



ECOLOGICALLY-COMPATIBLE URBAN PLANNING

Designing a Healthier Environment

Stefano Salata



ECOLOGICALLY-
COMPATIBLE URBAN
PLANNING

This page intentionally left blank

ECOLOGICALLY- COMPATIBLE URBAN PLANNING

Designing a Healthier
Environment

STEFANO SALATA



United Kingdom – North America – Japan – India
Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2019

© 2019 Stefano Salata

Published under exclusive licence by Emerald Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78973-784-4 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78973-783-7 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78973-785-1 (Epub)



ISOQAR

REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>About the Author</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xix</i>
<i>General Introduction</i>	<i>xxi</i>
Part 1: Planning in the Contemporary City: Do Urban Plans Still Matter?	1
Introduction	3
1. The Contemporary City	7
1.1 Climate Change and Resilience	11
1.1.1 What Is Resilience?	17
1.2 Ecosystem Service Drives Change	19
2. Towards the Paradigm of 'Eco-systemic Planning'	27
2.1 Ecosystem Services for Urban Planning	30
2.1.1 The Crucial Role of Mapping	37
2.2 Ecosystem Services for Green Infrastructures	39
3. Eco-systemic Planning Reform	45
3.1 Ecology as a Cultural Mainstream	46
3.2 Methodology	49
3.2.1 Reducing the Variables	50
3.2.2 Data Interpretation	53
3.3 An Agenda for Urban Planning	55

Part 2: Acquiring New Competencies	59
Introduction	61
4. Ecosystem Service Mapping in Land Use Plans:	
Modelling with InVEST	63
4.1 On Mapping Tools and Their Possible Utilisation	69
4.2 Introduction to Modelling	74
4.2.1 Mapping the Ecosystem Services	77
4.3 From ES Maps to Green Infrastructures Design	78
4.3.1 From Multipart Data to Network Design	80
4.3.2 Weighted Overlay Tool	81
4.3.3 Hotspot Analysis	81
4.3.4 Aggregate Polygons	82
4.3.5 Results	83
4.3.6 Conclusion	85
4.4 The Effect of ES Degradation on Health	86
4.4.1 Fatalities Caused by Atmospheric Pollution	89
Part 3: Case Studies	93
5. Case Study One	95
5.1 Mapping Air Quality in Urban Areas	95
5.1.1 PM Concentration in the Milan Area	101
5.1.2 Synthesis of the First Methodological Implementation	105
5.2 Ecosystem Service Planning for Human Health	109
5.2.1 Towards Methodological Coherence	110
5.2.2 Air Quality and Well-being: What Should We Do?	111
6. Case Study Two: Resilience Is Not Sustainability	115
6.1 Sustainability vs Resilience	116
6.1.1 Sustainability, Resilience and Urban Ecosystem Services	119
6.1.2 An Empirical Experiment	120

6.1.3 An ES Indicator of Sustainability	122
6.1.4 An ES Indicator of Resilience	123
7. General Conclusions	127
7.1 Who Is Responsible?	128
7.2 What Can We Do?	133
7.3 Action!	135
7.4 Some Final (Banal) Thoughts	137
<i>References</i>	139
<i>Index</i>	153

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Composite Ecosystem Service Value for Different Land Use Classes.	35
----------	---	----

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Ecosystem Service Value Coefficient for Each Land Use Category.	76
Table 2	Demand of Water for Agricultural Uses.	123

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: A NOTE FROM STEFANO SALATA

Born in Grado (Italy) in 1983, I was awarded a PhD in Territorial Government and Urban Design in March 2014 (XXVI Cycle) at the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies (DAStU), Politecnico di Milano. I have a bachelor's degree in Urban and Territorial Planning (2006) from the Urban Planning Faculty (IUAV – Venice) and a master's degree in Urban Planning and Territorial Policies (2008) from the School of Architecture, Politecnico di Milano. I am a Research Technologist in the Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning, Politecnico di Torino, and I have participated in the European project *LIFE+Soil Administration Models for Community Profit (SAM4CP)* with the same department.

Since 2009, my research activity as a member of the National Research Centre on Land Take – Italy (CRCS) has focused on land use change analysis and its environmental effects. In 2014, I joined the Ecosystem Service Partnership (ESP), and I have been selected to co-host thematic sessions at the European and World ESP conferences. I am co-editor of many Italian national reports on land take (2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2017 and 2018) of CRCS and co-author of the chapter *Policy and good practices* in the book *Urban Expansion*,

Land Cover and Soil Ecosystem Services edited by Ciro Gardi (Routledge), as well as many international publications on ecosystem services mapping and their utilisation for urban planning and territorial policies.

During my bachelor degree, I learnt the fundamental theories of the urban planning discipline: the economic, environmental and societal challenges of newly emerging territorial issues were explored and analysed within a multi-disciplinary approach. My interest was mostly focused on analysing environmental issues, among others, as the most challenging for territorial policies. Subsequently, in Milan, I put into practice the previously acquired theoretical background, and during my master's degree I was able to gain some academic experience participating in a range of collaborative research projects related to Urban and Territorial Design Plans. On graduating, the Politecnico di Milano offered me a period of research training on land use planning activities, and I also continued to participate in many academic collaborations. At the same time, I started a professional career as an urban and territorial analyst.

Since 2009, my research activity has been focused on land take assessment through land use change analysis in post-metropolitan urban regions at different levels (using European, national, regional and local datasets, applying both the statistical differences approach or cross tabulation analysis). From 2011 to 2014, I completed my education with a PhD in Territorial Government and Urban Design. The PhD thesis pointed out the topics that were to characterise my research activity:

- The growth of urban areas is not only happening to the compact city, and thus land use change analysis should be expanded to large-scale datasets.

- Urban forms are multiple and of different characteristics, thus data are not always reliable for some kinds of urban dynamics such as the sprinkling morphology.
- The effects of land use change are not only related to the phenomenon of ‘urbanisation’, therefore it is necessary to identify all possible land use changes and their effects rather than just those referred to as ‘expansion’ in agricultural or natural zones.
- The environmental impact of land use change needs to be assessed with composite indicators that apply the ecosystem services (ES) approach as a proxy for the Natural Capital state and its pressures under different land use scenarios.

During my PhD, I discovered the debate (theoretical and practical) around ES. As a planner by training, I was fascinated by ES modelling as a powerful tool to understand the spatial distribution of environmental values. Nonetheless, soon the problem of the spatial interpretation of statistical data (biophysical values) became relevant to my research. With the help of my PhD thesis supervisor (Prof. Ciro Gardi), I tried to find practical solutions to using ES for planning purposes. At the core of the ES approach, there is the awareness of preserving Natural Capital value as one of the fundamentals for social health and well-being, which nowadays is a key issue of spatial design for green infrastructures (GIs). As a senior Post-doctorate Researcher at the LIFE+ SAM4CP research project (Politecnico di Torino), I had the opportunity to work on ES mapping for land use regulation purposes at the local level, discovering new techniques and tools for ES assessment. Their values (biophysics and economics) are fundamental for stakeholder participation and citizen involvement with environmental processes.

As a planner with a broad background in various disciplines, I am curious to find practical solutions for applying ES

quantification and assessment to territorial policies rather than land use plans and projects. Such an approach requires significant improvements to the traditional way territorial government and land use planning are structured. From this point of view, I am aware that the ES approach is one that considers in a more holistic way the concept of sustainability because it accounts for the different kinds of services that Natural Capital provides. Planning for an increase in Natural Capital needs a significant renewal of the methodological approach that adequately supports the evaluation of land use scenarios. In this book, I will explore how one of the most promising elements in planning for urban resilience in order to foster the adaptive capacity of a socio-ecological system is, for example, the development of GIs.

From this perspective, the assessment of ES trade-off under different land use configurations is crucial to the design of GIs. For example, an improved incorporation of ES in the scenario planning process will increase the possibility of suite mapping models for different kinds of ES (supporting, regulating, provisioning and cultural). Mapping ES is crucial for planning purposes. Nonetheless, mapping has several limitations in that it does not account for (1) the scale of assessment, (2) stakeholder interests and (3) the mismatch between supply and demand of ES. However, these issues are the most stimulating for my interest in these research topics.

I have found that ES analysis and related mapping tools and techniques can be used to define sustainable land use strategies aimed at achieving resilience of socio-economic systems. In my experience, it was evident that the analysis of ES improves the ability of politicians, administrators, planners, and stakeholders to define strategies of urban regeneration, ecological adaptation and energy efficiency.

Few planners are really aware of the effects of land use change to human health. I remember when, in 2014, I discovered

the problem of particulate matter (PM) re-suspension when I was involved in a study for the new Climate Adaptation Plan of the Lombardy Region (Italy). Professor Antonio Ballarin Denti first talked to me about this problem and its relationship with soil sealing. At that time, I was a young post-doctorate student with a fellowship at the Department of Urban Studies at Politecnico di Milano, where I was developing a GIS-based spatial analysis of land use changes in the Lombardy Region. I was collecting data on soil sealing rates and their environmental effects and wondered why my department had asked me to participate in the regional study for the Adaptation Plan. I remember very well what Professor Ballarin Denti told me: the more you seal urban areas, the more PM increases independently from direct emissions, because PM re-suspends when not captured by vegetation or by green areas. Therefore, if you know the sealing rate of urban areas, you are able to have an assessment of PM concentrations due to re-suspension.

In mid-2015, I was participating in the first Scientific Young Researcher national competition with a research proposal entitled *Deterioration of Ecosystem Services: Influence of Land Use Change on Particulate Matter Resuspension in the Metropolitan Area of Milan* (the acronym was DtEcS2014 and I now understand why I didn't pass). That research was the first tentative step towards designing an activity around the issue of health problems generated by land take and soil sealing.

Subsequently, I discovered that 'air filtering' and the contribution of green areas to capturing PM avoided re-suspension and consequently improved the relation between ES provision and the quality of life of citizens. The loss of soil functions and ES is one of the major environmental challenges Europe is facing. The European Commission has proposed, in the Environment Action Programme for 2020 (seventh EAP), having policies in place by 2020 to achieve 'no

net land take' by 2050; it has also clarified the contribution urban and rural land use planning can make to achieve the target to limit urbanisation and protect soil ES. Moreover, the *Guidelines on Best Practice to Limit, Mitigate or Compensate Soil Sealing* emphasises the fact that land use alteration generates huge impacts on human health; thus the effect of spatial planning is crucial to achieving environmental sustainability. This means all relevant public authorities (municipalities, regions and countries) are fully committed to considering ES alteration during decision-making processes for land use planning, changing the philosophy of how we use land: newer integrated approaches are needed. The concept of sustainability in urban planning has risen to the fore, and the techniques/methodologies of environmental assessment have become more sophisticated.

I believe that ES modelling aids land use planning processes, revealing new paths to define practically sustainable land use strategies, thereby introducing the concept of an 'ecosystemic approach'. My field of research (according to the Italian Minister of Education, University and Research) is 08/F1 urban and territorial planning; this book will therefore embrace a multidisciplinary approach to define some steps: modelling re-suspension in urban areas (an environmental engineer approach integrated with geomatics experience) whilst observing the outcomes that such knowledge will generate to my main research area (urban planning).

Finally, I wish to thank the Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning of Politecnico di Torino (DIST, Polito) and the Interdepartmental Responsible Risk Resilience Centre (R3C) where I work. Their goal is to increase knowledge of operative models to integrate environmental assessment into traditional planning discipline. The use of ES as a new paradigm of resilience is an asset in developing an international dimension to our research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is the result of an enjoyable and enthusiastic research activity that I developed interacting with many people. Since I believe that the quality of research depends on the quality of people, I would like to thank some of them: Andrea Arcidiacono, Silvia Ronchi, Laura Pogliani, Carlo Alberto Barbieri, Carolina Giaimo and Grazia Brunetta.

This page intentionally left blank

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This book is structured in three main parts. The first introduces the reader to the main challenges in urban planning by explaining how changing conditions require a new approach to spatial policies, a more ecological-oriented approach to the city design and new competencies. Chapters 1 and 2 present the discourse around the descriptive approach to cities, their expansion and how the process of urbanisation affects ecosystem service provision, while Chapter 3 introduces a new approach to urban analysis which has been entitled ‘the ecosystemic planning reform’ that forward ‘an agenda for urban planning’.

Part two of this book is entitled ‘Acquiring New Competences’, and it demonstrates how the traditional approach to the ecological study of urban systems should be integrated with new competences and tools that aid the decision-making phase during urban planning. In particular, Part two is dedicated to ‘mapping’ ecosystem services as a crucial phase to reach a spatial knowledge of the distribution of biophysical and economic values of ecosystems in a defined environment. This part moves from the utilisation of mapping tools to the basic GIS operations that are crucial to designing multifunctional GIs. Chapter 4 aims at demonstrating how the quality of urban environments affects human health and connects the concept of ecosystem services to well-being and the health

of communities. This chapter links the discourse of ecosystems to their tangible effects to demonstrate the important responsibility of urban planners to acquire an adequate knowledge and competence to deal with these problems.

Part three of this book aims at bridging the gap between theory and practice by presenting case studies that demonstrate how urban areas are vulnerable to climate conditions and how changing scenarios affect quality of life.

The first case study regards the assessment of particulate matter distribution due by the land use configuration in the city of Milano and shows how urban green areas are fundamental to obtain a higher deposition of fine and coarse particulate matter and achieve a higher air quality. This case study serves to demonstrate the roles that urban planning should play to create better environmental conditions by implementing mitigation measures, compensation and multi-functional GIs that serve to regulate ecosystem functioning in anthropic systems.

Case study two shifts the problem to the measurement of water provisioning resilience in metropolitan areas. It is shown how the water yield ecosystem service in the metropolitan area of Turin reacts to climate change conditions, displaying that sustainable areas are not necessarily resilient to changing conditions. Therefore, adaptation planning requires in-depth instruments to assess the variability of the system in a co-evolutive perspective.

Finally, Chapter 7 is dedicated at concluding this book and putting forward some brief suggestions.

PART 1: PLANNING IN THE
CONTEMPORARY CITY: DO
URBAN PLANS STILL MATTER?

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Ecologically-compatible Urban Planning is the title of this book: I hope every reader becomes aware that planners are responsible for their actions, and that alterations of land use generate health problems. This book also introduces the term 'eco-systemic' associated with 'planning' to show that the recent approach to ES mapping, assessment and practice is nowadays pervasive, and collaboration between environmental scientists and urban planners is essential in reforming the traditional method of urban studies and urban planning. Academic literature underlines that the separation or gap between research theories and their practical application is weakening the possibility of applying the Ecosystem Service framework systematically to policy and planning instruments and tools. This is true to an extent. There is no separation between the way we analyse and comprehend a phenomenon and the way we behave towards it. Knowledge itself is action. The greater our awareness of a problem, the more we change our actions and our lifestyles accordingly. We need to think about how information (good and bad, unfortunately) affects the market, our personal choices and policy too. Quality of life has only recently become a value, and the need for a better environment is nowadays claimed as a right for communities. Communication and knowledge in communication are therefore crucial in explaining that we can change our actions to

strive for a better world. However, to change our efforts we have to change our ideas: it comes down to knowledge. Correct knowledge is that which is easy to understand for the public at large; furthermore, it is the kind that moves beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries to innovate.

I am firmly of the belief that the integration between territorial disciplines is nowadays sufficiently practised, supported by analytical data and developed to define a new paradigm in the way urban planners approach tools and projects. The disconnect between urban studies (understood as the theoretical framework of the analysis of cities and territories) and urban planning (understood as the practice of designing plans and land use regulations) has, over the long term, weakened the influence planners have on political and civil society. The formal control of space is decreasingly perceived as necessary, and urban planners are today 'designers of theories' rather than designers of land use projects. The proliferation of theories also often remains vague and without any practical effects on the concerns of planning tools and planning legislation. Planners blame politicians for not paying attention to territorial issues, but planners themselves are responsible for the declining power of the discipline. If the most prominent issue of territorial governance is nowadays the environmental emergency, it is because land use regulation has failed to address ecological, academic and scientific instances. Therefore, it is of no surprise that the ES approach to planning is 'in the hands' of environmental engineers, naturalists, ecologists and even soil scientists, rather than planners. It is my view that we have not done enough to strengthen and enforce our ecological scientific background over the last decades, paying little attention to the concept of ES in educational courses and putting too much focus on socio-demographic, economic, geographical and political aspects.

In this book, the term Ecosystemic Planning refers to what urban planners need to reconsider as being more effective in their mission to design spatial plans along with decision-making support systems and to regulate the contemporary city in order to achieve well-being and health in cities. Experience, culture and disciplinary methodologies have been developed as a result of the practical applications of urban plans and projects. The landscape planning culture should be reconsidered and technically enforced. This book will propose a renewal of the urban planning background to meet the emerging issues posed by contemporary living in urban areas affected by climate change. The city, which is the object of planning, has changed dramatically in the last few decades. The focus of this book will be on changes in land use as a general proxy for other dynamics: private mobility, migration, the real-estate market, etc. The question of whether ‘urban planning still matters’ is the background that has driven the chapters in this first part. I acknowledge that this vision will be partial and limited, but it represents the results of a decade and more of research around land use change issues and their effects on populations.

This page intentionally left blank

THE CONTEMPORARY CITY

The city has radically changed. What has historically been termed a 'city' is nowadays an obsolete concept which comes from the ancient idea of the 'city' in opposition to the wild rural and natural environment. Nowadays, the urban phenomenon is much more 'pervasive' and the character of urban areas has extended to dense and less dense metropolitan areas, both in the megalopolis and in the countryside. The process of urbanisation has changed over the last few decades; although urbanisation is still occurring around major urban areas in the typical form of 'expansion', its dynamics and distribution are different. Approximately 75% of the European population live in urban environments, and a quarter of the EU's land surface has been directly affected by urbanisation. This type of land use cover affects urban climate through alteration of surface-atmosphere interactions through energy fluxes (European Environment Agency, 2006).

Planetary Urbanisation is the term used by Nail Brenner (2004, *Implosion/Explosions*) to define the end of specific dichotomies (urban/rural, centre/periphery, nature/society) that have characterised territorial analysis and urban planning theories since the nineteenth century. Philosophically,

Brenner's proposal follows the theories of 'Modern Liquidity' made by Bauman (2000) where the intrinsic condition of modernity is the abandonment of dialectical, physical, social and also geographical categories that 'shaped' the inductive/deductive comprehension of the world, and thereby its regulation. The translation of this 'approach' into a territorial discipline such as urban planning puts forward radical innovations in the way it has conceived the interpretation and the formal regulation of territory, the possibility for its transformations and its society. The scientific inductive approach of the nineteenth century also affected the planning discipline, which was conceived as a science of space. The inductive scientific and taxonomical approach, together with the deductive typological approach of land use classification, description and their normative contents, were conceived to generate classifications, lists, zones and formal definitions in order to govern a society through the formal regulation of space.

Terms like urban 'expansion,' 'diffusion,' 'dispersion' and relative patterns (radial urbanisation, discontinued urbanisation, leapfrogged urbanisation or jeopardised urbanisation) including 'sprawl' or 'sprinkling' still refer to what, to some extent, can be viewed and classified by using a 'metric', hence a hierarchical interpretation, and ultimately a modern view of space. The post-modern interpretation abandons these measurements and classifications, assuming that the 'urban phenomena' is everywhere, without boundaries, metrics or classifications; furthermore, without hierarchy, rational relations or linear networks. Space is 'in-between' and undefined: it is fluid, the economy is fluid, society is fluid. This view creates a disjunction with our technological capacity to observe, measure, position and structure space in increasing detail (think about Earth observation and GPS positioning).