

The urban planning requirements of cultural conservation policy

by **Prof. Franco Archibugi**

Background Note

for a Planning Studies Centre *Symposium within the EU "Raphael Programme"*

Rome, April 1998

1. Premise

In the recent reflexions developed around the effectiveness of various policies oriented to a better protection and valorisation of a country (or region, or city) cultural heritage and goods, more and more evident the conviction is emerged that, either in the case of "natural" heritage either in the case of "antropic-historical" heritage, their strong degradation and their missed valorisation, is connected with the lack (or wrong and inappropriate presence) of a land-use or environmental policy (at different scales: national, regional, urban, and so on).

This conviction, largely shared, has been supported partly by a certain number of empiric enquiries, partly has been the result of a cognitive presumption for any further research or reflection.

This presumption has had an impact in the past (in Italy and as well in others western countries, especially European) on the birth and development of some research lines oriented to two goals:

- the identification of the connections between the degradation/valorisation problem of the cultural heritage and goods *and* the land-use and environmental planning;
- the study of which principles, parameters, of organisation of the land use and environment could be considered suitable, moreover a "condition", of an active, balanced (degradation/valorisation) management of the cultural heritage and goods.

2. The "Quadroter" Project

Particularly in Italy, this research orientation has been implemented in the recent years, in the framework of a cooperation of the Ministry of the Environment and the National Research Council (Cnr).

It began with the launching from the Cnr, on the base of a financial convention with the Ministry of Environment of a research "strategic project"¹, named "Quadroter"².

The Quadroter Project had a scope much more large and complex than the two goals above indicated, but it is arrived also to certain conclusions (in matter of land-use strategy and policy) concerning the two above goals. And, moreover, it has had, as result, the identification - for the entire national territory - of the modalities for a first implementation of the guide-ideas concerning the two above objectives (emerged by the reflection and the researches)³.

In the attached annexe it is possible to find a short description of the guide-ideas resulting from the study (by the Planning Studies Centre, 1994) about the two objective above indicated. Otherwise, this guide-ideas about those two objectives are the output of a general analysis for a environmental policy developed - as said - by the Quadroter project (and namely for it by the *Planning Studies Centre*), concerning the entire "urban" strategy at national scale.⁴ And the "cultural heritage" solution has been seen as connected to the "urban quality" solution through the institution of the "Urban Eco-system", in which the cultural heritage solution should be "framed" (in order to achieve the appropriate solution). This special vision from Quadroter of the urban quality/cultural heritage connexions, is illustrated by the same Note in Annexe.

¹It has been denominated officially in such way a family of research projects of the Cnr, expressly oriented to certain policy fields of public interest.

²This is the acronym for "*Quadro territoriale di riferimento per la politica ambientale*" [Territorial Reference Framework for the Environmental Policy]. The coordinator of the Project was Prof. Franco Archibugi.

³This part of Quadroter has been developed with a contract with the "Planning Studies Centre" of Rome, the same subject of this actual European initiative within the Raphael Programme.

⁴This strategy of Quadroter Project has been adopted by the Ministry of Environment's Ten-year Plan for Environment (named "Decamb"), which include an "urban environment programme" based on the creation of 37 Urban Ecosystems in the country. This general frame has been described of course in several reports and publications, unfortunately only in italian language. Very short descriptions in english are available in two chapters of the F.Archibugi's book, *The Ecological City and the City Effect* (Ashgave, London 1997), Chapt. 8 (Quadroter) and Chapt. 9 (the Decamb programme on the Urban Ecosystem).

(It may be important to know that the entire philosophy and methodology of the Quadroter Project and its strategy to create Urban Ecosystem to orient the Land-use and Environmental Policy at national level, has had the occasion to be evaluated and, in certain way, applied in other three European countries (France, Germany and UK), by a European research supported by the 4th Frame Research Program of the EU, (managed by the Commission DgXII) by a special multinational team of the Planning Studies Centre (the author of the Italian research within Quadroter and Decamb) to which have attended and belonged some British, French and German research institutions.⁵ However, this first approach at European scale to evaluate and test the Quadroter urban approach has not been extended to the Quadroter proposal about the cultural heritage case).

3. The Raphael Program and the Symposium Subject

The Raphael Program of the European Union (managed by the Commission DGX), has offered the opportunity to discuss at European level, the result of the Quadroter Projects and to develop furtherly with a Symposium the way to test the economic and general validity of the land-use approach suggested by the Quadroter projects. The available resources do not allow further specific researches, but they allow an intellectual and scientific exchange among expert on the subject.

The first target of the Psc proposal to the Raphael funding was to develop among several European research institutions in the field of city and land-use planning about the theme of the *"urban planning requirements of a cultural heritage conservation policy"*. (In Appendix 1, people can find the text of the Psc proposal).

The second, concomitant, target of the Psc proposal to the Raphael funding concerned *to put the Italian experience under a series of assessment from experts coming from other planning experience*, and eventually - if it occurs - *under a comparison with other planning experiences*.

⁵The report of these research is forthcoming in English (eds. F.Archibugi et al.) by Ashgate, Intern. Publisher, London, under the title: *The urban eco-systems in Europe: toward a European urban systems concept and strategy*. An abridged text of the research report, can be found in the Web page of the "Planning Studies Centre": www.planninstudies.org.

In order to pursue these targets, the Psc have propose a International Symposium, open to a large participation of experts and scholars interested to give a contribution to the development of the theme.

The Psc has created a European team of leading experts in the cultural heritage evaluation connected to planning experience, that act as Steering Committee of the Symposium.

And under the preparation of few background papers from this team of expert, another college of ten well-know experts (suggested by the Steering Committee) will be invited to exprime their opinion on the topics of the backgrounds paper and reporting eventually on other significant experiences.

4. Backround Questions for the Raphael Symposium

As said, the premise on which the initiative of the Psc is based is that the conservation and valorisation of the cultural heritage can be much improved through a *appropriate land use and territorial land use planning and organization*.

Therefore the reflexion that has been commiteed - via its own proposal - by the European Union Raphael Programme to the Psc , is on a list of questions which can ordered in the following terms.

A. General:

1. In which way the *cultural heritage value* can be defined and classified in its different issues and items?
2. In which way - gived the differents items (about No.A1) - the cultural heritage value can be *measured*?
3. Consequently, in which way it would be possible to define and establish *policies and programmes* suitable to aknowledge and implement it?
4. Give the policies and programmes (of No.A3), how can we introduce *modalities of assessment* of their objectives?
5. Which kind of *indicators* we could use to measure and monitor their achievements?

B. The cultural-heritage and its environment

- i) Which kind of interrelationship we can establish between a cultural heritage value and its *territorial environment*?
- ii) Which kind of *phenomenons, or variables, or indicators*, can be assumed as expression of the *interrelationship* (of No.B1) between cultural heritage and its territorial environment?
- iii) And, consequently, in which way the land-use planning can have an impact on a conservation and valorisation policy of the cultural heritage? And which kind of impact? economic?, technical? organisational?
- iv) There are certain categories of cultural heritage properties that are subject to different (and conflicting) impacts in front to possible conservation and valorisation policies? And if yes, how to articulate these differences by category of property?.
- v) There are good examples of implementation of a land-use planning with positive results on conservation and valorisation policies? (Or, simply, to be example of the modalities under para B3 and B4?).
- vi) Is it appropriate, suitable, and faisable to assume a *mix* of cultural heritage characters, belonging to a territorial place as instrument to conceive and define a *Cultural-heritage Territorial Unit* as the *Utras* (Italian Quadroter experience)? In which extension this application is possible?
- vii) If yes, how is possible to *list* the *requirements* to become a *Cultural-heritage Territorial Unit*?
- viii) It is possible, suitable etc. to define an apriori mix of characters to be assumed as minimum requirement for the identification of a *Cultural-heritage Territorial Unit* ?

C. Policies and policy evaluation for the cultural heritage territorial Units

- a. Given the possibility and opportunity to conceive and define the *cultural heritage territorial Units*, why and how they can be used as tools for a conservation/valorisation public policy? i.e. in which way they can become *Cultural-heritage Territorial Conservation and Valorisation Units*, (Chtcvu or Utras)?
- b. Which kind of institutions could be involved in elaborating a

- general policy for cultural heritage territorial Units, and a specific policy for each defined Unit?
- c. It would be suitable to create a special managerial authority for each Unit?
 - d. Which kind of policies can we apply to implement these Units? i.e. which kind of policies we can list and expound as implementation of a conservation and valorisation policy for these Units?
 - e. In which way we can suggest to measure the conservation and valorisation objectives of such Units? Which kind of role could it play the value of land, and its variations, as indicator of the success of the conservation/valorisation policies in such Units?
 - f. here are cost and costless policies and measures for the implementation of these Units? How to measure the costs and the benefits of such policies?
 - g. And consequently, how to evaluate the results of these policies in face of the cost for implement them?
 - h. In which way, should be possible associate private interests to the conservation/valorisation policies? In which way could it possible to share, between private and public subjects, the costs and the benefits of the implementation policies ?
 - i. Conclusively, would be possible to suggest some action guidelines for central governments and for the eventual individual unit's managerial authorities? May we sketch such guidelines?