

# **Olympics Games: the organisation, the history, the committee, the projects. Rome 1960-Barcelona 1992: From a dream to the Olympic model**

*Valerio della Sala<sup>1</sup>*

*PhD student, University Autònoma of Barcelona, Department of Geography, Barcelona, Spain*

*Olympic studies center, Observatory of urbanism, SPORTCOMLAB, University of Bologna, Italy*

## **Abstract**

The choice of analysing the Olympic Games of Rome 1960 and Barcelona 1992 belongs to the conflicting and diverse impact generated on the two cities. I will examine how management models will either prevent or increase the exploitation of intangible benefits, necessarily associated to the Olympic event. Olympic venues are at the heart of Olympic planning, as they constitute the citizens' Olympic legacy. My critical analysis, regarding these two mega- events, is carried out through the development of 13 guidelines, aiming to offer effective criteria in order to guarantee not only economic revenue but also intangible, future benefits. This investigation shows how cities could favour from these intangible benefits, which develop as a consequence of both, the Olympic bid's success and the infrastructural evolution.

**Key words:** Olympic games, legacy, sustainability, urbanism.

---

<sup>1</sup> [valerio.dellasala@gmail.com](mailto:valerio.dellasala@gmail.com)

## **Introduction**

The Olympic Games are the sporting event for excellence. They are catalysts of emotions and change. The cultural and social revolution involved in the Olympic Games is unique and unrepeatable. With the Olympic nomination, cities can undertake and implement difficult choices in urban planning and public service management. The choice to analyse the Olympic Game of Rome and Barcelona is prompted by the contrasting impact generated by both city events. This article will explore how the use of different regulatory instruments in these events will lead to a conflicting development for the post-Olympics. Most European cities, after the industrial revolution and the Second World War, encountered structural issues that inevitably caused some social problems in the future. Urban planning with the support of national regulations has been identified as the only tool that can help cities to rebuild a social structure. In Italy, the most important example is Milan, transformed from an industrial city to a financial one. Amsterdam, London and Glasgow are just few significant examples of European cities that have transformed their urban fabric through existing structures, preserving their history and culture. The Olympic Games in Rome in 1960 and Barcelona in 1992 are considered to be among the largest ever made, both for the historical moment in which they occurred and for the amount of structural work that cities have received. Both cities, in the period preceding to the Olympic nomination, were going through a period of enormous crisis: economic, social and housing.

## **Olympic Games of Rome 1960**

The Olympic Games in Rome are considered the first high-impact Olympics, as urban design drastically altered the eternal city urban planning. The transformations that took place in Rome, in the years following the XVII edition of the Olympics, were intersected in particular with the events related to the expiration of the 1931 Regulatory Plan and the problems in elaborating a new plan for Rome. By law, the effectiveness of the 1931 Regulatory Plan ended in 1958, yet the 1150/1942 urban law established the general disapproval of all Regulatory Plans within ten years (1952) and expressed the need to renew them<sup>2</sup>. A series of measures allowed the extension of the PRG (General Plan) until 1958, but the new plan was only set up in 1967 with effect in 1968. In the decade after World War II the city of Rome was experiencing a wildfire-like expansion. Although the city was changing its shape, the Olympic project lacked of strategic planning, due to political instability and a violent controversy over the management of public affairs. The regulatory themes on which the city of Rome needed to focus were the same as in previous years: 1. City development planning; 2. Expansion containment; 3. Historic centre preservation. Considering that the master plan is the main supporting element for the Olympic project, any action should be taken to foster socio-economic development within the city. The Olympics in Rome had been a great Olympic Game, both in terms of participants of media coverage, being the first major live TV event. The creation of the “Foro Italico” complex and the various structures envisaged by the fascist

---

<sup>2</sup> State Urban Law, n. 1150 Art. 42, 17 august 1942

government and the 1942 EXPO area, allowed the 1960s Olympic Games in Rome to have a world-wide reputation and to be remembered as a memorable edition. The project was characterized on one side by political movements seeking to gain greater public attention, and on another, private individuals who bought state's land for a few thousand "lire". In addition, the city continued to live without a master plan in the years after the Olympic event. Between 1951 and 1957, roman urbanism, through various disconcerting episodes, had become the protagonist of the town chronicle, being a topic of great interest for administrations, political parties and cultural administrations<sup>3</sup>. Failure to set restrictive measures and the absence of a strategic plan will inevitably introduce the city of Rome into a whirl of multidisciplinary issues that will characterize the organization of the XVII edition of the Olympic Games. The organizing committee also suffered from various financial problems, that were later solved by issuing the Pella<sup>4</sup> law, securing special funding during the Olympic Games so that it could complete the reconstruction of the city of Rome. The city of Rome in the 1950s was only equipped with a sport's popular area: "The Foro Italico", formerly "Foro Mussolini"; designed by the greatest Italian rationalist architects: Moretti, Del Debbio, Libera. The Olympic works were chaotic, with no respect for the environment and landscape preservation. Failure to protect the environment and the landscape caused a significant reduction in public greenery, subtracting it to its citizens. The masterplan of Rome had to solve many

---

<sup>3</sup> Della Seta P., et al., *Il piano regolatore di Roma*, Roma, Editori Riuniti, 1963, p. 15

<sup>4</sup> Pella's Law, n.103, Art. 1 del 28 febbraio 1953

issues such as: distribution of city activities, counteracting illegal development through new urban norms, reclaiming suburbs that were experiencing a wildfire-like expansion, rebuilding a transport system that could connect the suburbs with the historic centre and protect the parks and green spaces available within the eternal city. The City Council initially assumed the construction of an equipped-axis facility that could dramatically reduce people flow to the centre by redistributing the transport system and the infrastructures<sup>5</sup>. That axis would have had an asymmetrical urban scheme which tended to unbalance the urban weights and residential concentrations, with the aim of changing as much as possible the layout of the city and preserve the history of the latter. The plan's agreement, as learned, will never be founded, but in the years after the Olympic event, the city of Rome was again without a general plan and with the same problems identified in the previous 40 years. Certainly, political instability did not favour the masterplan's drafting and therefore neither a general agreement on it. The works for the Olympic Games were prepared in a hastily way, and moreover, they heavily influenced the drafting of a new master plan, negatively reflecting on the urban development of the city of Rome. Fortunately, the city had two detailed plans in both Olympic areas. The never completed masterplan caused some green areas to be invaded by a brutal wild and illegal development, heavily influencing the town planning and transport system. The public administration in my study is identified as the principal responsible of the complex urban project, mainly focused on cement and asphalt. It can

---

<sup>5</sup> I. Insolera, *Roma Moderna*, Torino 1971, p. 150

be surely stated that people involved in urban decisions have used the city of Rome according to a principle of territory's exploitation, dividing the city only on the basis of their territorial speculative principles. The economic boom that Italy experienced in those years can be considered another factor that has seriously damaged the quality of residential interventions, aimed to quickly respond to the population's needs. Preliminary projects sought to rapidly respond to the housing demand, without taking into account the quality of architectural interventions and the principles identified within the Athens Charter<sup>6</sup>. The State also proved absent in this case, being unable to respond in an optimal way to its citizens demands and leaving private decision-makers in complete control of the structural decisions that had to be taken. This path was the fruit of a tedious and hasty politics, with no humanity and without appreciating its own areas and archaeological sites. The entire Olympic project was carried out without considering and respecting the urban fabric of the city of Rome. Without the predisposition of a defined project and, above all, without a preliminary regulatory study, the city began to take on its own form that will greatly limit and negatively influence its own development. The lack of public spaces, parks, squares, streets, pedestrian paths, trees, buildings, and parking lots prevented the eternal city to exploit the maximum intangible profit associated with the Olympic event. The city of Rome has always needed synergies, yet the succession of administrations of different political divisions has not allowed strategic development to safeguard the history of the city. The

---

<sup>6</sup> Le Corbusier, *Principio de Urbanismo*, Ariel, Carta di Atene, 1942, p.3

administrations in Lazio and in the municipality of Rome have been varied: over the years socialist, democratic, communist and republican administrations had been succeeding, without being able to create a model of planning and considering about the future of the city. The equipped axis that was later transformed into an oriental axis has become one of the city's major problems, constantly clogged with traffic and integrated into the uncontrolled urban development of the city. The most important criticism concerns the lack of timing of realisation, cost and resources; in short, urban planning rules were absent. The absence of planning has led to the development of an Italian costume regarding public works management, which can be termed as "non-existence of feasibility", precisely because of the absence of this very element<sup>7</sup>. Whereas, one of the positive aspects associated with the XVII Olympics can be identified within Olympic projects prepared by our greatest architects and rationalist engineers. In fact, they have been able to express themselves in the best of ways and without any kind of design constraint, guaranteeing and allowing one unique spectacle at the Olympic event. The functionality and purity of Rome's Olympic structures will always be remembered over the years and it will be an intangible element that the city and its citizens will benefit throughout their lives. Citizens are the people to whom these structures should be granted, allowing them to freely use them. The Olympic project definitely changed the vision of the capital by dividing the city without adopting any principle of dependence and interdependence between the areas identified for Olympic works.

---

<sup>7</sup> G.Furitano, *Il nuovo progetto del Piano Regolatore Generale di Roma, Capitolium*, XXXVIII, 1963, p.18

Insolera (Insolera, 1971) identifies the five areas of architectural and infrastructural development set up by the XVII Olympics:

- *Development of the EUR, with consequent city opening to the sea*
- *The Olympic Way*
- *The Olympic Village*
- *The realization of Porta Pinciana and Lungotevere tunnel*
- *New Leonardo da Vinci Airport*

The lack of connection between the proposed interventions will catalyse a new wave of debauchery on public works. Politics, aristocracy and the catholic church are the socio-cultural factors that have characterized Italy and they mirrored within the capital of Italy to this day. In the period following the Olympics, most of the facilities had been managed by CONI (Olympic Italian Committee) and EUR (Enterprise of Universal Exposition) organization. The EUR s.p.a. holds property in the city's neuralgic areas, continuing to influence the capital development even after the Olympic event. To date, the above-mentioned organization continues its speculative building policy to the detriment of the city of Rome. The Olympic plan did not take into consideration the maximum scope of the event and the capacity of each single sports venues. This deficiency of data caused, especially during the opening and closing ceremonies, discomfort for spectators and participants. The total budget amounted from 60 billion to



70 billion Lire, 75% of which were invested in structures and infrastructures<sup>8</sup>. Short before the opening ceremony - January 1960 - the Organizing Committee began to identify problems and to divide them into special areas: 1. Technical Administrative Office; 2. Execution and development of structures; 3. Welcome. Furthermore, in November 1959, the Executive Committee decided to split the responsibilities between the following entities: CONI; Provincial Tourist Board; Common. Meanwhile, the Olympic Village, designed to provide citizens with residences and to leave the city of Rome with a structural heritage, was in completion and it will be one of the major structural successes of the Olympic Games in Rome.

Architectural style and the design of the entire block were an example for the whole world.

The architects who participated in the project will be the predecessors of a great urbanism that will characterize the next twenty years. The division of residences, the provision of services and the identification of green spaces were only a few elements that architects considered to give a unique neighbourhood to the city and its citizens. In addition, designers also paid close attention to the predisposition of greenery, increasing the amount of bushes and shrubs in the area. "It can be legitimately stated that in Rome this is the first case of subsidized housing, in which not only a conceptual and formal architectural unity has been achieved, but also a complete cohesion between

---

<sup>8</sup> A.Cederna, *Mirabilia Urbis*, Turin, Einaudi, 1965, p.78

architecture and urban layout." The major problems that the city of Rome suffered in the twenty years following the Olympic event were determined by the absence of a general master plan and the absence of a global strategy, causing the following issues: 1. Traffic; 2. Public greenery; 3. Schools; 4. Public transport. Architectural and urban planning were mainly focused on some areas of the city, without any predisposition of urban integration elements.

Moreover, the failure to design an integrated transport system did not allow the city to have a dense network of infrastructures and transport in its future. According to sociological principles, schools and public greenery are the essential elements to form a neighbourhood, as they enhance community's interest. Social relationships that take place within the neighbourhoods tend to increase the sense of urban community and they allow to tie strong affiliations, supporting the development of one's own personality. The absence of schools or the absence of predisposition of the same, has brought to light a plan that has neglected the organic formation of individuals. These shortages in the housing organization also created psycho-social problems. The failure to implement a master plan, backed by the total lack of strategic planning, made the task of future urban planning administration very difficult. Managing a city without a master plan is not easy, as it indirectly precludes a strategic design that can guarantee the intangible success associated with the Olympic event.

The organization did not consider the sequential increase of the following elements: 1. Tourism; 2. Population; 3. Commercial activities. These are just some of the areas where

the strategic plan for the named city should be set up. The major dangers associated with the event will only manifest themselves in the decade after and, above all, citizens will suffer the direct consequences. However, by analysing the impact of the Rome Olympic Games in the coming years and studying the rules on public services and sport organizations, it can be said that the city managed to leave only a good memory to the participants and to the Olympic Committees. The Olympic Games in Rome are defined as the first major revolutionary Olympics in urban and structural terms, but urban transformation does not take into account the primary needs of the city and its citizens. The reality is that with the Olympics plan, any other choice that could have favoured the city of Rome was precluded.

### ***The 1992 Barcelona Olympic Games***

The Olympic Games held in Barcelona in 1992 have a completely different story. Although the organizing committee was inspired by the revolutionary model adopted by the 1960s Olympic Games in Rome, the Spanish Olympic project had a solid foundation in terms of urban planning and prior studies. The Barcelona project must be analysed through the historical periods that marked the origin of the “Barna” urban revolution. Barcelona suffered a major socio-economic crisis in the 1970s, which led to a 40% unemployment rate. The technological change and the energy crisis of 1973 had completely transformed the city and its citizens<sup>9</sup>. The Barcelona project will be analysed

---

<sup>9</sup> Capel H., *Capitalismo y morfología urbana en España*, Barcelona, Los libros de la Frontera, 1975, p.23

through four fundamental periods: 1. From the fall of Franchism to the first government; 2. 1980-1986, From the first democratic elections to the Olympic nomination; 3. 1986-1992, From the Olympic nomination to the dream of the XXVth Olympic Games in Barcelona; 4. 1992-2000, Planning a Great Metropolis.

The Barcelona Olympic project focused on urban renovation, on roads' reconstruction and of transport systems. The project prioritized interventions on infrastructure and communication routes that, at the time of the Olympic Games, were unable to contain the increase of registered vehicles number. The city of Barcelona needed great infrastructural works, and the Olympic Games were the end point of a project begun many years before<sup>10</sup>. In order to analyse in detail, the Barcelona Olympic Games project, it will be necessary to study the development plans which had been executed over the years preceding the Olympic Games, also taking into consideration the recent establishment of a democratic state.

Moreover, thanks to the structural interventions carried out by the organizing committee and the Olympic Games, the event served as a catalyst for a larger socio-urban transformation. Financially, it was realized through mixed management; with a 40% private participation and the remaining 60% of public participation. This mixed collaboration will also be promoted in the post-Olympic period, leaving new

---

<sup>10</sup> Borja J., Barcelona: un modelo de transformación urbana, 1980-1995, quinto programa de Gestión Urbana (PGU-LAC), 1995, p.54

management models and business philosophy legacy.

In addition to ensure economic and social profitability, the XXVth Olympics increased the following areas: 1. Associationism; 2. Public Renewal Projects; 3. Provision of parks, sports facilities and public spaces; 4. Political will of the State; 5. Nationalism. The Olympic project was focused on resolving the dynamics that were leading to a social division at micro and macro level.

Barcelona's candidature represented the "break-even point" for the urban fabric development of the city. The socio-structural crisis, the absence of infrastructure, the deficiency of sewers and primary services, the absence of health regulation, urban planning and sports regulations were just some of the problems in the city few years before the Olympic event.

The division of the four Olympic areas, connected through two circular rallies, will be one of the elements that will guarantee the city complete transformation. The project was conducted through mixed management, with the help of anonymous companies that were controlled by a large holding company: Barcelona Holding Olimpico S.A. (HOLSA). It was controlled by the Generalitat of Catalunya for 51% and the remaining 49% by the City of Barcelona<sup>11</sup>. The predefined companies were responsible for specific areas and they were also supported by the Municipal Urban Promotion Institute, which

---

<sup>11</sup> P.Subiros, "El Vol de la flexa, Barcelona 92, Cronica de la reinvenio de la ciutat", Elcta, 1992, p.62

was in charge of expropriations, sales and construction. Holding's lease was scheduled for 10 years, allowing the company to respect its financial obligation with customers and providers. The Games' management was a great success mainly for three fundamental reasons: 1. Mixed Economy; 2. Two-sector structure (Political, executive-administrative); 3. Maragall was the Committee Chairman. In addition, thanks to previous studies and to the 1976 Metropolitan General Plan, (PMG) the organizing committee was able to preserve areas and to realise specific detailed plans that fit into the city's fabric. The financing of the Olympic project, as noted, was guaranteed by a majority of public participation, realising projects involving various districts of the centre: the historic centre, the seafront and the urbanization of the four Olympic areas. The city of Barcelona exploited the Olympic Games in order to start those works that the city needed. The cultural activities allowed the city to regain an identity which seemed to have disappeared in the period before the Olympic event.

The entire project allowed the neighbouring cities to implement policies that integrate with the city of Barcelona and that respect the principles set by the 1976 Metropolitan Plan<sup>12</sup>. In this way, Catalan ideology will be the frame of the Olympic event. The Olympic event was assigned to the COOB92 '(Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games in Barcelona), responsible of organizing the Olympic event and athletes' services.

---

<sup>12</sup> CMB, Programa de actuacion, Barcelona, CMB, 1976

In this case, the COE (Spanish Olympic Comitee) did not guarantee any economic-administrative rights associated with the Olympic event. The “Generalitat” and the city council merged into HOLSA S.A., financially supporting the three big companies that managed and planned the great Olympic works and infrastructures: AOMSA (Anilla Olímpica de Montjuïc, SA); IMPUSA (Instituto Municipal de Promoción Urbanística, SA); VOSA (Vila Olímpica, SA). However, these private companies with public control created a new form of corporation, which made explicit the necessity of a new law with the purpose of respecting public principles. In addition, these companies were fully responsible for the sale of expropriated areas. The Barcelona event was heavily influenced by agreements between “Generalitat” and the City Council, which had never been fluid, until the inaugural ceremony. However, the city was provided with enormous public spaces, parks, sports facilities, new ways of communication, new means of transport and, above all, the revival of neighbourhoods and the city.

The city of Barcelona previously ruled the abusive nature left behind by the industrial crisis and emigration to Europe.

In addition, architects will be the real builders of the neighbourhood transformation, while the monumentalization of the city granted the optimal decoration of the public space, making it unique.

The revaluation of old buildings and unused buildings was delivered through culture: thanks to the driving force of culture, the new spaces will allow citizens to live a new

public place<sup>13</sup>.

Barcelona's Olympic project needs to be analysed through the “Cerde” plan and later through the plans prepared by “Corporació Metropolitana de Barcelona” (CMB):

- *Metropolitan General Plan 1976*
- *PERI*<sup>14</sup>
- *Hard squares*
- *Coastline Plan*
- *“Collserola” Plan*
- *ANC (new downtown)*<sup>15</sup>

The preparation of the aforementioned plans provided the city with a basis for drawing itself, taking into account the constraints and obligations imposed by the 1976 Metropolitan General Plan. The strategy used by the Organizing Committee was divided into three phases: 1. Olympic nomination; 2 XXVth Olympics; 3. Post-Olympics. In the phase before the Olympic nomination, the city of Barcelona sought to implement urban practices that would help to rebuild a lost identity and increase popular consensus for the Olympic event.

The application form submitted by the COE was supported by 40.000 volunteers; the

---

<sup>13</sup> M.Moragas, Barcelona:l’Herencia dels Jocs (1992-2002), CEO-UAB, 2002, p.365

<sup>14</sup> M.S.Morales, El proyecto Urbano, U.R, n. 5 y 6. Barcelona, 1988

<sup>15</sup> Ajuntament de Barcelona, Àrea de Nuevas Centrlitat 1987, p.207



only example in Olympic history. The organizing committee, after the nomination, began to change the scale of action on the city, contributing to the origin of a new metropolis.

The transformation was radical, the city saw the construction of new communications and transport routes, which connected it with neighbouring nations and regions, guaranteeing the city a new future. The Committee established guidelines and project levels, in order to ensure an optimal execution of urban policy. Whereas the council prepared a double organizational structure, able to direct the projects of the Olympic works and event.

The private company named “Barcelò Promociò Olimpique S.A.”, was responsible to find funding for the four major Olympic venues, in the post-Olympic period. The other sports facilities became of public use and, above all, they were owned by IMD. The city of Barcelona, thanks to the 1987 sports law and the 1990 national law, was able to take full advantage of the intangible values associated with the Olympic event.

In this way, the event became the promoter of a sports culture that increased the city sports practice by 51% the year after. Citizens will be able to exploit the four Olympic districts' legacy: 1. Poble Nou; 2. Vall d'Hebron; 3. Montjuic; 4. Diagonal. In addition, as a support during the Olympic event, seven new high-tech venues were realised on the regional territory.

The sports facilities program was entrusted to a group of urbanists who in 1982 carried out a study on the requirements that the structures had to comply with. 1. The

investment was to ensure real and concrete needs, providing also for its later use; 2. The works had to be built in areas lacking of sports facilities, so that they could have a key impact on the regeneration of urbanism and territorial balance.

The Barcelona Olympic project or, to better define it, the city planning project of the city of Barcelona, needs to be analysed through some critical points, identified during the post-Olympic event: 1. Density; 2. Speculative building; 3. The decline in public greenery; 4. Modern architecture; 5. Concentration of sports facilities.

These problems continue to persist today. Considering also the new design proposals implemented by the council of Barcelona, it can be surely stated that tourism and the advent of international companies have changed the design scale again, and, above all, the goals to be achieved in the long term. However, the XXVth Olympics project focused on the following development points: 1. Renovation of the city; 2. Recovery of existing spaces; 3. Definition of Olympic areas; 4. Integration of the city; 5. Urban Reconstruction; 6. Large projects with European funds. After the planning, organization and construction of sports facilities, a regulation concerning the management of municipal sports facilities was adopted, so that maximum benefit could be gained.

The Olympic project was only part of the greater urban reorganization project that the city had to face in order to counter the previous industrial crisis.

The Olympic Games were just a tool to find the funds needed to complete the work. The council, headed by Maragall (Mayor of Barcelona), always made decisions that could

have helped the population in later years, exploiting an intangible legacy that was never observed before. Urban intervention involving the city of Barcelona is considered to be the largest urban project carried out by a European city in the 1990s<sup>16</sup>.

Today, thanks to the planned works, the city is very well exploiting the Olympic legacy, and citizens can make full use of all facilities made for the Olympic Games. The mixed economy of Barcelona has undoubtedly guaranteed the right financial flexibility for the autonomous companies established before the Olympic event. So, I claim that the Olympic Games allowed Cataluña and the city of Barcelona to differentiate themselves from the Iberian Peninsula, by implementing cultural policies that ensured the promotion of popular practises and traditions.

This intangible element can be considered one of the key factors that guaranteed the success of the Olympic event and the resulting wave of tourists to the city. The Spanish legislation, concerning public and sport services, was another reason for the success of the event, as the independence of autonomous communities allowed greater efficiency in terms of management and coordination of sports activities.

*The 13 elements or aspects to be considered for the Olympic event*

**I. Institutional agreements**

**II. Mixed Economy**

---

<sup>16</sup> Moragas M., y B.M., Las Claves del éxito: impactos sociales, deportivos, económicos y comunicativos de Barcelona '92, CEO-UAB 1995, p.16

- III. Distinguished organizations for each level of responsibility
- IV. Investment Plan (Concentric Principles)
- V. Strategic management (maximization and minimization)
- VI. Excellence in terms of organizing the event, users' feedback
- VII. Strategic Planning (Post Period)
- VIII. City legacy (Olympic venues)
- IX. Continuity in investment and project to keep the Market positioning
- X. Transportation
- XI. Urbanism and architecture
- XII. Environment
- XIII. Sporting Law and Public Services

### **Analysis of the 17th Rome Olympic Games of 1960**

1. **Institutional Agreements** → The Rome Olympic Games were supported by institutional collaboration between different organizations. The Eur organization, the CONI and the central government. While, for the transport and communication system, the State cooperated strictly with the capital transport company and with ANAS.
2. **Mixed Economy** → In the 1960s it was unthinkable to organize an Olympic event with a private participation.

3. **Distinctive Bodies** → The central government and the council took care of the infrastructure necessary for the Olympic event. The EUR agency assumed full responsibility and expropriation independence of the entire area of the EUR. The CONI provided instruction for the Olympic venues and it was also identified as the responsible subject of the Olympic event. INCIS took care of the construction and of the following Olympic Village's sale. However, the greatest responsibilities and benefits were central Government's exclusive.
4. **Investment Plan** → The absence of an inversion plan did not allow the city of Rome to get advantage of concentricity's and flows resulting from the interdependence relationships between the neighbourhoods and the infrastructures set up. The absence of responsibilities division and of a masterplan has caused social-urban problems difficult to eliminate. The Olympic way remains the exemplary evidence of the concentration absence between planned interventions.
5. **Strategic management** → Failure to have a planning meant that the organizing committee was facing financial and structural problems. Failure to analyse the areas and citizens needs has meant that works were planned to accommodate the expropriation interests, due to the absence of a masterplan. The "Foro Italico" and the EUR, fortunately, had a 30-years masterplan, defined by the fascist party. The absence of a plan for the city, and of detailed plans for neighbourhoods, had been seen as one of the counter-productive

elements for the event and for the primary needs citizens. In the aftermath of the Olympic Games, the communication channels were drastically changed, due to the lack of canopies provision, sidewalks and reserved lanes for buses. The roads had remained the same from the Fascist government, with the slight exception of the Olympic Route and East Axis, the worst works ever carried out in the capital. To date, both routes designed for the Olympic Games are considered as the city's busiest routes. Trains and public transport experienced the same changes, the city of Rome began to coexist with public works from this moment. The absence of a strategy has become a peculiar feature of the council's administration.

6. **Excellency**→ The city of Rome received congratulations from international press and participants. Mass media support and live television allowed the city to show the world its wonders. The location of the events and the architectural interventions, made by the best rationalist architects in the world, were key elements for the Olympic success that the city had been enjoying over the years.
7. **Strategic Planning**→ The lack of planning in the post-Olympics is due to the lack of strategy and synergy between the bodies involved. No project for the post-Olympics era was drawn up to exploit its intangible values. This was crucial for the failure of sporting practice on the territory. Eventually, sporting venues became on property of the CONI and the EUR.

8. **Olympic Legacy** → It can be found within the areas of the “Foro Italico” and the EUR. Citizens and the city enjoyed avant-garde architecture without being able to take advantage of the facilities associated with it. The exclusive use of Olympic venues at the Italian Olympic Committee considerably reduced the possibilities to develop sports practice within the city. The architecture of sports facilities will be an indispensable element providing the city with an intangible heritage over time.
9. **Investments Consistency** → In later years, the administration was committed to modify the previously taken choices. The chaos and discontinuity of interventions also reigned in the post-Olympic period, reducing the chances of optimal development for the city.
10. **Transportation** → The Olympic Games in Rome were designed for private transport, reducing public transport. Many tram lines were dismantled to allow space for new communication routes. However, in the period following the event, the city needed new works to rebuild the public transport system and the communication channels.
11. **Urbanism and Architecture** → The fabric of the city was completely revolutionized, but the absence of a general masterplan did not guarantee any benefit for the citizens. The lack of zoning and parcelling has strongly affected the urban expansion project for the city. The choices adopted by the Commission and the council are constantly contradicting modern urban

principles. However, the collaboration of the best rationalist architects in the world succeeded in securing works made of marble and with the utmost respect for rationalist style. These works will give the city of Rome an incredible architecture, and the Olympic Village of Rome will be an inspiration model for residential architecture in the 70s and 80s, not only in Italy but also in the rest of Europe.

12. **Environment** → The environment was not preserved at all; the Olympic project was left in the hands of the private and church decisions and choices. The exploitation of the highest building did not allow for the protection of natural areas. The Olympic Route divided a public park into two to ensure the expropriation of the adjacent areas. Its design and its course are totally against the respect of nature. Moreover, the Olympic route destroyed a whole natural reserve in the heart of Rome.
13. **Italian Legislation** → The absence of a sport ministry, with responsibility for promotion and development, has prevented Italian sports evolution. In addition, the non-existence of territorial organizations, responsible for sporting facilities, has not been able to optimize resources and to reduce the chances of the Olympic Impact. The sale of sports facilities to CONI has drastically reduced hopes for the evolution of sport in Italy. Moreover, the absence of predisposition of organizational models has definitely not stimulated the management and promotion of sport in the nation.



## **Analysis of the XXV Edition of the 1992 Barcelona Olympic Games**

1. **Institutional Agreements**→ The institutional arrangements between the various public figures involved in this Olympic project, have created a unique, one-of-a-kind cohesion among its entities. Federations were involved in setting up Olympic venues and competitions, while the Olympic Committee was responsible to implement marketing policies with Spanish sponsors and to fund the promotion and practice of Spanish Olympic sports. Choosing to assign the Organizing Committee responsibility to Mayor Maragall has provided an intangible element, which allowed greater co-operation between the entities involved.
2. **Mixed economy**→ The economic and financial organization was achieved through the mixed economy model. The Organizing Committee, after the Olympic nomination, began to set up private companies with public capital, dividing the project responsibilities between the various agencies and thus allowing a faster bureaucracy. Public participation will be greater due to the great structural and infrastructural works needed to reconstruct the city. Public participation in the Olympic project, as noted, was guaranteed by the cooperation of the three main public administrations: the city council, the “Generalitat” and the central government. Furthermore, the Committee also

- involved the state-owned telecommunications company "Telefonica", working as a provider of appropriate tools and technologies for the development of new communication systems. In this way public revenue will be 60% while private entities will finance 40% of the entire project.
3. **Distinctive Bodies**→ The Organizing Committee provided various organisations, in order to enable each of them to efficiently organize and plan Olympic works. HOLSA, owned by the Central Government and the council of Barcelona, was responsible for the financial resources of the entire Olympic project, participating with the 100% in two private companies: the AOMSA and the VOSA. In this way, VOSA could guarantee the construction and subsequent sale of the residences planned for the Olympic Village. VOSA was also managed by NISA, a private joint venture enterprise. The project design of municipal infrastructure and public works was entrusted to the Municipal Urban Promotion Institute (IMPU), which was later transformed into a private company to speed up bureaucratic practices involving the expropriation and the sale of the areas. While "Generalitat" predisposed interventions through the GISA company. Finally, the port was entrusted to the company POBASA, also a joint venture company.
  4. **Investment plan**→ The inversion plan adopted by the organizing committee was based on the "concentration" of the interventions. The division of the areas and the following division of responsibilities was a key choice for the layout of urban

works. The main difficulty lies in communication between them and in the coordination of expansion projects. Municipalities around the city and municipal service companies had to cooperate efficiently to allow for concentration of flows. The citizens' organisations were incorporated inside the global project and they were also responsible for the modernization of regional and provincial infrastructures;

5. **Strategic management** → The project design of infrastructures and structures was planned thanks to the urban plans prepared by CMB, PERI and PNC. Project management was supported by previous studies and could therefore guarantee interventions, respecting the degrees of priority. The council, in order to face the change in the intervention scale, prepared the works dividing it in three distinct design moments: before the event, during the event, after the event. Marketing and commercialization of broadcasting rights, supported by the ADO program and the Olympic marketing, allowed the committee to have the necessary resources for the Olympic event. The Organizing Committee was supported also by the involved citizens and volunteers. The citizen's consent to the project and to the event is a very important element, considering the future coexistence of the same with the new works.
6. **Excellence** → The established companies allowed the COOB 92 and the COE to receive compliments from the entire Olympic world for organizational efficiency. The Olympic event entrusted to the COOB 92 provided a better

management of activities and services for the participants' delegations. Opening and closing ceremonies were so spectacular to be remembered today because of their impact on viewers. The Olympic ceremony tended to express Catalan culture in the world and also sought to eliminate the Spanish stereotypes imposed by modern society. Olympic activities and activities will be a beautiful frame for the Olympic event.

7. **Strategic Planning**→ The Organization Committee, after the Olympic nomination and the establishment of the companies responsible for the Olympic project, appointed a committee in 1988 to prepare the strategic project for the post-Olympic period. The project was drafted with the participation of the major stakeholders involved in the Olympic project, in order to ensure a joint evolutionary process between public and private organizations. In 1990, the Barcelona 2000 project was prepared in collaboration with 150 entities and it was updated in 1993 with Barcelona 2000 Part II. In 1993, through the annual analysis of the proposed plan impact, the council proposed the drafting of a new plan, given the geopolitical changes that were characterizing the World.
8. **Olympic Legacy**→ Barcelona has received new structures and infrastructures, which are the most prominent Olympic legacy, accessible to all citizens. The transformation of the transport network, the division of the zones and the integration of the neighbourhoods triggered an improvement in the psycho-social status of each individual. The opening to the sea and the newly acquired

- seafront have guaranteed the city a new image in the world, allowing tourism to become the maximum intangible value associated with the event.
9. **Investment Consistency**→ In the post-Olympic period the continuity of investments is another crucial element to preserve structures and infrastructures. The city, in collaboration with the Central State and private companies, drafted new projects and new expansion measures for the city. The drafting of twenty years Plans such as Barcelona @ 22 had been essential to ensure a shift, which is divided by intervention scales. The consistency of State's investments has been increasing the confidence of foreign companies in the city.
  10. **Transport**→ The transport and sewerage systems were the first interventions made by the council. The train system, managed by the region and the Central State, has changed dramatically, allowing greater planning freedom and greater speed. The road system was adapted and enhanced in a way that significantly reduced the weight of city traffic on the centre, i.e. "Ronda". The regional road system was expanded too, in order to improve communications with nearby states and regions.
  11. **Urbanism and Architecture**→ The Barcelona project was made respecting some very important urban planning constraints: the 1976 masterplan and the ANC. Internal reform plans and the policy of hard squares acted as promoters for the new construction philosophy. The presence of ANC has simplified the project at urban level and the choice of areas was supported by the transformation of the

urban transport system. Architectural design could be defined with a rationalistic base and a modernist apex. The Olympic port and the Poble Nou district are the true centre of architectural revolution.

12. **Environment** → The city of Barcelona proposed a plan that guaranteed the protection of the areas, identifying various environmental boundaries. The areas of Montjuic and Collserola Park, which were the areas with the greatest risks of speculation by individuals, have been preserved and enhanced in terms of cultural programs.
13. **Spanish legislation** → Thanks to the normative autonomy -within each autonomous community- supported by the regulations on sport and public services, Spain has been able to spread the practice and the promotion of sport within the city. The presence of the Ministry of Sport and the IMD was very important for the management of sports venues in the post-Olympic period. The Barcelona City Council carried out sports centre's divisions addressed to each market segment, in all the city's neighbourhoods.

## **Conclusion**

As observed, both Olympic events have led to drastic urban changes triggering several results over the years. Since the Olympic Games have been less revolutionary over the years, to this days, the Olympic trend implies that the designated cities should carry out a project that encompasses a structural and infrastructural revolution, respecting the

standards required by international tourism. During the XXVth Olympic Games of Barcelona, the presence of *special* contractual models dedicated to both culture and sport have been revolutionary to the evolution of sport and physical activity within the city and the region. The management models, proposed for the management of public's sports venues, were a key element in providing their citizens with the opportunity to practice sport as a means of psycho-social integration. Environmental knowledge is of fundamental importance for the masterplan. Failure to set up an efficient masterplan will fail to secure the benefits associated with strategic planning. Brunet's argument, which focuses on generating a positive impact on host cities is, hence, incomplete. In fact, he does not take into account some crucial aspects as highlighted in this research, such as: environmental impact, sport and public service normative, public and mixed management models, architectural models and urban planning. The environmental impact should be one of the key factors necessary to respect the landscape and the integration of new structures and infrastructures. Agenda 21 and Agenda 2020 (ONU,1992,2009)) have sought to set guidelines to reduce the environmental impact. Sport normative is the basis for the division of responsibilities in the promotion and sport practice field, and it must be in the hands of the council, being it the only person responsible for the right to sport on the territory. Public service management and mixed management models have to comply with the European competition rules, otherwise they will become "special and temporary" organization models, risking corruption and bankruptcy. In addition, according to the findings of this

research, urban and architectural planning should respond to the needs of citizens and, above all, it should take into account a flow of new people coming into the city in the post-Olympic period. The offer of services and means of transport will have to meet the expectations of international tourists who will be the "pro-consumers" of the city. The infrastructure system will need to be integrated within the strategic plan in order to exploit the maximum synergies. The management and organization of the Olympic event is not simple, especially in consideration of the guidelines provided by the IOC that are not able to limit the negative impact the Games may have on the city and on its national economy as a consequence. The examples of Athens and Montreal are the evidence that, in the future, the IOC should envisage new guidelines to benefit the committee and the Olympic application dossier. States should not propose small-scale Olympic Games -except for re-entering cities- given that media impact and economic interests would only be an economic loss. It is suggested that the candidate city will definitely have to set up its own brand, by dividing it in various advertising and sponsorship campaigns and by leveraging the benefits associated with international advertising before and after the Olympic event.

Cultural, congressional and sports activities, national and international, will have to promote the city to ensure international visibility and attractiveness for international investment. These opportunities, associated with the promotion of the city, supported by technology and communications, can lead to the emergence of new economies,



guaranteeing new cash flows for the city and for the event, in the post-Olympic period. The 13 points, outlined above, aim to provide comprehensive guidelines, with the purpose of carrying out a prior analysis on the candidate cities. Respecting these points and applying tangible strategies will greatly limit the chances of economic problems, as encountered in Rome. In conclusion, the contrasts between the local and the global scale will always be at the centre of the city's problems, both before and after the Olympics. In order to limit the negative impact associated with the event, the International Olympic Committee should provide, every four years, updated guidelines that are easily comprehensible by all States, to allow more Olympic applications; thus, attracting new States to the project of promoting the Olympics in the world. To this date, more and more states renounce the nomination or do not deliver the final dossier, implying the beginning of a new Olympic trend. Because of the impact and the audience, the summer event has a greater appeal than winter games, especially considering the structures to be prepared, requiring great maintenance costs and a sporting practice already developed. Over time, private companies such as PWC and LEED provided specific guidelines for each field of action, but the responsibility still lies within the International Olympic Committee.

### **Bibliography**

Ajuntament de Barcelona, (1987). “Àrea de Relacions Ciutadanes, *Àrees de nova centralitat*”. Ajuntament de Barcelona.

- Andrew K. Rose and Mark M. Spiegel. (2009). “*The Olympic Effect*”. National Bureau of Economic Research, Federal Bank.
- Archibugi F., (2004). “*Rome. A new Planning Strategy*”. (1rd. ed.). Routledge, London,
- Borja J., (1995). “*Barcelona:un modelo de transformación urbana*”. 1980-1995, PGU-LAC.
- Borja, J., & Muxi, Z. (2004). “*Urbanismo en el siglo XXI. Bilbao, Madrid, Valencia, Barcelona*”.UPC.
- Brunet F. (1994). “*Economía de los Juegos Olímpicos*”. UAB-CEO.
- Brunet, F. (1995) “*An economic analysis of the Barcelona’92 Olympic Games: resources, financing, and impacts*”Centre d’Estudis Olímpics.
- Burbank, M.J., Andranovich, G.D., and Heying, C.H., (2001). “*Olympic dreams: lessons learned from mega-events politics Boulder*”, Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Capel H., (1975). “*Capitalismo y morfología urbana en espana*” (1rd. ed.). Amelia Romero.
- CE, “*Trattato di Lisbona*” (2007).
- Cederna A., (1965). “*Mirabilia Urbis*”. Einaudi.
- CHORE, (2007). “*Multi-stakeholder guidelines on mega-events and the protection and promotion of housing rights*”.
- Clark, G., (2008). “*Local Development Benefits from Staging Global Events*”. OECD.
- CMB, (1976). “*Programa de actuación*”. CMB.

- CMB. (1987). “*Pla de costes: proposta d’ordenació de la zona costanera metropolitana de Barcelona*”. CMB.
- De Carlo M., Sainaghi R. (2003). “*Destination management e grandi eventi sportivi*”. *Economia & management*, n.6.
- Della Seta P., (1963). “*Il piano regolatore di Roma*”. Editori Riuniti.
- Dickinson R., (1963). “*The West European City. A Geographical Interpretation*”. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- DOCG n.898, 5/10 del 1987. Generalitat de Catalunya
- Frey, M. I., (2007). “*The impact of wide-scale sport events on local development: an assessment of the XXth Torino olympics through the sustainability report*”. IEFÉ.
- Furitano G., (1963). “*Il nuovo progetto del Piano Regolatore Generale di Roma*”, *Capitolium*, XXXVIII.
- Furrer, P., (2002). “*Sustainable Olympic Games: A Dream or a Reality?*”. *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, VII/4.
- Gratton C., (2008). P. H. , “*Maximizing Olympic Impacts by Building Up Legacies*”. *The international journal of the history of sport*.
- Gratton, C., & Henry, I. , (2001). “*Sport in the City*”. New York: Routledge.
- Gutmann A., (1986). “*Sports Spectators*”, Columbia University Press.
- HOLSA, (1992). “*Barcelona Olimpica, La ciudad Renovada, La gran transformacion urbana de Barcelona*”. *Ambit serveis editorials*.
- Insolera I., (1971). “*Roma Moderna*”. Einaudi.

- Kaspar, R., (1998). “*Sport, Environment and Culture*”. Olympic Review.
- Le Corbusier, (1942). “*Principio de Urbanismo*”. Ariel.
- Lenskyi, H., (2002). “*Games ignore locals*”. Vancouver Courier.
- Ley n. 8, 1987. Generalitat de Catalunya.
- M.Moragas, (2002). “*Barcelona:l’Herencia dels Jocs*”. UAB-CEO.
- M.S.Morales, (1988). “*El proyecto Urbano*”.U.R. n. 5 y 6.
- Macho L.M., (1999). “*Los Servicios Publicos y el Regimen Juridico de los Usuarios*”. CEDECS.
- Malaret E. i Garcia, (1992). “*Publico y privado en la organizacio de los Juegos Olimpicos de Barcelona 1992*”. Cuadernos Civitas.
- Manieri E.M., (1960). “*Olimpiadi e Miliardi*”. Urbanistica.
- Moragas M., y B.M., (1995). “*Las Claves del éxito: impactos sociales, deportivos, económicos y comunicativos de Barcelona ’92*”. CEO-UAB.
- Morbelli G., (1997). “*Città e piani d’europa*”. Dedalo.
- ONU. (1992). “*Agenda 21*”. ONU
- Paquette, J., (2011). “*The Interpretation of Environmental Sustainability by the International Olympic Committee and Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games from 1994 to 2008*”. Sport in Society, Vol. 14(3).
- Preuss, H., (2000). “*Economics of the Olympic Games: hosting the Games 1972 – 2000*”. University of Germany.

Preuss, H., (2004). “*The Economics of Staging the Olympics: A Comparison of the Games 1972–2008*”. Edward Elgar Pub.

Ritchie, J.R., (2000). “*Turning 16 Days Into 16 Years Through Olympic Legacies*”. Event Management. Volume 6(3).

Subiros P., (1992). “*El Vol de la flexa, Barcelona 92, Cronica de la reinvenio de la ciutat*”. Electa.

Theodoraki, E., (2007). “*Olympic Event Organization*”. Elsevier.