. Width and material of sidewalk is dependent on traffic flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple divided lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking both sides of street- low levels of informal parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of informal parking</td>
<td>Street trees (single species) Wide or narrow sidewalks depending on land use of buildings Asphalt sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide or narrow sidewalks depending on land use of buildings Asphalt sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Building Typology

| Hybrid Block | • Combination of two or more building types  
|             | • In EUR’s context, the hybrid is a multistory tower attached to a one- or two-story base  
|             | • Base usually forms a continuous facade connecting two or more towers  
|             | • No separation between entrances of base and sidewalk, allowing the ground floor to be used as a commercial space |
| Slab Building | • Flat building with a controlled depth  
|              | • Units arranged along a corridor with single or multiple cores depending on the building length  
|              | • Often greater than four stories in height |
| Palazzine | • Multi-story (3,4,5,6,9)  
|           | • Multiple units per floor  
|           | • Freestanding building with balconies and roof terraces  
|           | • May be aligned or set back from sidewalk with grilled walls along the perimeter providing some security and privacy for the ground floor apartments |

Photos Taken by Hannah Brockhaus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>The utilization of single or multi-family housing on a property, which may or may not be also above commercial shops or offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Office</td>
<td>The utilization of offices whether it is within a residential building, above commercial shops, or an entirely separate use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Shop</td>
<td>A business that is open to the public and is accessible from the street. It may be part of another building or below residential or offices spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Infrastructure</td>
<td>A building dedicated to public services (e.g. post office, fire department, police department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>A building or part of a building that is dedicated to schooling or advanced education, whether public or private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>A religiously institutional building that is recognized as a place of worship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Street and Building Surveys

CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher: Veronica Avahan  Street Segment: Ficca 1
Date: 3/14/16  Time In: 2:48 PM  Time Out: 2:57 PM
Weather Conditions: Sunny ~ 10°C

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
- Sidewalks
  - On Both Sides of Street?
  - Trees or Shrubbery Present?
  - Street Furniture Present?
  - Width of Sidewalk(s)
  - Comments:

Street/ Sidewalk State
- Condition
- Repair Material Used
- Comments:

Building and Land Use

Typology:
- Religious

Address

Comments: Church is surrounded by steps/stairs, open as a public space.

Number of Units

Number of Floors

Upper Floor Use

Comments:

Ground Floor Use

Comments:

Age/Ancient Architectural History
- 20's - 30's - 40's - 50's - 60's
- 70's - 80's - 90's - 00's - 10's

Surface Decoration

State of Repair/Condition

Indication of Vacancy

Vacancy

Presence of Shared Spaces

Construction?

Comments: Public space so fully shared space; could be combination of government and Roman Catholic church development; consider history of all of EUR.
CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

- Presence on Street: □ One Side □ Two Sides □ No Sides
- Street Cover/Shade: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Maintenance: □ Low □ Medium □ High □ N/A
- Comments: Shade coming from buildings on other side

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces: N/A

- Presence of Furniture: □ Yes □ No
- Density/Presence of People: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Pedestrian Traffic: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Maintenance: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Comments:

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- Number of Establishments: 1
- Types of Establishments: □ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School
- (Specify in Comments): □ Government □ Other
- Comments: School for primary/secondary students

Other Material

- Presence of Publicity: □ Yes □ No
- Type of Publicity: □ Flyers □ Tarp □ Painting □ Other
- Presence of Decor: □ Yes □ No
- Decor Quality: □ Traditional □ Modern
- Amount of Decor: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Comments: Amount of decor very low - plants if that.

Stickers predominate on electrical panels/poles.
CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher: Veronica Amboim Street Segment: Viale America 2
Date: 3/14/13 Time In: 10:30 Time Out: 12:04 (walked other streets)
Weather Conditions: Sunny ~ 10°C

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction  □ One Way  □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3
Dividing Barriers Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Comments: Three lanes - with street for shops, street is used for parking for shoppers. Dividing barriers between two lanes and shop street is combination sidewalk and greenpace. Parking integrated into division, seems like main road.

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street?  □ Yes  □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Street Furniture Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s)  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3 meters "park"
Comments: Unit of choice is passionate; trees present include variety of umbrella pines and other (9) trees. Most along road, still have leaves. Sidewalks is both cobblestone and asphalt - mostly asphalt.

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition  □ Poor  □ Fair  □ Good
Repair Material Used  □ New  □ Original
Comments: Asphalt is used; Asphalt is used to cover asphalt. Cobblestone parts by entrance of street to park is fair but in need to grooming; weeds, etc. are getting stuck in choices.

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

Presence on Street  □ One Side  □ Two Sides
Street Cover/Shade  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Maintenance  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Comments: Trees predominantly over street to shops. On main two lanes, no shade. Sidewalks have minimal coverage.

Plazas and Other Public Spaces

Presence of Furniture  □ Yes  □ No
Density/Presence of People  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Pedestrian Traffic  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Maintenance  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Comments: Park right next to street - metro stop close by. Lower number of people - may pickup during lunch time (noon 11:46)

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

Number of Establishments  □ 14
Types of Establishments  □ Bar/Restaurant  □ Business/Office  □ School
(Specify in Comments)  □ Government  □ Other
Comments: Bars/Restaurants dominate; Two clothing stores; Bank present. Most stores for lower level of apartment buildings immediately behind.

Other Material

Presence of Publicity  □ Yes  □ No
Type of Publicity  □ Flyer  □ Tarp  □ Painting  □ Other
Presence of Decor  □ Yes  □ No
Decor Quality  □ Traditional  □ Modern
Amount of Decor  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Comments: Publicity is very minimal; one pole with one flyer for concert. Door of buildings (apartments only) is minimal - retractable basically to plain doors or boarded walls.
**Quantitative and Qualitative Data**

**For Whole Street**

- **Street Type**
  - Street Direction: □ One Way  ☒ Two Ways
  - Number of Lanes: = 8
  - Dividing Barriers Present? □ Yes  ☒ No
  - Comments: Main road (can tell by width) intersects with Europa Street, fed into/fed by Europa. Has cobblestone border

- **Sidewalks**
  - On Both Sides of Street? □ Yes  ☒ No
  - Trees or Shrubbery Present? □ Yes  ☒ No
  - Street Furniture Present? □ Yes  ☒ No
  - Width of Sidewalk(s): = 118 units = 118 meters
  - Comments: Made of cobblestone, includes sidewalk for handicapped/blind person

- **Street/Sidewalk State**
  - Condition: □ Poor  ☒ Fair  ☒ Good
  - Repair Material Used: □ New  ☒ Original
  - Comments: Material doesn't seem to be in need of repair.
  - Mostly cleaning of litter, weeds and leaves

---

**Street Profile**

- Sidewalk (grass/trees)
- Cobblestones

---

**Street Layout**
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Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

Presence on Street
- One Side
- Two Sides

Street Cover/Shade
- Low
- Medium
- High

Maintenance
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments: Many trees lack shade this time of year. Trees in a lot of sun but still cold. Flowers contain small insects.

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

Presence of Furniture
- Yes
- No

Density/Presence of People
- Low
- Medium
- High

Pedestrian Traffic
- Low
- Medium
- High

Maintenance
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments: Adjacent to semi-formal market that is extension of bars or are small shops, next to Porta Italia.

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

Number of Establishments = 24 Establishments

Types of Establishments
- Bar/Restaurant
- Business/Office
- School

(Specify in Comments)
- Government
- Other

Comments: Mini-mart, economy; number of bars/restaurants, supermarkets, specialty stores - eye glasses, etc.

Other Material

Presence of Publicity
- Yes
- No

Type of Publicity
- Flyers
- Tarp
- Painting
- Other

Presence of Decor
- Yes
- No

Decor Quality
- Traditional
- Modern

Amount of Decor
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments: Publicity also includes stickers for ads. Decor is minimal - plants, hiding of vents or ac units.
Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street
Street Type
Street Direction: X One Way □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes =
Dividing Barriers Present? □ Yes X No
Comments: Street direction is going towards Viale America; Street almost same width or smaller than sidewalk. One of the feeder streets into Viale America.

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street? X Yes □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present? X Yes □ No
Street Furniture Present? X Yes □ No → Benches by gates
Width of Sidewalk(s) = 14 units = meters
Comments: Sidewalks used as motorcycle parking (informal); Also part of driveways into parking areas for apartment buildings. One side predominantly asphalt, other is cobblestone. Units are paces/strides

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition □ Poor X Fair □ Good
Repair Material Used □ New □ Original
Comments: Asphalt used over asphalt; cobblestone still seems like original.

Trees, Shrubs, and Green Spaces
Presence on Street □ One Side X Two Sides
Street Cover/Shade □ Low □ Medium X High
Maintenance □ Low X High □ Medium
Comments: Trees cover very well sidewalk — although creates cold zone for pedestrians so don’t stay for long.

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces
Presence of Furniture □ Yes X No → Benches
Density/Presence of People □ Low □ Medium □ High
Pedestrian Traffic □ Low □ Medium □ High
Maintenance □ Low □ Medium □ High
Comments: Sidewalks form almost public space as extension to apartment complex — wall between is important.

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices
Number of Establishments = 24 Establishments
Types of Establishments □ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School
(Specify in Comments) □ Government □ Other
Comments: Cucina, Studio Commerciale, Barberia, Metro, Specialist Car Repair. Corners have stores. Offices inside residential buildings.

Other Material
Presence of Publicity □ Yes □ No
Type of Publicity □ Flyers □ Tarp □ Painting □ Other (Plaques)
Presence of Decor □ Yes □ No
Decor Quality □ Traditional □ Modern
Amount of Decor □ Low □ Medium □ High
Comments: Street facade has minimal coverage/decor. Publicity is for office in buildings → not obvious publicity.
Street Profile

Street Layout

Trees

Bench

Cobblestone

CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
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Street Type

Street Direction: Two Ways
Number of Lanes: 2
Dividing Barriers Present?: No
Comments: Made of asphalt - although could include cobblestone as there is no separator between asphalt and cobblestone.

Sidewalks

On Both Sides of Street?: Yes
Trees or Shrubbery Present?: Yes
Street Furniture Present?: Yes

Paces = 1.5 feet

Units = paces/strides. Sidewalk is cobblestone with stone curb. Interjected with concrete/light glass panels to make openings by stones. Street furniture is metal/plastic composite benches, planters, planters/concrete boxes present.

Street/Sidewalk State

Condition: Fair
Repair Material Used: Original
Comments: Not in need of great repair/maintenance. Presence of small litter predominates.
Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

- Presence on Street: □ One Side  ☑ Two Sides
- Street Cover/Shade: ☑ Low  ☑ High
- Maintenance: ☑ Low  ☑ High
- Comments: Trees have lost leaves, no shade from shadows (thin). Maintenance is minimal with small litter collecting here and there.

Plazas and Other Public Spaces

- Presence of Furniture: ☑ Yes  □ No
- Density/Presence of People: □ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
- Pedestrian Traffic: □ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
- Maintenance: □ Low  ☑ Medium  □ High
- Comments: Question of restaurants as a collective → public?

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- Number of Establishments: = 24
- Types of Establishments: ☑ Bar/Restaurant  ☑ Business/Office  □ School
- (Specify in Comments): □ Government  □ Other
- Comments: Stores for clothing/jewelry/accessories dominate. Include international stores; street sellers also very common. McDonald's is fist in Rome.

Other Material

- Presence of Publicity: ☑ Yes  □ No
- Type of Publicity: □ Flyers  ☑ Tarp  □ Painting  ☑ Other
- Presence of Decor: ☑ Yes  □ No
- Decor Quality: □ Traditional  ☑ Modern
- Amount of Decor: □ Low  ☑ Medium  □ High
- Comments: Publicity on bus stop signs (political?) — posted on side of signs. Decor of residences very minimal; stores predominates with decor/flagging/boxes.
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Researcher: [Redacted]  
Street Segment: [Redacted]  
Date: [Redacted]  
Time In: [Redacted]  
Time Out: [Redacted]  
Weather Conditions: [Redacted]  

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Direction</td>
<td>□ One Way □ Two Ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>= [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividing Barriers Present?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sidewalks

| On Both Sides of Street? | □ Yes □ No |
| Trees or Shrubbery Present? | □ Yes □ No |
| Street Furniture Present? | □ Yes □ No |
| Width of Sidewalk(s) | = [Redacted] units = [Redacted] meters both sides |
| Comments: |  |

Street/Sidewalk State

| Condition | □ Poor □ Fair □ Good |
| Repair Material Used | □ New □ Original |
| Comments: |  |

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

| Presence on Street | □ One Side □ Two Sides |
| Street Cover/Shade | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Maintenance | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Comments: |  |

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

| Presence of Furniture | □ Yes □ No |
| Density/Presence of People | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Pedestrian Traffic | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Maintenance | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Comments: |  |

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

| Number of Establishments | = [Redacted] |
| Types of Establishments | □ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School |
| (Specify in Comments) | □ Government □ Other |
| Comments: |  |

Other Material

| Presence of Publicity | □ Yes □ No |
| Type of Publicity | □ Flyers □ Tarp □ Painting □ Other |
| Presence of Decor | □ Yes □ No |
| Decor Quality | □ Traditional □ Modern |
| Amount of Decor | □ Low □ Medium □ High |
| Comments: |  |
**Eur-Europa Neighborhood Study 74**

**Street Profile**

- National Institute of International Locomotion

**Street Layout**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative and Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Whole Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street Type**

- **Street Direction**: □ One Way
- **Number of Lanes**: 2
- **Dividing Barriers Present?**: □ Yes
- **Comments**: 

**Sidewalks**

- **On Both Sides of Street?**: □ Yes
- **Trees or Shrubbery Present?**: □ Yes
- **Street Furniture Present?**: □ Yes
- **Width of Sidewalk(s)**: 5 units = 30 meters
- **Comments**: 

**Street/Sidewalk State**

- **Condition**: □ Poor
- **Repair Material Used**: □ New
- **Comments**: 

---

CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013

Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher:      Street Segment:  
Date: 4/3/08 20  
Time In: 11:30  Time Out: 12:25  
Weather Conditions:  

---

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>□ One Side</th>
<th>□ Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>□ Yes</th>
<th>□ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>= 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>□ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>□ Government □ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>&quot;Residential, Bar, Restaurant, Business, Office, School&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>□ Yes</th>
<th>□ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>□ Flyers □ Tarp □ Painting □ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>□ Traditional □ Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>□ Low</td>
<td>□ Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quantitative and Qualitative Data

**For Whole Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th>Street Direction</th>
<th>One Way</th>
<th>Two Ways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dividing Barriers Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Street with 3 small stones did not seem walkable

**Sidewalks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Both Sides of Street?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees or Shrubbery Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Sidewalk(s)</td>
<td>5.72 units = 1.75 meters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Normal-sized sidewalk, and some amount of cracks with sidewalk path.
- Muddy path 5 present on left side sidewalk

**Street/Sidewalk State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair Material Used</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Some vegetation growing out of corner of sidewalk

### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Mostly green with some bare spots on north side of road

### Plazas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- No public plazas very small parking strip

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Non-commercial, completely public

### Other Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Some vegetation growing out of corner of sidewalk
**Street Profile**

![Street Profile Diagram]

**Street Layout**

![Street Layout Diagram]

---

**Quantitative and Qualitative Data**

**For Whole Street**

**Street Type**

- Street Direction: ☑ One Way
- Number of Lanes: \( \text{__} \)
- Dividing Barriers Present?: ☐ Yes
- Comments:

---

**Sidewalks**

- On Both Sides of Street?: ☑ Yes
- Trees or Shrubbery Present?: ☑ Yes
- Street Furniture Present?: ☐ Yes
- Width of Sidewalk(s): \( 5 \text{ feet} = 1.5 \text{ meters} \)
- Comments:

---

**Street/Sidewalk State**

- Condition: ☑ Poor
- Repair Material Used: ☑ New
- Comments:
**Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>More street lights on west side of street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Piazzas and Other Public Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Yarn rope hanging on one sidewalk gives the place a higher density of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices**

- Number of Establishments: 4
- Types of Establishments: Bar/Restaurant, Business/Office, School
- Comments: High density

**Other Material**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: political information by signs is a complex process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street Profile**

[Street profile diagram]

**Street Layout**

[Street layout diagram]
Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction  □ One Way  □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes  = 2
Dividing Barriers Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Comments:

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street?  □ Yes  □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Street Furniture Present?  □ Yes  □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s)  = 2 m
Comments:

Other Material
Presence of Publicity  □ Yes  □ No
Type of Publicity  □ Flyers  □ Tarp  □ Painting  □ Other
Presence of Decor  □ Yes  □ No
Decor Quality  □ Traditional  □ Modern
Amount of Decor  □ Low  □ Medium  □ High
Comments:
Street Profile

Residential

Street Layout

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction: □ One Way □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes: 2
Dividing Barriers Present?: □ Yes □ No
Comments: Pavement asphalt, pines on center divider, street
          O is two-way traffic, street is on
          decoration

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street?: □ Yes □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present?: □ Yes □ No
Street Furniture Present?: □ Yes □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s): 6.1 units = 2 meters + 3 m = 5 m
Comments: street in beginning of property has two sidewalks
          or be crumbling and straight

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition: □ Poor □ Fair □ Good
Repair Material Used: □ New □ Original
Comments: was a block of repair is on north side, but generally very good
### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- [ ] Extremely high maintenance of plants, mostly for edging in rear of road.

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- [ ] Presence of benches in center of road.

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>_____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- [ ] [Another comment]

### Other Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
## Quantitative and Qualitative Data

### For Whole Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Direction</td>
<td>One Way</td>
<td>Two Ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividing Barriers Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sidewalks

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Both Sides of Street?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees or Shrubbery Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Sidewalk(s)</td>
<td>1.5 units = 1.6 meters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Street/Sidewalk State

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Material Used</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence on Street</td>
<td>One Side</td>
<td>Two Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piazzas and Other Public Spaces</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Furniture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, &amp; Government Offices</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Establishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
<td>Business/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Material</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Publicity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

- Presence on Street: ☑ One Side  ☐ Two Sides
- Street Cover/Shade: ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
- Maintenance: ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
- Comments: Parking areas on the street, tree-lined street, people walking.

Plazas and Other Public Spaces

- Presence of Furniture: ☐ Yes  ☑ No
- Density/Presence of People: ☑ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
- Pedestrian Traffic: ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
- Maintenance: ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
- Comments: People at in the commercial area of street, relatively little movement.

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- Number of Establishments: ☑ 6 Establishments
- Types of Establishments: ☑ Bar/Restaurant  ☑ Business/Office  ☑ School
- (Specify in Comments): ☑ Government  ☐ Other
- Comments: Bar/Restaurant next to a small park, some trees, commercial area.

Other Material

- Presence of Publicity: ☑ Yes  ☐ No
- Type of Publicity: ☑ Flyers  ☐ Tarp  ☐ Painting  ☑ Other
- Presence of Decor: ☑ Yes  ☐ No
- Decor Quality: ☑ Traditional  ☑ Modern
- Amount of Decor: ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☑ High
- Comments:
Eur-Europa Neighborhood Study 85

CRP 4160; Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher: Hannah  Street Segment: 1022 A
Date: 2-14  Time In: 2:12  Time Out: 2:30
Weather Conditions: Sunny, around 10°?

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction  ☑ One Way  ☐ Two Ways
Number of Lanes  2
Dividing Barriers Present?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
Comments:

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
Street Furniture Present?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
Width of Sidewalk(s)  16 units  5 meters
Comments:

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition  ☑ Good  ☐ Fair  ☐ Poor
Repair Material Used  ☐ New  ☑ Original
Comments: Construction

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces
Presence on Street  ☑ One Side  ☐ Two Sides
Street Cover/Shade  ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
Maintenance  ☐ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
Comments:

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces
Presence of Furniture  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Density/Presence of People  ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☑ High
Pedestrian Traffic  ☑ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
Maintenance  ☑ Low  ☑ Medium  ☑ High
Comments:

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices
Number of Establishments  2
Types of Establishments  ☐ Bar/Restaurant  ☐ Business/Office  ☑ School
(Specify in Comments)  ☑ Government  ☐ Other
Comments:

Other Material
Presence of Publicity  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Type of Publicity  ☐ Flyers  ☐ Tarp  ☐ Painting  ☐ Other
Presence of Decor  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Decor Quality  ☐ Traditional  ☐ Modern
Amount of Decor  ☑ Low  ☐ Medium  ☑ High
Comments:  Formal style, minimal decoration
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Street Profile
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Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher: Hannah
Street Segment: EUF121+E2
Date: Time In: 12:30 Time Out: 1:24G
Weather Conditions:

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction □ One Way □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes —
Dividing Barriers Present? □ Yes □ No
Comments:

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street? □ Yes □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present? □ Yes □ No
Street Furniture Present? □ Yes □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s) — units = — meters
Comments:

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition □ Poor □ Fair □ Good
Repair Material Used □ New □ Original
Comments: across from school by park, construction, by hotel next cond. asphalt

5
### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>−</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>MIR Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction
One Way
Two Ways

Number of Lanes
4

Dividing Barriers Present?
Yes
No

Comments:

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street?
Yes
No

Trees or Shrubbery Present?
Yes
No

Street Furniture Present?
Yes
No

Width of Sidewalk(s)
10 units = 3 meters

Other Material
Presence of Publicity
Yes
No

Type of Publicity
Flyers
Tarp
Painting
Other

Presence of Decor
Yes
No

Decor Quality
Traditional
Modern

Amount of Decor
Low
Medium
High

Comments:

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces
Presence on Street
One Side
Two Sides

Street Cover/Shade
Low
Medium
High

Maintenance
Low
Medium
High

Comments:

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces
Presence of Furniture
Yes
No

Density/Presence of People
Low
Medium
High

Pedestrian Traffic
Low
Medium
High

Maintenance
Low
Medium
High

Comments:

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices
Number of Establishments
2

Types of Establishments
Bar/Restaurant
Business/Office
School

(Specify in Comments)
Government
Other

Comments:

CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)
### Trees, Shrubs, and Green Spaces

- **Presence on Street**: Two Sides
- **Street Cover/Shade**: Low/High
- **Maintenance**: Low/High
- **Comments**: Private street cover

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

- **Presence of Furniture**: Yes
- **Density/Presence of People**: Low
- **Pedestrian Traffic**: Low
- **Maintenance**: Low
- **Comments**: 

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- **Number of Establishments**: 3
- **Types of Establishments**: Bar/Restaurant, Business/Office, School
- **Comments**: 3 stories

### Other Material

- **Presence of Publicity**: Yes
- **Type of Publicity**: Flyers
- **Presence of Decor**: Yes
- **Decor Quality**: Traditional
- **Amount of Decor**: Low
- **Comments**: 

---

Street Profile

Street Layout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time In:</td>
<td>Time In:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Out:</td>
<td>Time Out:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Conditions:</td>
<td>Weather Conditions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quantitative and Qualitative Data

**For Whole Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th>Street Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Direction</td>
<td>□ One Way □ Two Ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividing Barriers Present?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: people speed low

**Sidewalks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Both Sides of Street?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees or Shrubbery Present?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture Present?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Sidewalk(s)</td>
<td>= units = meters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: pedestrian avg. 1.5 ft wide, high speed

### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ One Side □ Two Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street Cover/Shade:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density/Presence of People:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Decor</th>
<th>Presence of Decor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian Traffic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Low □ Medium □ High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

Corner:

Comments:

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

Number of Establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Establishments:

| Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School |

( Specify in Comments )

Comments: office avg. 1.5 ft wide, high speed

### Other Material

Presence of Publicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Publicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Decor</th>
<th>Presence of Decor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decor Quality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Decor</th>
<th>Amount of Decor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Low □ Medium □ High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Street Profile

Street Layout

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street
Street Type
- Street Direction: □ One Way □ Two Ways
- Number of Lanes: 2
- Dividing Barriers Present?: □ Yes □ No
- Comments: Concrete edge on either side (under parked cars)

Sidewalks
- On Both Sides of Street?: □ Yes □ No
- Treeshore Shrubbery Present?: □ Yes □ No
- Street Furniture Present?: □ Yes □ No
- Width of Sidewalk(s): □ X units □ X meters
- Comments: Sparse shrubbery, couple bollards 24.15 feet

Street/Sidewalk State
- Condition: □ Poor □ Fair □ Good
- Repair Material Used: □ New □ Original
- Comments: Asphalt
### Trees, Shrubs, and Green Spaces

- Presence on Street: □ One Side □ Two Sides
- Street Cover/Shade: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Maintenance: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Comments: 4-5 trees, ferns, high mostly deciduous

### Parks and Other Public Spaces

- Presence of Furniture: □ Yes □ No
- Density/Presence of People: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Pedestrian Traffic: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Maintenance: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Comments:

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- Number of Establishments: 10
- Types of Establishments: □ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School
- (Specify in Comments): □ Government □ Other
- Comments: Clothing, Sweet Baby

### Other Material

- Presence of Publicity: □ Yes □ No
- Type of Publicity: □ Flyers □ Tarp □ Painting □ Other
- Presence of Decor: □ Yes □ No
- Decor Quality: □ Traditional □ Modern
- Amount of Decor: □ Low □ Medium □ High
- Comments:

---

*This section should be for an store?*
CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td>Phone # (if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Floors</td>
<td>Gated □ Cameras □ Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>□ Store/Business □ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Floors</td>
<td>□ Residential □ Office Space □ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/Architectural History</td>
<td>Ground Floor Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>□ Residential □ Office Space □ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Repair/Condition</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indication of Vacancy</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Shared Spaces</td>
<td>Number of Floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction?</td>
<td>Ground Floor Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Quantitative and Qualitative Data

#### For Each Establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone # (if available)</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>□ Government □ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Sample Price/Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics:</td>
<td>□ Toddlers/Children (0-8) □ Preteens (9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Teens (13-17) □ Young Adults (18-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Adults (Early 30’s-60’s) □ Elderly (60’s-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Each Building

Building Type
(45% 24% 100%)

Address

Phone # (if available)

Street Frontage
□ Gated □ Cameras □ Parking
□ Store/Business □ Other

Comments:

Number of Units = __________ units
Number of Floors = __________ floors
Upper Floor Use
□ Residential □ Office Space □ Other
Comments:

Ground Floor Use
□ Residential □ Office Space □ Other
Comments:

Age/Architectural History
□ 20's □ 30's □ 40's □ 50's □ 60's
□ 70's □ 80's □ 90's □ 100's □ 10's

Surface Decoration

State of Repair/Condition
□ Poor □ Fair □ Good

Indication of Vacancy
□ Yes □ No

Vacancy = __________ # of units available / __________ # of all units

Presence of Shared Spaces
Inside: □ Yes □ No ; Outside □ Yes □ No

Construction?
□ Self Built □ Public Development
□ Private Development □ Other

Comments:

Establishment Typology
black dello a cafe

Address

Phone # (if available)

Types of Establishments
□ Bar/Restaurant □ Business/Office □ School
(Specify in Comments)
□ Government □ Other

Size = _______ units = _______ meters

Sample Price/Quality

Demographics:
□ Toddlers/Children (0-8) □ Preteens (9-12)
□ Teens (13-17) □ Young Adults (18-26)
□ Adults (Early 30's-60's) □ Elderly (60's-Onward)

Comments:
Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Each Establishment

Establishment Typology

Address  

Phone # (if available)  

Types of Establishments
☐ Bar/Restaurant  ☐ Business/Office  ☐ School

(Specify in Comments)

Size  

Sample Price/Quality

Demographics:

Comments:

Number of Units  

Number of Floors  

Upper Floor Use  

Comments:

Ground Floor Use  

Comments:

Age/Architectural History  

☐ 20's  ☐ 30's  ☐ 40's  ☐ 50's  ☐ 60's

Surface Decoration  

☐ 70's  ☐ 80's  ☐ 90's  ☐ 00's  ☐ 10's

State of Repair/Condition  

☐ Poor  ☐ Fair  ☐ Good

Indication of Vacancy  

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Vacancy  

# of units available / # of all units

Presence of Shared Spaces  

Inside: ☐ Yes  ☐ No; Outside: ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Construction?

☐ Self Built  ☐ Public Development  ☐ Private Development  ☐ Other

Comments:
**Quantitative and Qualitative Data**

*For Whole Street*

- **Type**: [ ] Pedestrians [ ] Cars [ ] Motorcycles [ ] Trucks
- **Intensity**: [ ] Light [ ] Medium [ ] High
- **Flow**: [ ] Cars Per 10 Minutes x 6 = [ ] Cars Per Hour
- **Comments:**

---

**Sidewalks**

- **On Both Sides of Street?**: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **Trees or Shrubbery Present?**: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **Street Furniture Present?**: Yes [ ] No
- **Width of Sidewalk(s)**:
  - [ ] __29__ units
  - [ ] __15__ meters
- **Comments:**

---

**Noise/Sound**

- **Level**: [ ] Low [ ] Medium [ ] High
- **Decibel Count**: [ ] (only if available)
- **Sound Source(s)**:
- **Comments:**

---

**Traffic**

- **Date**: 2/14
- **Time In**: 2:37
- **Time Out**: [ ]
- **Weather Conditions**: [ ] Sunny

---

**Vehicle Parking**

- **Car Parking Present?**: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **Car Parking Condition**: [ ] Formal [ ] Informal
- **Car Parking Ratio**: [ ] # of Spots Filled [ ] # of Spots Available
- **Motorcycle Parking Present?**: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **Motorcycle Parking Condition**: [ ] Formal [ ] Informal
- **Motorcycle Parking Ratio**: [ ] # of Spots Filled [ ] # of Spots Available
- **Comments:**

---

**Comments:**

- Needs overgrown around planted trees
- Broken bollard
- Grass all over
- Worst section: between A and B on slope
- Only on side

---

**Notes:**

- Barreira
- Tree on corner
- Only on side
- Car from parking lot
### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

- **Presence on Street**: One Side, Two Sides
- **Street Cover/Shade**: Low, Medium, High
- **Maintenance**: Low, Medium, High

**Comments:**

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

- **Presence of Furniture**: Yes, No
- **Density/Presence of People**: Low, Medium, High
- **Pedestrian Traffic**: Low, Medium, High
- **Maintenance**: Low, Medium, High

**Comments:**

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- **Number of Establishments**
- **Types of Establishments**: Bar/Restaurant, Business/Office, School
- **(Specify in Comments)**: Government, Other

**Comments:**

### Other Material

- **Presence of Publicity**: Yes, No
- **Type of Publicity**: Flyers, Tarp, Painting, Other
- **Presence of Decor**: Yes, No
- **Decor Quality**: Traditional, Modern
- **Amount of Decor**: Low, Medium, High

**Comments:**

---

### Pedestrian Demographics

- **Age Group**: Toddlers/Children (0-8), Preteens (9-12), Teens (13-17), Young Adults (18-26), Adults (Early 30s-60s), Elderly (60s-Onward)
- **Gender**: Female, Male
- **Activity**: Formal/Business Attire, Semi-Casual/Semi-Formal, Casual
- **Attire**: Formal/Business Attire, Semi-Casual/Semi-Formal, Casual

**Comments:**

**Additional Comments:**
### Quantitative and Qualitative Data

**For Whole Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Street Type</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Direction</strong></td>
<td>□ One Way  □ Two Ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividing Barriers Present?</strong></td>
<td>□ Yes  □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td>2 lanes parking, 2 lanes driving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sidewalks</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Both Sides of Street?</strong></td>
<td>□ Yes  □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees or Shrubbery Present?</strong></td>
<td>□ Yes  □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Furniture Present?</strong></td>
<td>□ Yes  □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width of Sidewalk(s)</strong></td>
<td>R = _______ units  L = _______ units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

Presence on Street
☐ One Side  ☐ Two Sides

Street Cover/Shade
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Maintenance
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Comments:
- Some trees but thinly spaced ( Spartan ) so much bare medium-high cover when none, dry
- Maintenance: fairly frequent but low density (especially a problem to get tree leaves on dry)

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

Presence of Furniture
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Density/Presence of People
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Pedestrian Traffic
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Maintenance
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Comments:

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

Number of Establishments = 6

Types of Establishments
☐ Bar/Restaurant  ☐ Business/Office  ☐ School

(Specify in Comments)
☐ Government  ☐ Other

Comments:

Pedestrians moving in a perpendicular or straight (being very slow)

Other Material

Presence of Publicity
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Type of Publicity
☐ Flyers  ☐ Tarp  ☐ Painting  ☐ Other

Presence of Decor
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Decor Quality
☐ Traditional  ☐ Modern

Amount of Decor
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High

Comments:

Young company
### Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Motorcycles</th>
<th>Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Number of Cars Per 10 Minutes x 6 = Number of Cars Per Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Parking Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking Condition</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking Ratio</td>
<td>Number of Spots Filled / Number of Spots Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking Condition</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking Ratio</td>
<td>Number of Spots Filled / Number of Spots Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Encourage planting more Trees in the area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Presence of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>Establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant Business/Office School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise/Sound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decibel Count</td>
<td>Number of Cars</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pedestrian Demographics

**Age Group**
- Toddler/Children (0-6)
- Preteens (9-12)
- Teens (13-17)
- Young Adults (18-26)
- Adults (Early 30's-60's)
- Elderly (60's-Onward)

**Gender**
- Female
- Male

**Activity**
- Sitting/Dancing
- Walking

**Attire**
- Casual
- Semi-Casual/Semi-Formal
- Formal/Business Attire
- Other

**Comments:**

---

**Additional Comments:**

---

### Street Profile

![Street Profile Diagram]

---

### Street Layout

![Street Layout Diagram]
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Researcher: [Name]
Street Segment: [Segment]
Date: 3/12/13 Time In: 11:20 Time Out: 11:47
Weather Conditions: [Description]

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction: □ One Way □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes: [Number]
Dividing Barriers Present? □ Yes □ No
Comments: [Notes]

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street? □ Yes □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present? □ Yes □ No
Street Furniture Present? □ Yes □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s): [Width] units = [Meters]
Comments: [Notes]

Street/Sidewalk State
Condition: □ Poor □ Fair □ Good
Repair Material Used: □ New □ Original
Comments: [Notes]

Traffic
Type: □ Pedestrians □ Cars □ Motorcycles □ Trucks
Intensity: □ Light □ Medium □ High
Flow: [Cars Per 10 Minutes x 6 =] [Cars Per Hour]
Comments: [Notes]

Vehicle Parking
Car Parking Present? □ Yes □ No
Car Parking Condition: □ Formal □ Informal
Car Parking Ratio = [Number of Spots Filled] / [Number of Spots Available]
Motorcycle Parking Present? □ Yes □ No
Motorcycle Parking Condition: □ Formal □ Informal
Motorcycle Parking Ratio = [Number of Spots Filled] / [Number of Spots Available]
Comments: [Notes]

Noise/Sound
Level: □ Low □ Medium □ High
Decibel Count: [Value] (only if available)
Sound Source(s): [Description]
Comments: [Notes]
**CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013**
**Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)**

### Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

- **Presence on Street**
  - [ ] One Side
  - [ ] Two Sides

- **Street Cover/Shade**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Maintenance**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Comments:**

### Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

- **Presence of Furniture**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Density/Presence of People**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Pedestrian Traffic**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Maintenance**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Comments:**

### Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

- **Number of Establishments**
  - [ ] 0

- **Types of Establishments**
  - [ ] Bar/Restaurant
  - [ ] Business/Office
  - [ ] School

- **(Specify in Comments)**
  - [ ] Government
  - [ ] Other

- **Comments:**

### Other Material

- **Presence of Publicity**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Type of Publicity**
  - [ ] Flyers
  - [ ] Tarp
  - [ ] Painting
  - [ ] Other

- **Presence of Decor**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Decor Quality**
  - [ ] Traditional
  - [ ] Modern

- **Amount of Decor**
  - [ ] Low
  - [ ] Medium
  - [ ] High

- **Comments:**

- **Pedestrian Demographics**

  - **Age Group**
    - [ ] Toddlers/Children (0-8)
    - [ ] Preteens (9-12)
    - [ ] Teens (13-17)
    - [ ] Young Adults (18-26)
    - [ ] Adults (Early 30's-60's)
    - [ ] Elderly (60's-Onward)

  - **Gender**
    - [ ] Female
    - [ ] Male

  - **Activity**
    - Sitting or relaxing, doing nothing

  - **Attire**
    - [ ] Casual
    - [ ] Semi-Casual/Semi-Formal
    - [ ] Formal/Business Attire
    - [ ] Other

- **Comments:**

- **Additional Comments:**

---
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Traffic

Type
- Pedestrians [X]
- Cars [X]
- Motorcycles
- Trucks

Intensity
- Very Light
- Medium
- High

Flow
- # of Cars Per 10 Minutes x 6 = # of Cars Per Hour

Comments:
- Nobody walking, only people getting in & out of cars

Vehicle Parking

Parking Present? [X]
- Yes
- No

Parking Condition
- Formal
- Informal

Parking Ratio
- # of Spots Filled / # of Spots Available

Motorcycle Parking Present? [X]
- Yes
- No

Motorcycle Parking Condition
- Formal
- Informal

Motorcycle Parking Ratio
- # of Spots Filled / # of Spots Available

Comments:

Noise/Sound

Level
- Low
- Medium
- High

Decibel Count
- [only if available]

Sound Source(s)

Comments:

Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces

Presence on Street
- One Side
- Two Sides

Street Cover/Shade
- Low
- Medium
- High

Maintenance
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments:
- Mostly no public greenery

Piazzas and Other Public Spaces

Presence of Furniture
- Yes
- No

Density/Pedestrian Presence
- Low
- Medium
- High

Pedestrian Traffic
- Low
- Medium
- High

Maintenance
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments:

Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices

Number of Establishments
- [ ] Establishments

Types of Establishments
- Bar/Restaurant
- Business/Office
- School

(Specify in Comments)

Government
- Other

Comments:

Other Material

Presence of Publicity
- Yes
- No

Type of Publicity
- Flyers
- Tarp
- Painting
- Other

Presence of Decor
- Indoor
- No

Decor Quality
- Traditional
- Modern

Amount of Decor
- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments:

[Handwritten Remarks]
Pedestrian Demographics

Age Group
- ☐ Toddlers/Children (0-8) ☐ Preteens (9-12)
- ☐ Teens (13-17) ☐ Young Adults (18-26)
- ☐ Adults (Early 30’s-60’s) ☐ Elderly (60’s-Onward)

Gender
- ☐ Female ☐ Male

Activity
- ☐ Walking ☐ Jogging ☐ Running

Attire
- ☐ Casual ☐ Semi-Casual/Semi-Formal
- ☐ Formal/Business Attire ☐ Other

Comments:

Additional Comments:
CRP 4160: Rome Workshop, Spring 2013
Neighborhood Analysis Survey - Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR)

Researcher: __________________________ Street Segment: __________________________
Date: 14/03/15 Time In: 11:55 AM Time Out: __________________________
Weather Conditions: __________________________

Quantitative and Qualitative Data
For Whole Street

Street Type
Street Direction    □ One Way    □ Two Ways
Number of Lanes = 2
Dividing Barriers Present? □ Yes □ No
Comments:

Sidewalks
On Both Sides of Street? □ Yes □ No
Trees or Shrubbery Present? □ Yes □ No
Street Furniture Present? □ Yes □ No
Width of Sidewalk(s) = _____ units = _____ meters
Comments:

Street Sidewalk State
Condition    □ Poor □ Fair □ Good
Repair Material Used □ New □ Original
Comments:

Traffic
Type □ Pedestrians □ Cars □ Motorcycles □ Trucks
Intensity □ Light □ Medium □ High
Flow = _____ Cars Per 10 Minutes x 6 = _____ Cars Per Hour
Comments: __________________________

Vehicle Parking
Car Parking Present? □ Yes □ No
Car Parking Condition □ Formal □ Informal
Car Parking Ratio = _____ # of Spots Filled / _____ # of Spots Available
Motorcycle Parking Present? □ Yes □ No
Motorcycle Parking Condition □ Formal □ Informal
Motorcycle Parking Ratio = _____ # of Spots Filled / _____ # of Spots Available
Comments: __________________________

Noise/Sound
Level □ Low □ Medium □ High
(only if available)
Decibel Count = _____
Sound Source(s) __________________________
Comments: __________________________
**Trees, Shrubbery, and Green Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence on Street</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Cover/Shade</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Piazzas and Other Public Spaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Furniture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density/Purpose of People</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Traffic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shops, Bars, Restaurants, Businesses, & Government Offices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>Establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Establishments</td>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specify in Comments)</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Material**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Publicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publicity</td>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Tarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Decor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor Quality</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Decor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>