THE RULE AND THE MODEL
AN APPROACH TO THE CONTEMPORARY URBAN SPACE

Cristina Soares Cavaco

Faculdade de Arquitectura – Universidade Técnica de Lisboa
Pólo Universitário – Alto da Ajuda, Lisboa, Portugal,
Email: ccavaco@fa.utl.pt

ABSTRACT: Reflecting on the idea that the *rule* and the *model* - as two primary proceeding figures of urban space and form - can be set up as tools in the important task of reading, understanding and analyzing the urbanized landscaped city, this paper traces an analytical retrospective upon the urban space of modernity. With an eye to the *legibility* and the *intelligibility* of contemporary urban space and form, the paper highlights the importance of these two concepts – the *rule* and the *model* – when it comes to the governability of the territory. At the end, some premises are drawn up focusing on the articulation of models and rules as a planning and a governance demand.
KEYWORDS: contemporary city, spacing, rule, model, legibility, intelligibility

1 INTRODUCTION

At Beijing's first IFou conference, a paper and a communication were presented reflecting on the idea that the *rule* and the *model* - as two primary proceeding figures of urban space and form (Choay, 1980) - can be set up as tools in the important task of reading, understanding and analyzing the urbanized landscaped city. With concerns on the *legibility* and the *intelligibility* of the new urban form, the argument was delivered in order to create a new platform and a preliminary basis to better plan and design the landscaped city.

Three years later, when the PhD thesis that has carried out the research is coming to an end, this article follows the argument expressed in above and tries to clarify the relevance of these two concepts and tools - the *rule* and the *model* - in the difficult task of governing, planning and designing the contemporary city.

After taking the Metropolitan Area of Lisbon (AML) as an empirical framework for observation and research, and after identifying the way different rules and models have been determinant to the emergency of new settlement patterns and a completely novel non-canonical urban space, a proposal for an instrumental platform of work and reflection is put forward. With an eye to the *legibility* and the *intelligibility* of the contemporary urban space, a set of *nine premises* is drawn up. The main focus goes to the articulation and compatibleness between models and rules as a planning and governance demand.

The paper is organized into three different parts:

1. The first part briefly establishes a critical review of concepts concerning both their theoretical traits and their praxis attributes on the history of urbanism and urbanization;

2. The second part attends on an analytical retrospective on how rules and models have contributed to the formulation and definition of the urban space of modernity. This conceptual retrospective attends on *spacing* as one of the main fundamentals of modernity;

3. The third and last part of the paper presents the premises themselves. By doing so, the paper traces some of the challenges planning and governance need to face down our days.

2 A CRITICAL REVIEW OF CONCEPTS

In order to theoretically introduce and review the argument and the concepts expressed in above, three questions are put forward:

A. Why were the *rule* and the *model* selected as concepts and tools to structure a new instrumental approach to the contemporary city?

B. Why is the idea of *intelligibility*, in correlation with the concept of *legibility*, so important to the comprehension of the contemporary urban space?

C. What sort of relationship can be established between the *rule* and the *model* as morphological tools and the idea of a *legible* and *intelligible* urban form?

Based on the article of 2006, an attempt to give brief answers to these questions will be made.

2.1 The Rule and the Model

In the beginning of the research a challenge was made to recover the figures of the *rule* and the *model* as morphological tools and an instrumental basis to recognize the *legibility* and the *intelligibility* of the contemporary urban form and structure.

After these concepts have been brought in together by Françoise Choay in 1980 (within the book entitled *La Règle et le Modèle,* as an updated edition of author's PhD thesis), and also after a particular emphasis has been given to an extensive and consistent body of inaugural texts on the theory of architecture and urbanism, whose *regularities* and *synchronized ideas* have driven to the *rule* and the *model* as main proceeding attributes of space, it seemed that these concepts were substantially well founded and documented, in an epistemological and hermeneutical way, to be a support to our primary purpose and demand (Cavaco, 2006).

First of all, the *rule* and the *model* were considered by Choay as two fundamental spatial matrixes, constant features within the theoretical space of architecture and urbanism, which means that they were able to synthesize the two most typical proceeding methods concerning the conception and the production of the building space. While the methodology associated with the figure of the *model* dictates the attributes and the properties of form via an utopian like framework that is an aprioristic vision of what the city should be (the city as an idea or a project), the methodology associated with the figure of the *rule* is described as a process or an operational like method whose foundation consists in a system of rules and principles that allows creative responses to different physical and social contexts, according to the differences of time and individuals (the city as function or a process) (Cavaco, 2006).

Secondly, and since they were figures of an already proved consistency and stability (Choay, 1980), the *rule* and the *model* appeared to wonderfully respond as tools on what concern the reading and the analysis of the contemporary urban form. In fact, the visible complexity and the extension of the contemporary urban phenomenon, associated with a new type of exploded and fragmentary urban landscape, were asking for a very new type of approach – an approach that should be able to primarily attend to the *rationality* of urban form.

In fact, what contemporary cities seem to have of erratic and unpredictable is not, afterwards, the result of a free-of-engagement urbanization process, as if everything inside the contemporary urban realm was the result of a always spontaneous growth, an instinctive and unwilling process completely deprived of logics and rationality. Contradicting all the expectations, today cities grow up, more than ever, under a very rational and even formal procedural background. Indeed, very strict rules and normative models determined the development of cities, although the multiplicity of processes and actors apparently took cities away from their intelligible reason and origin.

This means that besides giving attention to the physical characteristics of urban form, the approach should necessarily be informed by a very diligent inquiry about the *orders of rationality* that have been determinant to the settlement and to the transformation of urban form. Only this way the physical traits of urban form would be clarified and its structure would become easily understandable. So, the argument and the theoretical approach of this research were delivered under the belief that the modern contemporary city is everything less than a spontaneous-like urban landscape.

2.2 Intelligibility *versus* Legibility

The need for clarification in terms of rational structure takes us to the next question which concerns the importance of *intelligibility* on the comprehension of the contemporary urban space.

In 1960, with the work of Kevin Lynch on the *image of the city*, urban planners and researchers became aware of the importance of *legibility* to the design and to the reading of urban form. At that time, as a reaction to the illegibility of modern urban territories, the *legibility* of urban form turned out to be one of the

main purposes and values to be achieved by city's planning and urban design (Merlin & Choay, 1988:437). Nevertheless, the concept of *intelligibility* was not a target at the time.

Although one can say that the worthy insights of Kevin Lynch on the image of the city still remain up-to-dated viewpoints for the theories of our days, the city landscape has changed a lot since then. Sprawl, fragmentation and discontinuity have increased. And Urban form, as well as the urban functioning became *splintered*, more complex and unstructured than ever (Graham & Marvin, 2001). In fact, we became aware that the notion of *legibility* is not by itself enough concerning the functional and the conceptual complexity of contemporary cities.

According to our references, it was Thomas Sieverts in 1997 that has pushed the idea of Lynch a little bit further, integrating within the concern of a legible urban form, the aim of an as such intelligible urban space. Quoting Siverts, "*(...) legibility and intelligibility are the preconditions for perceiving and experiencing the city region as a space which shapes everyday life. Legibility and intelligibility are two of the most important conditions for the difficult task of regenerating an identity of society and space for everyday life in the Zwischenstadt*" (1997:61).

However, intelligibility is not an opposite of legibility. Actually, they represent two different levels or stages within the phenomenological experience of space. Knowing that, whether the concept of *legibility* touches the meaning of *imageability* or *visibility* [which, according to Lynch, is the "*(...) quality of a physical object which gives it a high probability of evoking a strong image in any given observer (...)*"(1960:20)], *intelligibility* refers a deeper stage in the phenomenological perception, i.e., an intellectual intuition level that especially concerns the object's qualities or properties that can only be known by intelligence. Within the urban realm, the less an effort of intelligence is necessary to grasp a certain urban tissue, the more it becomes intelligible. Focused on the intellective structure of urban form, the concept of intelligibility concerns all the features of a city that are able to define it as either a functioning system and a physical manifestation of ideal intentions. That is why the concept is absolutely necessary, in addition to legibility, to the understanding of the contemporary city.

2.3 The aim of deciphering contemporary urban form

In order to answer to the third of the former questions, we do believe that, as long as the *rule* and the *model* introduce a procedural and conceptual understanding of the building space, they are able to increase its *intelligibility*. In fact, since the *rule* and the *model* can be operated at a variety of scales and abstraction levels, they will easier structure the comprehension that should intermediate between the perceptible or the sensible space of everyday life and the abstract space of reasons (as are the economical and the functional forces which interact within a city; as are as well the utopian visions and the conceptual intentions that, in a visible manner, explain afterwards the tangible urban artifacts that took shape on the ground).

Therefore, via the operational character of rules and via the utopian nature of models, all the processes, laws and principles, as well as the concepts and the visions of space are revealed. By that the intellective structure of the building space is supposedly becoming unveiled. In the optics of the *intelligibility* of urban form, the *rule* and the *model* appeared as worthy instruments since they are able to assimilate the very essence of an urban artifact that has become extensively fragmented, vertiginously mutant and rationally complex. Undoubtedly dense within the context of architectural culture and urbanism, the *rule* and the *model* have, indeed, a special vocation to help us to decipher the reasons that explain urban form, its physical structure and its significant meaning.

3 THE URBAN SPACE OF MODERNITY: AN ANALYTICAL RETROSPECTIVE THROUGH THE RULE AND THE MODEL

Within the scope of these concepts, a framework for observation and analysis has then supported the empirical research. Under the aegis of the PhD research, the Metropolitan Area of Lisbon was given as a general territory of analysis, within which several case studies were selected in order to exemplify different types of settlements.

Among all the issues that have fulfilled our methodology of analysis, contributing to the reading and to the systematization we are about to present, we stress the following items:

a) The empirical evidence of different types of urban tissues with their own modes of territorial

insertion and morphologic dialectics;

b) The discovery of important references, within the planning proposals, concerning normative city models;

c) The acknowledgment of different types of initiative (either public or private);

d) The identification of different types of actors and stakeholders;

e) The contextualization of the case studies within the framework of urban public policies, the regulation norms and within the framework of economics, including the real-estate market behavior;

f) The identification of different types administrative proceedings, considering both the urban regulation norms and the urban practices in general;

g) The verification about the use of different planning instruments and drawing tools, concerning their interference on the physical urban outcomes.

In a synthesis, the idea was to identify the way different *rules* and *models* have been determinant to the configuration and emergency of urban patterns, providing better knowledge about the reasons (as is to say, the *orders rationality*) that have been decisive to the establishment and to the transformation of the contemporary urban form within the region of Lisbon. Though, throughout the collection of a great amount of elements and data, a very rigorous empirical research and analysis were accomplished, providing an alternative approach, a new way of looking at the contemporary urban space. Indeed, the analytical retrospective on how *rules* and *models* have contributed to the formulation and to the definition of the urban space of modernity has sharpened our rational understanding of the contemporary urban landscape.

Attending on *spacing* as one of the three main fundamentals of Modernity (these were *spacing*, *circulation* or *connection* and *nature* – Mangin, 2004), and of course with an eye to the *legibility* and to the *intelligibility* of the contemporary city, four different stages within the formulation process of the contemporary urban space are then put forward.

3.1   Why *spacing*?

Before introducing it, a question must be done: what is *spacing* and why is it driving our empirical approach?

In a context of urban space and urban morphology, *spacing* can be defined as the degree of openness in urban form, which, in other words, means the amount and the dilation of the free open spaces within the building tissue.

In fact, this idea and will of *spacing* within the theoretical corpus of urbanism marks an important step in the history of cities, outstandingly pointing out their passage from a condition of tradition to a condition of modernity. Choay (1969), Panerai (1975) and Mangin (2004), among others, offered valuable insights on the matter, either presenting an extraordinary perspective on the evolution of the urban space or comprising several examples with the view of explaining the modern urban space as a *spacing* issue.

Of course *spacing* cannot be disintegrated from the idea of the city as a *circulation system*; neither can it be separated from the idea of arranging very strong linkage and mixture between the *nature* and the city. Nevertheless, *spacing* seemed to have had wider interference on the reading of the city as a continuous building system, easily affecting its image and legibility. Since our concerns were especially focused on the legibility and the intelligibility of the urban form, our rules-and-models research was then addressed to the *spacing* issue.

But, how exactly did the interaction between models and rules on the urbanization process affect the urban form as a *spacing issue*? How did it affect the legibility and the intelligibility of contemporary urban space?

Let see then how the process was driven in the Portuguese context.

3.1   The awakening of *spacing*: the rupture with linear urban space

The first of the stages within the formulation of the urban space of modernity is precisely the awakening of *spacing* and the rupture of urban space as a linear legible system. The way models and rules were addressed and combined became decisive to explain how and why this rupture actually happened (Cavaco, 2009).

In the Metropolitan Area of Lisbon, we can say that it was by the middle of the 1940's that this process

has started. The peripheral nucleus and the municipalities around the capital city started being confronted with an abrupt affluence of people from the countryside to the metropolitan region and urbanization around Lisbon arose.

At that time the first planning initiatives were coming to be published in Portugal. Urbanism - as a technical and political way of conceiving and controlling the urban development – had finally entered into the Portuguese urban scene and a doctrinal legal basis for urban development had also been created. Indeed, the country was crossing a political regime of dictatorship (*Estado Novo* 1926-1974) and urban order was regarded as a strategy to command and to impose authority upon the people. So, the idea was to promote and control the expansion of the existing historical settlements, planning formal public solutions to overpass housing shortage.

The urban paradigm and the morphologies of the *garden city movement* were the main normative reference among a very limited group of urban planners that was in charge of the master plans for the new settlements. According to Howard's theories and diagrams (Howard, 1989), new layouts came up following the *Garden Cities* morphological principles: a central roundabout, main thoroughfares and avenues, a secondary hierarchical system of streets and closes, a system of parkways and green urban parks, etc.

It is true that, while *spacing* was awakening as a «*formula to the future»*, the dependence between the axial line of streets and roads and the alignment and continuity of the building tissue was already suffering a first dilution (sidewalks were enlarged, building facades were move back from the margin of the streets, new green elements were introduced as morphological ordinances, etc). Yet, the reference of Beaux-Arts was still a strong reference on planners' imaginary, and the linearity and imageability of urban space have remained evident on the proposals and on the ground.

The rupture happened at the moment rules came to collide with the normative imaginary of the city. If, at the beginning, the public system of rules and also the urban practices themselves were all moving towards the realization of the city model, things were about to change in the 50's and 60's.

At first, the conformity between the normative model of the city and the public system of rules was addressed to the authority of the regime: on one hand, expropriation mechanisms and a special type of land tenure (*the right of surface*) were introduced in the letter of law in order to create expedite manners of performing the production of the urban fabric; on the other hand, the normative reference of the street-corridor, as well as the one of the block, as main morphological elements, made the urban production easier, especially in cases where land owners were many and where expropriations were restricted to the public domain. Like this, operational rules were completely adjusted to the visual model of the city. On the behalf of public urban planning, the priority was attributed to the capital (the financial capacity to build) in the detriment of agrarian privileges.

However this adjustment and compatibility did not resist too long. Political priorities were inverted as a consequence of agrarian and real-estate pressures. The result was the rupture of urban space as a linear legible system. It is true that *spacing* became more intense since new models of the *city of towers* started assuming a bigger relevance on the master plans. Nevertheless, it was especially the way how policies, urban practices and rules defended the private land tenures and ownerships that has been determinant to the rupture of linearity and to the corruption of legibility. When the procedural divorce between rules and models came up, *spacing* got incompatible with the linearity of urban space.

3.2 Assimilation and abuse of *spacing*: the illegitimacy of certain urban voids

On the 1950's and 60's a new stage has emerged within the formulation of the modern urban space. *Spacing,* as a morphological *formula* for the city, was then assimilated by architects and urban planners who were adhering more and more to the *Corbusier's* ideas of the *Ville Radieuse*. In Portugal, after the first and revolutionary *National Congress of Architecture* (1948), the lines of modernity have started to become evident within the production of architecture and urbanism in our country; a production that until then was completely submitted to the nationalist canons of *Estado Novo*. The original model of the *horizontal garden-city* has been substituted by the *vertical* model of the *city of towers*. Individual houses were replaced by collective housing solutions, while the block was abandoned on the behalf of an urban development based on isolated buildings, towers and bars. The portrait of a *reverse city* (Viganó, 1999) has definitively spread among us, characterizing the new urban territories within the Metropolitan Area of Lisbon.

But the assimilation of *spacing* as a modern attribute of urban space has been converted into an abuse. In qualitative terms, it has resulted in fragmentation and discontinuity. In quantitative terms, it has become an excess since the open free spaces belonging to the public domain have ended as a surplus inside contemporary cities (Augé, 1992; Graham & Marvin, 2001). However, the problem did not reside exclusively on *spacing* itself. Once again the question remained within the correlation between the model of the city (the one that was used as a normative reference) and the rules that have supported its implementation on the ground (Cavaco, 2009). Let see then how it happened.

When we look upon the theoretical basis of the modern city and urbanism, we can see that the entire normative proposal was based on the submission of the private property to the public domain and welfare. In fact, the idea of a Welfare State and a Welfare City were behind Corbusier's plans and ideas of the *Radieuse City*. The increasing in high of the buildings as a way of freeing all the space around, the execution of the *garden-city* in a certain vertical mode, the abolition of streets and the panacea of the landscape, the absolute democratization of soil, as well as the democratization of the green and other public facilities, were all among the issues and the virtues the Modern City in which urban space must be submitted to the public realm and to the rights of the collectivity.

In fact, this was not what happened in the Portuguese context. Our attempt to implement the modern city was a complete distortion of its normative principles. The way rules and regulation norms have been put into practice, the way urban practices have interacted with the utopian-like model of the city, had no other result than the unintelligibility and the illegibility of the urban space itself. Rather than being integrated within a whole - a free green open space that is offered to the people as a landscape of beauty, liberty and health –, the urban spaces have resulted into *in-between* illegitimate urban voids, nothing more than voids between-buildings, between-infrastructures, between-polygons, between-sectors (Sieverts, 1997; Mangin, 2004).

Indeed, urban policies and regulation norms have not had in mind edifying the modern *spacing* as an urban space of common welfare; rather, and paradoxically, they have been a public demand for private real-estate issues and agrarian interests. In general terms, and since the middle of the 50's until nearly the 90's, urban development has resulted from private plot-division operations where no sense of common welfare was present. While private owners were responsible for individually splitting up their lands into urban plots, public planning solutions for the territory were nearly reduced to a minimum. According to Mendes (1990:174), this situation had prejudice consequences on the coherence of the whole urban system. The more private plot-divisions were approved, the less municipal council and the central government were interested in promoting urbanism and public urban planning. Though, urban settlements started growing by separated segments, whose limits and polygonal shapes were exclusively dependent on the real estate agrarian cadastre, i.e., on the former limits of the rural properties. Accordingly, the fragmentation and the discontinuity of the urban fabric has become a reality, which was not exclusively a consequence of *spacing* as a morphological issue and a normative vision. This was also the result of administrative non-compatible procedures. This was primarily the result of a pathologic relationship between models and rules.

3.3 The awareness of the modern collapse: the primary refusal of *spacing*

The third of the stages concerning the evolution of modern urban space is the awareness of modern collapse. In fact, the announcement of modern failure is not a novelty for us. Since the 60's and 70's several authors have stressed this idea. According to Rowe and Koetter, for example, *"The city of modern architecture (it may be called the modern city) has not yet been built. In spite of all good will and good intentions of its protagonists, it has remained either a project or an abortion; and, more and more, there no longer appears to be any convincing reason to suppose that matters will be otherwise"* (1978:1). The critical review of modern ideals, especially when it came to the way they were materially expressed on the building tissue, has stimulated the emergency of new approaches to urban form. Face to face with the unintelligibility and illegibility of urban space, it was necessary to reinvent the city and to rediscover the valences of *spacing* as a fundamental urban issue.

In the Portuguese context several attempts were done on the matter. But, have rules been finally conciliated with the normative spatial models? Actually, some of the attempts have even introduced very new methodologies to deal with urban form and to manage urban production in terms of rules-and-models

proceedings. Nevertheless, the most common approach was the one that intended to deny *spacing* as a premature reaction to its generalization and abuse.

When we started entering into the 80's and 90's, several architects and planners have decided to invert the course of modern urban form directly introducing into their drawings a new model for the city space. Worried with the almost-tragic feeling associated with the dissolution of the city, they have chosen to promote, on the contrary, the closing and the containment of urban space. The strategy, contextualized within the philosophy of postmodern urbanism, presented by N. Ellin in 1996, was to reclaim the vernacular elements of the traditional city, in a nostalgic and sometimes idyllic or picturesque attitude. The street as a corridor, the square and also the block were some of the morphological references, and some of the design goals, that have returned into the city's imaginary - a romantic resurgence of the old city space and image. The formal rhetoric of modernity has also suffered an evident regression on the architecture of the buildings, which have started functioning more like a background scenario and less as independent volumes.

However rules did not get along with this vision of space. Actually, at the same level the project of the modern city was distorted by rules, the postmodern directives for a new urbanism were ruined by the sovereignty and the maladjustment of public policies, regulation norms and other institutionalized urban practices. Private plot-divisions operations have remained the easiest and most common manner of producing urban space, favoring a fragmentary polygonal growth in the detriment of urban continuity and linearity. At the same time grids were used in order to rationalize the aggregation of plots and building volumes, to create visual alignments and coordinate perspectives, the approach to the city as a global system did not happen at all. The patchwork-like approach, based on the former agrarian cadastre, has remained equal to itself, without significant alterations, and urban *spacing*, as an extended sprawled arrangement of the building fabric, has persisted in a fragmentary, discontinuous and incoherent way.

3.4 Topological reforms: *spacing* emancipation

The last stage on the formulation of modern urban space refers the emancipation of *spacing* as a result of a new paradigm of mobility and communication. At a time when the discouragement for the collapse of the modern project is about to disappear, when a new topological dimension of urban space is conquering the territory with the dissemination of infrastructural networks and the democratization of information technologies, *spacing* is giving signs of emancipation. This means that new tendencies are coming into being not only to overcome the *code reversals* of the modern city, but also to face up to fragmentation and urban discontinuity in a renovated perspective and enthusiasm.

Within the topology of contemporary urban space, *spacing* is enunciated at three different levels:

- The first one concerns the interdependency between the urban and the infrastructural. According to Graham & Marvin *"We recognize, rather, that much of the urban is infrastructure; that much of infrastructure actually constitutes the very physical and sociotechnical fabric of cities; and that cities and infrastructure are seamlessly coproduced, and co-evolve, together with contemporary society"* (2001:179).

- The second one handles with scale and concerns the increasing capacity to undertake multiscalar approaches to the territory and to the building space. In a territory where constant switches between the urban and the infrastructural happen, telescoped leaps between the urban and the territorial scales are absolutely necessary to manage the situation. Quoting once again Graham & Marvin *"Spatial scales and geographical scales (corporeal, urban, regional, national, international, global) are in a sense being continuously 'telescoped' within the contemporary networked metropolis"* (*Op.Cit.*:411).

- The third one refers connection as a precondition to accept urban segmentation. At this level, it is necessary to say that segmentation is not only a morphological and elementary problem. As Graham & Marvin also point out, segmentation is adopted as an operational and a procedural strategy to deal with the new characteristics of urban form and urban production. According to the authors, *infrastructural unbundling* and *splintering urbanism* refer the disintegration and the fragmentation of urban networks and infrastructures into several parts, whose execution and management are separated among private entities.

The question, now, is whether rules (public policies, regulation norms, urban practices) are able to evolve accordingly to the spatial model. In fact, in Portugal, old practices and rules are strongly embedded within the governability of the territory – within the public policies, the planning system and regulation -, which can be very problematic as long as an adjustment between the model and the rules is needed. Admit

the emancipation of *spacing* is an invitation to revise the procedural basis of planning and governance. It is also a demand for questioning the conditions of legibility and intelligibility within the space of the contemporary city.

4   PREMISSES FOR A NEW CONDITION OF LEGIBILITY AND INTELIGIBILITY

With an eye to the legibility and the intelligibility of the contemporary urban space, nine premises are then put forward attending to the way the *rule* and the *model* can take part in a proposal for an instrumental platform of work and reflection concerning the challenges planning and governance pass through our days.

The first of the nine premises attends to the idea of *spacing* and says that:
1º Legibility and intelligibility of contemporary urban space do not depend on spacing - i.e. the degree of openness and the dilation of the open free space - as much as they depend on the way rules and models get articulated and compatible with each other, in the progressive construction of the building space.

The second set of premises addresses the figure of the *model* and says that:
2º The reference of a normative model, that is to say, the presence of an utopian proceeding on the basis of the conception and the production of the urban space is absolutely indispensable within the challenge of creating a new condition of legibility and intelligibility to the contemporary city.

3º Concerning the legibility and the intelligibility of contemporary urban space, the reference of a model of space only matters on the perspective it can be reviewed in a close relationship of reciprocity with the operatory nature of the building space.

4º The impact of the model on the legibility and on the intelligibility of the building space can only be verified by a mutual reading of the rules that have also interfered on its edification.

The three premises that follow attend to the figure of the *rule* and reach to the understanding that:
5º More than the plethoric multiplication of rules as a strategy to govern and restrict action, the relevance of an operatory proceeding to the legibility and intelligibility of contemporary urban space is its real capacity to give a certain ideal model the necessary effectiveness and objectivity.

6º In an operatory proceeding of urban space, participation is the main and the most important challenge concerning the achievement of a new condition of legibility and intelligibility.

7º The impact of rules on the legibility and on the intelligibility of the building space can only be verified by a mutual reading of the models that have also interfered on its edification.

The following premise attends on *time* and reaches to the understanding that:
8º The legibility and the intelligibility of the contemporary urban space also depends on the flexibility of models and rules, which is to say that it depends on the way the intelligible structure of rules and models to adapt as time goes by.

At last, as a premise of synthesis:
9º The rule and the model must be considered and restored as two main structuring pillars and tools concerning a critical architectural regeneration of contemporary urban space and form.

REFERENCES

[1]   ASCHER, F., (2001) *Los Nuevos Principios del Urbanismo. El fin de las ciudades non está a la orden del día*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2004. 93pp. ISBN: 84-206-4198-7

[2]   ATKINSON, A. (2005). "Urban development. Reviving and activating Utopian strategies" *in City,* Vol. 9, nº3, Dezembro de 2005. London e New York: Routledge. pp.279-295. ISSN: 1360-4813 / ISSN: 1470-3629

[3]   CAVACO, C. (2006). «The Rule and the Model. Tracking New Methods and Tools to Analyze and Design the Zwischenstadt» *in* WANG, C., SHENG, Q., SEZER.C. *ed. International Forum on Urbanism 2006. Modernization & Regionalism. Re-Inventing the Urban Identity.* Vol I. Delf: IFoU. 83-89pp. ISBN: 90-78658-01-0

[4]   CHOAY, F. (1969). *Espacements. L'Évolution de L'Espace Urbain en France.* Milano: Skira Editore, 2003. 127pp. ISBN: 88-8491-644-5

[5]   CHOAY, F. (1980). *La Règle et le Modèle. Sur la Théorie de l'Architecture et de l'Urbanisme*, 2ª Ed. Paris: Éditions Seuil, 1996. 379pp. ISBN: 2-02-030027-3

[6]   CORBUSIER, Le. (1933). *La Ville Radieuse. Éléments d'une Doctrine d'Urbanisme pour l'Équipement de la Civilisation Machiniste.* Boulogne: Éditions de L'Architecture d'Aujourh'hui. 345pp.

[7]   ELLIN, N. (1996). *Postmodern Urbanism.* Edição revista, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999. 392pp. ISBN: 1-56898-135-X

[8]   GRAHAM, S., MARVIN, S. (2001). *Splintering Urbanism.* London, New York: Routledge, 2003. 479pp. ISBN: 0-415-18965-9

[9]   HORWARD, E. (1898), OSBORN, F.J. *ed.* (1965). *Garden Cities of To-morrow.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 168pp. ISBN: 0-262-58002-0

[10]   LEIPZIG CHARTER.(2007). *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities.* URL: *http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_998680/Leipzig-Charter-on-Sustainable-European-Cities-agreed-on-2 4-May-2007.pdf.*

[11]   LYNCH, K. (1960). *A Imagem da Cidade.* Lisboa: Edições 70, 1989. 205pp. DL nº26386/89

[12]   LYNCH, K. (1981). *A Boa Forma da Cidade.* Lisboa: Edições 70, 1999. 446pp. ISBN: 972-44-1025-0

[13]   MANGIN, D., PANERAI, P. (1999). *Projet Urbain.* Marseille: Éditions Parenthèses, Collection Eupalinos. 185pp. ISBN: 2-86364-604-4

[14]   MANGIN, D. (2004). *La Ville Franchisée. Formes et Structures de la Ville Contemporaine.* Paris: Éditions de la Villette. 398pp. ISBN:2-903539-75-8

[15]   MANGIN, D., MICHEL, J-M. *dir.* (2008). *La Ville Passante.* Paris: Éditions Parenthèses. 125pp. ISSN: 1280-2654 / ISBN: 978-2-86364-208-5

[16]   MENDES, M.C. (1990). *O Planeamento Urbano na Comunidade Europeia. Evolução e Tendências.* 1ªEd. Lisboa: Publicações Dom Quixote, 1990. 255pp. ISBN: 972-20-0772-6

[17]   MERLIN, P., CHOAY, F. (1981). *Dictionnaire de L'Urbanisme et de L'Aménagement*, 2ªEd. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996. 863pp. ISBN: 2-13-047415-2

[18]   OSWALD, F., BACCINI, P. (2003). *Netzstadt. Designing the Urban.* Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser. 303pp. ISBN: 3-76436-963-9

[19]   PANERAI, P., CASTEX, J., DEPAULE, J-C. (1975-1997). *Formes Urbaines. De L'îlot à la barre.* 3ªEd. Marseille: Éditions Parenthèses, Collection Eupalinos, 2004. 196pp. ISBN:2-86364-602-8

[20]   PINDER, D. (2005). *Visions of the City. Utopianism, Power and Politics in Twentieth Century Urbanism.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 354pp. ISBN: 0-7486-1488-5

[21]   PORTAS, N. (1969). *A Cidade como Arquitectura.* 2ªEd. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2007. 212pp. ISBN: 972-24-1463-1

[22]   PORTAS, N., DOMINGUES, Á., CABRAL, J. (2003) *Políticas Urbanas. Estratégias, Tendências e Oportunidades.* Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2003. 295pp. ISBN: 972-31-1061-X

[23]   ROWE, C., KOETTER, F. (1978). *Collage City.* Cambridge and London: The MIT Press. 186pp. ISBN: 0-262-68042-4/978-0-262-68042-4

[24]   SHANE, D.G. (2005). *Recombinant Urbanism. Conceptual Modeling in Architecure, Urban Design and the City Theory.* Wiley- Academy, 2005. 344pp. ISBN: 0-470-09331-5

[25]   SIEVERTS, T. (1997) *Cities Without Cities. An Interpretation of the Zwischenstadt*, London & New York: Spon Press, 2003. 187pp. ISBN: 0-415-27260-2

[26]   TERRITORIAL AGENDA. (2007). *Territorial Agenda of the European Union: Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions – Agreed at the occasion of the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion on 24 / 25 May 2007.* URL: *http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_1005295/Territorial-Agenda-of-the-European-Union-Agreed-on-25-May-2007-accessible.pdf*

[27]   VIGANÒ, P. (1999). *La Città Elementare.* Milano: Skira Editores, 1999. 206pp. ISBN: 88-8118-642-X