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Two Italian schools of thought regarding the landscape

1. Protecting the landscape as a great “outdoor museum” of recognized aesthetic and natural value

2. Activating management strategies aimed at sustainability and the quality of transformations.
The first school of thought has dominated on the legislative level

- The “Galasso Law” of 1985
The Italian experience in implementing the ELC is rich in innovative practices

Examples from:
1. A past regional experience that has tested interesting tools and ways of approaching the landscape

2. A regional landscape plans currently under development

3. A local plan, which is experimenting with innovative paths in search of greater operability, revealing fresh regulatory and design content.
New perspectives for the Italian landscape are emerging, in particular:

- interest in an integrated, multi-level approach in landscape planning and design;

- searching for a mutual relationship and collaboration between different planning levels;

- new ways of negotiating between the different sectors of public administration;

- activating participatory processes and knowledge of the territory, growing awareness of the landscape by all local players.
Some interesting experiences:

- the “Conca Project” in the Region of Emilia-Romagna;
- the Landscape Plan (PPR) in the Region of Umbria;
- a local plan: the PSC (Municipal Structural Plan) in Reggio Emilia.
This project is a good example of concrete experimentation that goes beyond the defensive and immobile approach of the PTPR (Regional Landscape Territorial Plan) in favour of identifying and constructing landscape values that are shared by local communities.
The project identifies and refines territorial strategies and guidelines for territorial landscape development, defining:

- *characteristic landscape systems*;

- *protected natural and cultural contexts of particular landscape prestige*;

- *degraded and compromised landscape areas*;

- *improvement/management areas* to qualify tourism and develop citizen services for inter-community areas;

- *active protection experiments* to improve the cultural and environmental heritage;

- an experimental *pilot action* to improve the valley (the Main Green Ring of the Conca (GAV)).
Changes of the landscape approach:

a) Emphasis has shifted from protection to landscape planning;

b) attention is no longer focused on immediate property but on territorial relationships;

c) The normative approach has changed into a search for measures and rules for landscape enhancement.
From an operational point of view, the PPR:

- defines the approaches, the combination of criteria, and the instruments to evaluate transformations;

- dictates measures to correctly integrate urban-planning previsions and intervention projects on different planning scales within the landscape;

- promotes specific projects for the landscape with the aim of enhancing particular unique contexts of strategic value;

- defines the specific responsibilities to be assigned to each level of territorial government.
The landscape aspect is not often directly considered by the plan. There are no deliberate transformations of the landscape, but only effects, the fruit of the indirect success of planned interventions over time.

The innovations of the have changed attitudes and intentions for a project in such a way that transformations are clearly enunciated and become deliberate, conscious landscape transformations.
The landscape project, the basic element of the PSC, is organised in three parts:

- “strategic areas”;
- “landscape system”;
- “focus points”.
a) The “strategic landscape areas”: the basic reference unit for defining the objectives of landscape quality and general indications for future territorial transformations and identifying the planning aim of each area.

b) The “landscape systems”: divided into “systems of active protection” (of meaningful components and relationships to be safeguarded and developed) and “planning systems” (guidelines that stipulate specific actions and projects).

c) The “planning focus points”: specific planning areas to be investigated further in the implementation phase.
Conclusions

Italy now does not plan *more* but rather plan *better*, ensuring that the landscape does not become a separate entity, but the object itself of territorial and urban planning.

What is the role that can be attributed to the landscape in redefining planning and territorial management levels?

**My proposal for landscape planning in Italy:**

- Assign a new role to a renewed intermediate level of territorial government (a new territorial plan or a plan by the union of municipalities);

- regulate and of correctly insert transformations within the landscape in the local plan;

- formulate “visions” of landscape, which can activate participatory processes for the construction of local development agreements.
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