sciendo

Art History & Criticism / Meno istorija ir kritika 16
ISSN 1822-4555 (Print), ISSN 1822-4547 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.2478/mik-2020-0005

Nicola BELLI
Institute of Architecture and Construction, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

MODERN URBAN PLANNING AND DISSONANT HERITAGE: THE CASE OF SAN POLO

Summary. The aim of the article is to understand to what extent modern mass housing estates, built in the decades following the Second World War with new construction methods and under the influence of innovative planning ideas and egalitarian philosophy, are currently facing a process of decline. In particular, the research is committed to understand how such innovative urban structures rapidly evolved into stigmatized places of residence and sources of dissonant heritage. The work focuses on the case of San Polo, a neighbourhood of Brescia, in Italy, designed by architect, planner and historian Leonardo Benevolo, who had the opportunity in the northern Italian city to experiment and implement his architectural views in the sphere of "public urbanization". It is possible to claim that Benevolo's theoretical approach and architectural practice excellently represented the golden age of modern housing in postwar Europe, when the connection between progressive political views and egalitarian urban planning was apparently perfect. Nevertheless, after the political and economic transition that characterized western Europe since the 1980s, mass housing quickly became a residual issue in the public discourse and entered in a spiral of decline. San Polo was no exception: problems – especially in its iconic tower blocks – soon emerged, and overall optimistic expectations were frustrated by the reality of physical, social and economic decline. This study is therefore committed to understand to what extent San Polo is a case of dissonant heritage in the urban context. While it is clear that the heritage of San Polo is the heritage of a precise historical phase and represents particular ideas in architecture and planning, on the other hand it must be stressed that the ideological transition of recent decades made its values and its messages obsolete and that socio-economic segregation negatively affected the reputation of the neighbourhood and its inhabitants had to face a process of stigmatization that found echo in official and journalistic discourse.

Keywords: Modern urban planning, Urban Landscape, Dissonant Heritage, Postwar History, Italy, Leonardo Benevolo.

INTRODUCTION. HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

The aim of the article is to understand to what extent modern mass housing estates, built in the decades following the Second World War with new construction methods and under the influence of innovative planning ideas and egalitarian philosophy, are currently facing a process of decline. In particular, the research is committed to understand how such innovative urban structures rapidly involved into stigmatized places of residence and sources of dissonant heritage. The work focuses on the case of San Polo, a neighbourhood of Brescia, in Italy, designed by architect, planner and historian Leonardo Benevolo. Two peculiar and overlapping reasons make the case of San Polo particularly interesting: the neighbourhood is one of the most relevant examples of Italian public urbanization, characterized by continuous and deep co-operation between planners and political power; moreover, San Polo was designed by one of the leading figures of Italian 20th century architecture .

Leonardo Benevolo's theoretical approach and his work as historian of the origins of modern town-planning are undoubtedly helpful to understand the ideas on architecture and politics that inspired his activity in Brescia. Benevolo firmly believed that the progressive views of modern planning could be realized only through the contact with political forces that were committed to reach a similarly general transformation of society; therefore, any

decision taken in the sphere of planning must be considered essentially political.[1] The author argued, in fact, that modern planning "should be regarded as an integral part of the general attempt to extend the potential benefits of the Industrial Revolution to members of all classes"[2] and that, to some extent, it could be "regarded as a vital factor in the creation of a democratic society."[3] Within this framework, the concept of a "neo-conservative" city is one of the most important contributions of Leonardo Benevolo to the analysis of modern urban transformations. While before 1848 planning was characterized by an open connection between scientific and moral aspects, around and after that year the situation deeply changed. On the one hand, the Marxist criticism towards the works of Utopian socialists put an end to the honeymoon between socialist political thinking and urban planning. On the other hand, post-1848 conservative regimes introduced an apparently purely "technocratic model of planning":[4] the state limited the complete freedom of the private sector through building and planning regulations and, at the same time, carried out important public works. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to claim that town planning became politically neutral; "on the contrary, it fell within the sphere of influence of the new conservative ideology."[5] In fact, political power deeply understood the importance of a coherent policy of public works for political stability: years that followed 1848 demonstrated that "reform was vital and regarded as the only possible alternative to even more intense social conflict."[6] Ideas such as the connection between physical urban design and socio-economic context, as well as the political nature of planning – even the apparently most technical and neutral – are crucial to introduce and explain the history of postwar modern mass housing in Europe. Leonardo Benevolo himself, in fact, was aware that the efforts made in San Polo to reach a more egalitarian society through proper housing policies were similar to the ones of British or Scandinavian planners[7] and he was conscious about the existence of a *file rouge* that connected the roots of modern planning to contemporary European context.

The European continent in the three decades that followed the end of the Second World War was characterized by economic, demographic and socio-political trends that fostered urbanization and demand for housing. After the end of the conflict Europe entered an era of political stability, and a general atmosphere of *détente*[8] – despite risks and uncertainties related to the Cold War – allowed the continent to start an era of unprecedented economic growth. Due to industrial development and new employment opportunities, many workers previously active in agriculture moved to towns and cities located in the most developed areas of their countries. This process of internal migration was deeply "pan-European": countries such as Sweden and the Soviet Union shared similar patterns of population movements; "in Italy, between 1955 and 1971, an estimated nine million people moved from one region to another."[9] Moreover, the postwar baby boom reversed the previously negative demographic trend: as Tony Judt argued, thanks to new confidence and new aspirations, "after a forty-year hiatus, Europe was becoming young again."[10] Thus, overall improvement in economic conditions, internal migration from the countryside to the city and positive birth rates caused a massive wave of urbanization, which stressed the dramatic housing shortage of European cities and carried out strong demand for dwellings. At the same time "urban lifestyles became the norm, even for Europeans not living in urban areas"[11] and the socio-cultural importance of the countryside diminished.

Only in the last two decades scholars stressed that, despite obvious political differences, postwar modern mass housing in eastern and western Europe "had a number of significant aspects in common".[12] A relatively "shared timeline in the housing crisis's features"[13] as well as a relatively "shared timeline in the responses of public powers"[14] characterized the continent. To some extent, it is reasonable to argue that "the socialist experiment which was imposed upon eastern Europe reflected many of the same desires which motivated Europeans in the western half of the continent."[15] European states, which had experienced the shock of war, found in fact the promise to overcome a painful past and "to construct a new and egalitarian society by providing dramatically improved housing and environmental

conditions"[16] very appealing. Expectations related to postwar urban planning were therefore huge and optimistic. Susan Reid argued that "the idea that rational town planning and architecture can engineer social harmony, health and happiness (…) became an essential tenet of modernist ideology and building practice"[17] and that "the modern home (…) became a key site for the concrete projection of 'tomorrow' and for the construction of the identity of the citizens."[18] To some extent it is possible to claim that "modernism, modernization and urban planning acquired a moral prestige as a quest for a revolutionary reorganization of society".[19]

To provide a comprehensive and satisfactory definition of modern mass housing is a difficult task. In one of the first and most relevant comparative studies about the phenomenon, postwar estates were "defined as distinct and discrete geographic housing areas which are dominated by residential blocks of five storeys or more."[20] Franz Wassenberg stressed the grouping of buildings, the uniform and distinct character, the similar and planned construction and the geographical concentration; combining those elements, he defined "housing estate as a group of housing quite distinct in form built together as a single development."[21] Following a similar pattern, modern housing estates have been recently defined as "areas containing at least 1,000 residents in high rise buildings, established by a developer or a development process between the 1950s and the 1980s as a coherent and compact planning unit."[22] More widely, it has been claimed that "mass housing resulted from a love-match between architecture and social policy. It combined standardisation (…) with state involvement."[23] Although it is almost impossible to define Modern mass housing, its main features are therefore clear: geographical concentration, distinctive form, use of vertical space, standardization of construction, careful planning and involvement of the public sector. In the three postwar decades the connection between political context and modern urban planning was apparently perfect. While outcomes and qualities had been later questioned and criticized,[24] spacious, relatively comfortable and well- designed housing became "the expression of a new world, being the most uniform, the most dominating, the most direct and the most visible result of postwar urban planning."[25] It is therefore possible to argue that, in short term, modern housing was a successful tool to solve contemporary urban problems.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT SITUATION: ANATOMY OF A DECLINE?

Although it is impossible to provide a comprehensive portrait of the phenomenon, and despite the relative success of some modern districts, it is undeniable that, nowadays, several postwar mass housing estates are facing a process of decline and physical and discursive deconstruction. In fact, despite "large scale estates have been carefully planned"[26] by scientists, architects and other experts, these efforts did not lead "to the intended satisfaction and popularity".[27] It is possible to claim that "the Modernistic thoughts inspired by CIAM movement and Le Corbusier seem to have lost the appeal they once held"[28] and that "what seemed like good solutions in the aftermath of WW2 often became dystopias".[29]

The planning process and consequent urban design revealed since the beginning a potentially problematic situation. Although design alone is not to blame for the lack of success of estates, the fact that many of them "malfunctioned from the beginning due to physical shortcomings"[30] must be considered. According to Frank Wassenberg the first cause of rapid decline of estates must be identified in "the way they were planned: top-down, by planning departments and according to (sometimes scientific) research into what would be best for residents – but without consulting residents, who were (supposed to be) happy simply to get any dwelling in times of everlasting housing shortages."[31] Often, such a top-down and centralized approach resulted in weak physical design and inadequate spatial planning. To begin with, estates have been mostly developed near or outside the city boundaries: while in some cases further urban growth made peripheral areas more central, many neighbourhoods remained isolated, "far away from amenities and job opportunities"[32] and they were characterized by underdeveloped schooling, shopping and recreational structures. Extreme standardization of

construction caused visual monotony and physical decay: the use of cheap building materials and the effort to construct quickly provoked rapid deterioration of buildings and public spaces. Moreover, design had a negative impact on social life: Wassenberg argued that poor physical design caused "problems like insecurity and lack of social control",[33] and Gideon Bolt claimed that "the design (…) was often too fluid and open with no well defined spaces and no clear hierarchy"[34] and that "residents did not feel responsible for public spaces, which soon became desolated and dilapidated."[35]

Within this framework, Baldwin Hess, Tammaru and van Ham argued that "the evolution of large housing estates in Europe demonstrates the tension between short-term versus long-term strategies for developing an urban housing stock."[36] On the one hand, mass housing helped to solve postwar housing demand and provided improved living standards to large shares of European population; on the other hand, optimism disappeared relatively quickly and "housing estates did not survive as ideal living environments."[37]

Nevertheless, shortcomings in planning and design are not enough to explain the decline of modern mass housing. Niels Prak and Hugo Priemus introduced a model to analyse the phenomenon;[38] they presented three cycles of decline, which may influence and reinforce each other: technical decline, social decline and financial decline. All those cycles can be affected by external factors, such as governmental policies as well as social and economic trends. Social inequalities increased significantly in many European countries since the mid-1970s and made the urban environment "a more unequal place."[39] Therefore, the "segregation of population groups based on occupation, income and/or education"[40] became a major issue. While higher social strata tended to concentrate voluntarily, low-income groups concentrated in certain areas and neighbourhoods, mostly due to lack of choice and presence of accessible and affordable housing. In fact, the initial demographic composition has been recently presented as one of the roots of socio-economic decline of many districts: "estates where the poverty level was already high among the initial population experienced a process of decline very soon after the estate was built [and] the concentration of poverty led to a bad reputation among outsiders."[41] Reputation and perception of housing estates is in fact a critical issue, since many postwar districts and their inhabitants have been stigmatized. Stigma is a further damage for estates because on the one hand it negatively affects the population and, on the other hand, it "could significantly alter the development trajectories."[42] As it will be later pointed out, to some extent also "stereotyping by the media has contributed to the poor reputation of housing estates and has diminished their chances for success."[43]

Home has a deep symbolic meaning: it reveals how people live, how well they are doing and who they are in the outside world. Therefore, such a situation negatively affected the identity of people living in mass housing, who often see themselves as "inferior": their financial conditions do not allow them to make individual choices and they must live in areas that, according to the dominant narration, "house the residue of society."[44] For these reasons, has been claimed that people living in postwar estates "are structurally discriminated":[45] they have no power in the housing market and they are marginal in the society; moreover, "they see their marginality reproduced and enlarged"[46] in their estates.

POSTWAR MODERN MASS HOUSING IN ITALY

As elsewhere in Europe, in Italy, direct public intervention in housing sector became relevant only after the Second World War, when the country moved toward an unprecedented age of prosperity known as the "economic miracle"[47] and, due to the postwar baby boom,[48] the population had a dramatic increase. Although the impact of postwar modernism on Italian urban landscape has been weaker, compared with countries such as France, Sweden or the former socialist republics in central and eastern Europe, its socio-cultural significance is undeniable. Postwar districts "provided a 'learning experience' to new immigrants to the city. Many postwar films by 'neo-realismo' directors (…) used them as a backdrop to narrating the tough apprenticeship of arrivals from deprived rural regions to such cities as Rome, Milan and Turin".[49]

The Italian mass housing era can be divided into two phases.[50] The first took place between the 1950s and the mid-1960s. In those years, industrial and economic development and demographic increase caused a massive wave of urbanization. Nevertheless, the growth of the country was far from being homogeneous: on the one hand, a high number of migrants moved to the main metropolitan areas, located in the most developed and industrialized regions of north-western Italy; on the other hand, the countryside and less developed areas lost relevant shares of population. During the first phase "housing policies as well as urban policies, were marked by what could be defined as a laissez-faire orientation."[51] The model adopted in Italy, at the time, was in fact quite different from the welfare typical of north European countries: despite a considerable amount invested by the state in public housing, there was little effort to create a proper public housing sector. The most revolutionary moment of the first phase was the introduction of the 167 Law, in 1962, which gave cities the right to reserve areas for social housing and to assign land to public and co-operative agencies that were committed to planning and construction. The second phase lasted until the end of the 1970s and was characterized by a changed political and social context that carried new issues, such as the problem of dealing with an unbalanced growth and the need to rationalize urban developments and to use available resources more efficiently.

The economic deceleration that took place in the second half of the 1970s changed patterns of development in the urban sphere. This period marked the beginning of a more dispersed growth that mainly included cities in central and north-eastern Italy, which were not affected by economic development in the very first postwar decades. At the same time the former "industrial triangle", the land among the cities of Milan, Turin and Genoa, began to face the challenges of post-industrial societies. Southern regions, on the other hand, widened the gap with the rest of the country. Furthermore, since the 1980s a new demographic situation emerged, particularly in northern Italy: on the one hand overall population growth decreased and the society aged, on the other hand there was a strong increase in immigration, particularly from Africa, the Indian sub-continent and eastern Europe, which deeply affected the ethnic composition of low income households.

Although, since the 1980s and 1990s, the construction of public supported housing did not completely disappear, it continuously declined. According to Liliana Padovani: "The choices made during the 1980s (…) were for the most part based on the assumption that housing was no longer a priority on the agenda of the public sector (…) [and] the areas of housing stress still existing were considered of a residual character."[52]

All in all, despite the construction of big and iconic modern estates, the Italian system of housing policies presented relatively little state involvement in housing policies as well as great regional variances. Furthermore, "housing policies have been relatively weak from a welfare viewpoint."[53] In fact, the supply of social housing was scarce, and "policies have not been sufficiently targeted to the needs of marginalised groups and groups in extreme poverty as well as being poorly integrated with general social welfare programmes."[54] Nowadays, most of the larger estates are characterized by a mix of social rented, private rented, co-operative and owner-occupied houses. Building type and housing tenure tend to coincide and the risk of segregation is real. The poorest estates are nowadays characterized by serious problems and by the concentration of families and individuals heavily dependent on the public system.

LOOKING FOR A NEW URBANIZATION: LEONARDO BENEVOLO AND BRESCIA

In 1977, Leonardo Benevolo left Rome and moved to Brescia, where he lived until his death in 2017. The choice was motivated by two reasons: on the one hand, the Italian planner was disillusioned by the academic career and the overall context of the capital, which limited its activity; on the other hand, in Brescia he had the opportunity to experiment and implement his architectural views in the sphere of "public urbanization". Since 1970 Benevolo had started co-operating with Luigi Bazoli, the Brescia assessor of city planning and member of the Christian Democracy;

he was positively impressed by the political atmosphere of the city: the decisions of Christian Democratic administration were often supported by the Communist Party – its main historical opponent – with the aim of introducing architectural and social improvements in the urban environment. Furthermore, Brescia gave Leonardo Benevolo the opportunity to directly know and gain inspiration from the work of Ottorino Marcolini, a Catholic priest graduated in engineering and mathematics, who planned and built, since the beginning of the 1950s, neighbourhoods to house the urban working class, the so called "villages". Marcolini started his activity in western periphery of Brescia, where the first village, Violino – 252 dwellings, church, a kindergarten and a primary school – was built. Between 1953 and 1987, the "Marcolini villages" provided more than 6,500 dwellings for about 25,000 inhabitants.[55] The humanitarian attitude of Marcolini as well as industrialized building created, therefore, the first example of social housing in the city.

Benevolo, in the 1970s, was committed to "demonstrate advantages of public urbanization compared to the traditional system, and therefore to present new system as an alternative to the previous one."[56] Nevertheless, the Italian planner considered previous involvement of the political sector in housing insufficient, and argued that, despite introduction of the 167 Law in 1962,[57] most of the projects for areas reserved for public housing "tended to be interpreted as normal plans of urbanistic coordination"[58] and did not provide significant structural innovations. While in Italy public urbanization was still an exception, elsewhere big unitarian settlements such as Swedish satellite districts, French *grands ensembles* and British new towns had already been successfully implemented. Leonardo Benevolo firmly believed that these European experiences demonstrated advantages of modern urbanism at the point that "traditional system of urbanization (…) was questioned and seriously threatened."[59] Moreover, following the example of Le Corbusier and the *Athens Charter*, he argued that the population would have appreciated advantages coming from a simultaneous plan of all urban elements in a new area carried out by public urbanization.

The municipality of Brescia developed a plan for social housing, according to the 167 Law, in 1965; the urbanization of eight zones located in the periphery was planned and, in the first eight years, six out of eight zones were totally or partially realized. Because of a variation of the original plan that was adopted in 1973 the two areas that had not yet been realized were unified in the area of San Polo. In the book *Brescia S. Polo: Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica* the plan for the urbanization of the area was extensively presented. The social and political goal shared by Benevolo and the municipal administration of Brescia was to use the existing legal framework to create a more direct link between builders and users, which excluded private businesses and speculators.

SAN POLO: ARCHITECTURAL AND SOCIAL OUTCOMES

The area chosen for the realization of the new district was a former agricultural zone between the Milan-Venice railway, in the north, and the A4 highway, in the south. The road between Brescia and Cremona can be considered the western border of the neighbourhood, while the one between Brescia and Mantua, which previously could be intended as the opposite border, nowadays divides San Polo into western and eastern zones. The area is linked to the highway system – the A4 to Milan and Venice and the A21 to Turin – and to *tangenziale sud*, a fast route that connects southern districts of Brescia to the province. Nowadays three subway stations – San Polo Parco, San Polo Cimabue and San Polino – are in the neighbourhood.

Leonardo Benevolo was committed to establish a proportion between number of inhabitants and "urbanistic standards": the aim was, in fact, to provide each inhabitant 50 m^2 of public green space, 9m^2 of streets and 18m^2 of public services.[60] The plan for San Polo included nine residential units; each unit had 500 dwellings and was inhabited by 1,800–2,000 residents. A residential unit was defined by Benevolo as "the minimum ensemble to be planned in cities;"[61] if, on the one hand, a dwelling could be considered the basic functional element of activities made by families in the private

space, when it came to activities that can be done daily inside and outside the domestic environment, "the basic functional element [was] not dwelling anymore but a group of dwellings associated with a given number of services."[62] Such basic residential units could be associated and form more complex unities.

Residential units presented three different housing types: 2 or 3-storey single family homes; 4 or 5-storey "spine"[63] houses and 15 or 17-storey tower blocks. Undoubtedly, tower blocks (*torri*) are the most iconic architectural feature of San Polo: they are five and, from West to East, they are called Tiziano, Raffaello, Michelangelo, Tintoretto, and Cimabue. Tiziano, Raffaello and Michelangelo are 15-storey blocks, built in the western part of San Polo; Tintoretto and Cimabue were built in the 1980s in the eastern part of the district to solve the increasing housing shortage. Considered by Leonardo Benevolo an even improved version of tower block typology,[64] Tintoretto and Cimabue are 17-storey buildings, each containing 195 dwellings. While other building typologies were intended for private owners, socially rented dwellings were concentrated in tower blocks.

The Margherita d'Este shopping centre, the first one in the whole city of Brescia, was opened in San Polo in 1985, near the Michelangelo tower, between the western and the eastern part of the district. This innovative element, again, reflects the influence of foreign modern planning on Leonardo Benevolo: for example, the district of Vällingby, in Stockholm, one of the pivotal modern postwar districts in the whole Europe, was planned and constructed clustered around a big shopping centre, the *Vällingby Centrum*. In *La fine della città,* that can be considered a summary of his career, Leonardo Benevolo argued that the work done in Brescia positively influenced the everyday life of many people and provided a better and integrated urban environment, where it has been possible to realize areas and public services unusual for Italy.

The social and demographic context of the district reflects the differentiations in housing typologies. The social composition of privately-owned single-family houses or flats in small blocks does not differ significantly from the overall situation of Brescia. On the other hand, the demography of tower blocks is more complex and heterogeneous. Families of different ages, single parents and older people live in the towers, and they all share "weak social and economic conditions."[65] Since the beginning, the towers, due to the massive presence of socially rented flats, attracted people who left the historic centre of the city during one of the first attempts of gentrification. Particularly, many dwellers of the towers moved from Carmine, an area in the centre of Brescia characterized by dramatic social problems and a collapsing housing stock. Moreover, families with a foreign background, usually younger and bigger than Italian ones, tended to cluster in the towers.

Since the first years after the construction, lack of social interaction characterized both the context of towers[66] and the whole neighbourhood: very few or no interaction developed between residents of the towers and people living in other housing types. It is therefore possible to claim that social and housing mix planned and implemented in San Polo did not prevent a certain degree of ghettoization. It goes without saying that demographic and social conditions had consequences on identity: people, in fact, identify themselves and are identified by others according to their homes. Negative perceptions strengthened stigmatization, especially of specific areas within the district: "Tintoretto tower (…) represented for citizens and institutions of Brescia the symbol of social and structural decay"[67] and the same can be claimed for Cimabue tower.

The set of solutions debated and proposed to solve the critical situation of the towers of San Polo, particularly Tintoretto and Cimabue, questioned the ideas of postwar modern planning and architecture. Tintoretto tower, considered the most complicated case, is totally empty since 2013; nevertheless, the decision apparently did not solve previous social problems. Many inhabitants moved to a new area, the San Polino district, where the same problematic situation is being reproduced, in a different location. Moreover, the destiny of the tower fostered an endless political debate which is still going on.

SAN POLO: A CASE OF DISSONANT URBAN HERITAGE

The aim of the analysis is to understand to what extent San Polo and its iconic tower blocks are considered symbols of urban decline and represent failures of postwar modern planning. The roots of Leonardo Benevolo's theoretical thinking must, once again, be considered: at this stage of research it is, in fact, necessary to analyse how and why his view of planning and the expected advantages of public urbanization did not produce – or only partially – the hoped-for results. It is important to remember that Leonardo Benevolo believed in a deep connection between modern planning and political forces to reach the purpose of a general transformation of urban landscape and society. Furthermore, in relation to the concept of the "neo-conservative" city, Benevolo demonstrated that even the apparently most neutral and technical planning was characterized by social and political goals. The activity of Leonardo Benevolo in Brescia followed the same principles: social – and somehow humanitarian – purposes and constant dialogue with political institutions guided his research of a new urbanization and his optimistic belief that the public dimension of planning would have positively affected the life of population. Apparently, something went wrong, but what?

To begin with, general models of decline of modern postwar housing must be considered.[68] As elsewhere in Europe, since 1980s, in Italy, social housing was not considered a priority anymore; in case of Brescia, furthermore, it must be stressed that the co-operation between the Christian Democracy and Communist Party, aimed at improving urban environment and promoting public urbanization, came to an end in the same years. Therefore, public attitudes towards San Polo began to change. Most probably, the main reasons for the decline of the neighbourhood and physical and discursive marginalization of its tower blocks lie in social inequalities and consequent socio-economic segregation. Since the beginning, in fact, low-income groups concentrated, particularly in Cimabue and Tintoretto towers; such a situation provoked a negative reputation among both residents of San Polo living in other housing types as well as outsiders. Physical shortcomings as well as badly kept public space and lack of safety made the reputation of the area even worse. The overall situation became very negative for the population of towers, which has been stigmatized.

Under these circumstances, it is possible to argue that San Polo constitutes a case of dissonant heritage in the urban context. Tunbridge and Ashworth defined dissonant heritage as a peculiar kind of heritage that "involves a discordance or a lack of agreement and consistency."[69] The analyses of the physical and discursive legacy of San Polo could give the opportunity to discuss the relation between modern mass housing and dissonant heritage, even in a wider perspective. Undoubtedly, the heritage of San Polo is the heritage of a precise historical phase and represents particular ideas on society and planning. Landscape can, in fact, "operate as a representational system",[70] and it is probably one of the most powerful and communicative media to represent ideas, social constructions, and power relations, as it did in the past. Caroline Humphrey claimed that "ideology is found not only in texts and speeches; it is a political practice that is also manifest in constructing material objects"[71] and that "artefacts are not material objects divorced from social relations."[72] The urban landscape, its forms, functions, and meanings used to be the perfect medium to express both relations of power and new aesthetics and styles.

To what extent is the heritage of San Polo "dissonant"? First of all, the fact that a process of transition took place since the area was planned and constructed must be considered. The golden age of social housing, inspired by the relation between progressive political views and carefully planned and egalitarian architecture came to an end in the 1980s. The transition deeply influenced contemporary perceptions of postwar modern mass housing and, within this framework, the process of "obsolete transmission", a typical source of dissonance in heritage, must be noted. In the case of "obsolete transmission", messages continue to be projected to a society that is changed, has different goals, and is characterized by different political conditions. Thus, ideological shift and transition made the values of modern urban planning and the theoretical approach of Leonardo

Benevolo, obsolete, according to new official discourse. Therefore, San Polo, which is the most iconic modern mass housing neighbourhood in Brescia, continues to represent social, political, and architectural values of the postwar decades, despite the society being deeply changed and the expectations related to urban planning not being the same. A second and crucial point to be considered is related to class. Class is a powerful generator of dissonance and, because of massive socio-economic segregation, "class dissonance" is prominent in the urban space. Social inequalities increased significantly in many European countries and, consequently, the city became "a more unequal place."[73] Therefore, the "segregation of population groups based on occupation, income and/or education"[74] became a major issue. While higher social strata tended to concentrate voluntarily, low-income groups concentrated in certain areas and neighbourhoods, mostly due to lack of choice and presence of accessible and affordable housing. The socio-economic segregation of San Polo makes class an excellent interpretative key for its contested heritage.

Discourse and journalistic representation actively shaped the interpretation of the San Polo tower blocks. On the one hand they provided evidence of the dissonant heritage of neighbourhood, especially in relation to class and socio-economic segregation,

Fig. 1. Tintoretto and Michelangelo towers. Unknown author. Unknown title. 2016. URL: http://www.radiondadurto.org/2016/11/02/brescia-investire-sgr-presenta-il-progetto-di-demolizione-della-torre-tintoretto/

on the other they reinforced and actively shaped the stigmatization of the area. It must, in fact, be considered that language use has power and journalism is an extremely powerful genre of communication and has strong social effects: it is able to reinforce or weaken beliefs, to shape the consciousness of people about their role and their place within society and can define the most and the least relevant issues. In case of the tower blocks of San Polo, and especially Tintoretto and Cimabue, which are undoubtedly the most complex and debated cases, the journalistic narration focused on two main points: the big uncertainties about the destiny of the towers and the portrait of San Polo and its towers as areas of decline and ghettoization. After residents left Tintoretto tower, the destiny of the building became widely debated. The discussion did not only question the building itself but the whole idea of life in high-rise blocks.

The debate whether demolishing or restoring Tintoretto involved, and still involves, the political establishment, financial sector and social activism. Advocates of demolition clustered their criticism around three main points. Aesthetically, San Polo and its tower blocks were harshly criticized and defined the worst outcomes of postwar urban planning in the city. The second argument used to promote physical demolition was mostly financial: it was claimed that total restoration would have been too expensive. Furthermore, social problems and safety issues were used as evidence of advanced decline of the area and to support the argument that any attempt at restoration would have been ineffective. On the other hand, advocates of restoration stressed the social value of towers. Despite physical decline and aesthetic ugliness, the possibility to improve and the necessity to save hundreds of socially rented dwellings have been considered priorities by politicians, intellectuals and social activists, who argued for the necessity to accept the challenge of urban renovation. The debate carried several uncertainties and question marks and basically no solutions, increasing the frustration of the local population and the perception, among other inhabitants of Brescia, of San Polo as a problematic area.

Fig. 2: Tintoretto tower. Unknown author. Unknown title. 2018. URL: http://www.bsnews.it/2018/08/23/torre-tintoretto-bando-aler-ristrutturazione-demolizione/

Fig. 3: Cimabue Tower. Ortogni, Marco. Unknown title. 2018.URL: https://www.giornaledibrescia.it/brescia-e-hinterland/degrado-e-disagio-alla-torre-cimabue-l-allarme-dei-residenti-1.3236114

CONCLUSIONS

Leonardo Benevolo firmly believed that any decision taken in the sphere of planning must be considered essentially political. To demonstrate his argument, Benevolo claimed that modern town-planning could be realized only through the co-operation with political power, with the aim of reaching a general transformation of society. Moreover, with the concept of a "neo-conservative" city, the Italian planner proved that even the apparently most neutral and technical planning fell within the sphere of influence of political power. This deep and continuous connection between planning and politics characterized the activity of Leonardo Benevolo in Brescia. In the Lombard city, Benevolo was able to plan the neighbourhood of San Polo according to the principles of public urbanization and under the influence of international postwar modernism. It is possible to claim that the theoretical approach and architectural practice of Leonardo Benevolo perfectly represented the golden age of modern housing in postwar Europe, when the connection between progressive political views and egalitarian urban planning was apparently perfect. Nevertheless, after the political and economic transition that characterized western Europe since the 1980s, mass housing quickly became a residual issue in the public discourse and entered a spiral of decline. San Polo was no exception: soon problems – especially in its iconic tower blocks – emerged and overall optimistic expectations were frustrated by a reality of physical, social and economic decline. Within this framework, it is possible to claim that San Polo is a case of dissonant heritage in the urban context. While it is clear that the heritage of San Polo is the heritage of a precise historical phase and represents particular ideas in architecture and planning, on the other hand it must be stressed that the ideological transition of recent decades made its values and its messages obsolete; such a situation is a potential source of dissonance and contestation about its legacy. Moreover, socio-economic segregation provided a second interpretative key to analyze the dissonant heritage of San Polo, which must be related to class. Spatial concentration of low-income groups, in fact, negatively affected the reputation of the neighbourhood and its inhabitants had to face a process of stigmatization that found echo in journalistic discourse. Nowadays, the heritage of San Polo and its tower blocks is still deeply contested.

References

Adam, Robert. "Lessons from history in the conservation of historic urban landscape." *UNESCO World Heritage Papers* 27 (2010): 81–88.

Baldwin Hess, Daniel, Tammaru, Tiit and van Ham, Maarten. "Lessons Learned from a Pan-European Study of Large Housing Estates: Origin, Trajectories of Change and Future Prospects." In *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges*, edited by Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru, 3–31. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

Bessel, Richard. "European Society in the Twentieth Century." In *The Oxford History of Modern Europe*, edited by Timothy Charles William Blanning, 234–259. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *The origins of modern town planning*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *History of modern architecture. Volume one: the tradition of modern architecture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1971.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *Brescia S. Polo. Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica*. Brescia: Morcelliana Editrice, 1976.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *La fine della città*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2011.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *Il tracollo dell'urbanistica italiana*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2012.

Bianca, Stefano. "Historic cities in the 21st century: core values for a globalizing world." *UNESCO World Heritage Papers* 27 (2010): 27–33.

Bolt, Gideon. "Who is to Blame for the Decline of Large Housing Estates? An Exploration of Socio-Demographic and Ethnic Change." In *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges*, edited by Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru, 57–74. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

Buchanan, Tom. *Europe's Troubled Peace*, 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2012.

Calavita, Nico. "Benevolo, Leonardo." In *Encyclopedia of the Cities*, edited by Roger W. Caves, 39–40. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Cremaschi, Marco. "Italy. High-rise as an urban way of life since the Roman Empire." In *High-rise housing in Europe. Current trends and future prospects*, edited by Richard Turkington, Ronald van Kempen and Frank Wassenberg, 75–85. Delft: Delft University Press, 2004.

Czepczyński, Mariusz. *Cultural Landscapes of Post-Socialist Cities. Representation of Power and Needs*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.

De Decker, Pascal and Newton, Caroline. "At the fall of Utopia." *Urbani izziv/Urban Challenge* 20, no. 2 (2009): 4–82.

Doxiadis, Constantinos A. *Architecture in Transition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Gifford, Robert. "The Consequences of Living in High-Rise Buildings." *Architectural Science Review*, 50, no. 1 (2007): 2–17.

Glendinning, Miles. "Introductory global overview of the issues of mass housing as 'heritage'; outline of key issues for discussion." In *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 9–14.

Gutnov, Alexei, Baburov, A., Djumenton G., Kharitonova, S., I. Lezava and S. Sadovskij. *The Ideal Communist City*. New York: George Braziller Inc., 1968.

Hall, Peter. *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design Since 1880*, 4th ed. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Humphrey, Caroline. "Ideology and Infrastructure: Architecture and Soviet Imagination". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11.1 (2005): 39–58.

James, Harold. "The Fall and Rise of the European Economy in the Twentieth Century." In *The Oxford History of Modern Europe*, edited by Timothy Charles William Blanning, 186–213. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2005.

Kearns, Ade, Whitley, Elise, Mason, Phil and Bond, Lyndal. "Living the High Life'? Residential, Social and Psychosocial Outcomes for High-Rise Occupants in a Deprived Context." *Housing Studies* 27, no. 1 (2012): 97–126.

Kip, Markus and Sgibnev, Wladimir. "Introduction: modernism and the (post-)socialist city." *Europa Regional* 22.2014, no. 1–2 (2015): 3–12.

Maxim, Juliana. "The microrayon: the organization of mass housing ensembles, Bucharest, 1956–1967." In *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 15–21.

Monclús, Xavier and Díez Medina, Carmen. "Modernist housing estates in European cities of the Western and Eastern blocs." *Planning Perspectives* 31, no. 3 (2016): 533–562.

Mumford, Eric. *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928–1960*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The MIT Press, 2000.

Muster, Sako and van Kempen, Ronald. "Trapped or on the springboard? Housing careers in large housing estates in European cities." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29, no. 3 (2007): 311–329.

Musterd, Sako, Marcińczak, Szymon, van Ham, Maarten and Tammaru, Tiit. "Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich." *Urban Geography* 38, no. 7 (2017): 1062–1083.

Musterd, Sako, van Kempen, Ronald and Rowlands, Rob. "Mass Housing Estates on Different Tracks: An Introduction to the Book." In *Mass Housing in Europe. Multiple Faces of Development, Change and Response,* edited by Rob Rowland, Sako Musterd and Ronald van Kempen, 1–19. Basingstoke, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Padovani, Liliana. "Italy." In *Housing Policy in Europe* 3rd edition, edited by Paul Balchin, 188–209. London, New York: Routledge, 2003.

Prak, Niels L. and Priemus, Hugo. "A model for the analysis of the decline of postwar housing." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 10, no. 1 (1986): 1–7.

Premoli, Fulvia and Servi, Maria Beatrice. "Edifici residenziali quartiere San Polo." Lombardia Beni Culturali. Regione Lombardia, 2014. Accessed 29 March 2020. http://www.lombardiabeniculturali.it/architetture900/schede/p3010-00065/

Reid, Susan E. "Khrushchev Modern: Agency and modernization in the Soviet home." *Cahiers du Monde russe* 47, no. 1–2 (2006): 227–268.

Richardson, John E. *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Scanlon, Kathleen, Fernández Arrigoitia, Melissa and Whitehead, Christine. "Social Housing in Europe." *European Policy Analysis* 17 (2005): 1–12.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.

Swenarton, Mark, Avermaete, Tom and van den Heuvel, Dick. "Introduction." In *Architecture and the Welfare State*, edited by Mark Swenarton, Tom Avermaete and Dick van den Heuvel, 1–23. London, New York: Routledge, 2015.

Tosi, Antonio and Cremaschi, Marco. *Housing policies in Italy*. Vienna: ICCR Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in Social Sciences, 2001.

Trapelli, Paola. "Il luogo di residenza come stigma. Il caso del quartiere San Polo a Brescia." *Master's Thesis, Cà Foscary University of Venice*, 2012.

Tunbridge, J. E. and Ashworth, G. J. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

Urban, Florian. "Mass Housing in East and West Germany - Controversial Success and Ambivalent Heritage." In *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 34–39.

van Beckhoven, Ellen, Bolt, Gideon and van Kempen, Ronald. "Theories of Neighbourhood Change and Decline: Their Significance for Post-WWII Large Housing Estates in European Cities." In *Mass Housing in Europe. Multiple Faces of Development, Change and Response,* edited by Rob Rowland, Sako Musterd and Ronald van Kempen, 20–50. Basingstoke, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

van Gent, Wouter P. C. (2009). "Estates of Content: Regeneration and Neighbourhood Satisfaction." In *Mass Housing in Europe. Multiple Faces of Development, Change and Response,* edited by Rob Rowland, Sako Musterd and Ronald van Kempen, 77–100. Basingstoke, UK; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Voldman, Daniéle and Fourcaut, Annie. "Mass Housing in Eastern and Western Europe, 1947–1989: a European project." In *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 47–55.

Wakeman, Rosemary. "Rethinking postwar planning history." *Planning Perspectives* 29, no. 2 (2014): 153–163.

Wassenberg, Frank. "Beyond an Ugly Appearance: Understanding the Physical Design and Built Environment of Large Housing Estates." In *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges*, edited by Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru, 35–55. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

Wassenberg, Frank, Turkington, Richard and van Kempen, Ronald. "High-rise housing estates in Europe," in *High-rise housing in Europe: Current trends and future prospects*, edited by Richard Turkington, Ronald van Kempen and Frank Wassenberg, 1–14. Delft: Delft University Press, 2004.

Zarecor, Kimberley E. "What Was so Socialist about the Socialist City? Second World Urbanity in Europe." *Journal of Urban History* 44, no. 2 (2018): 95–117.

Notes

[1] Leonardo Benevolo, *The origins of modern town planning* (Cambridge, Massachussets: The M.I.T. Press, 1967).

[2] Leonardo Benevolo, 32.

[3] Leonardo Benevolo, 34.

[4] Nico Calavita, "Benevolo, Leonardo", in: *Encyclopedia of the City*, ed. Roger W. Caves (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 39.

[5] Leonardo Benevolo, 13.

[6] Leonardo Benevolo, 118.

[7] See: Leonardo Benevolo, *La fine della città. Intervista a cura di Francesco Erbani* (Roma, Bari: Laterza, 2011).

[8] See: Tony Judt, *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2005).

[9] Tony Judt, 333.

[10] Tony Judt, 331.

[11] Richard Bessel, "European Society in the Twentieth Century," in *The Oxford History of Modern Europe*, edited by Timothy Charles William Blanning (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 246.

[12] Miles Glendinning, "Introductory global overview of the issues of mass housing as 'heritage'; outline of key issues for discussion," in *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 10.

[13] Daniélel Voldman and Annie Fourcaut, "Mass Housing in Eastern and Western Europe, 1947–1989: a European project," in *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 51.

[14] *Ibid*.

[15] Richard Bessel, 258.

[16] Frank Wassenberg, Richard Turkington and Ronald van Kempen, "High-rise housing estates in Europe," in *High-rise housing in Europe: Current trends and future prospects*, eds. Richard Turkington, Ronald van Kempen and Frank Wassenberg (Delft: Delft University Press, 2004), 1–14.

[17] Susan E. Reid, "Khrushchev Modern: Agency and modernization in the Soviet home," *Cahiers du Monde russe* 47, no. 1–2 (2006): 235.

[18] Sussan E. Reid Reid, 227.

[19] Rosemary Wakeman, "Rethinking postwar planning history," *Planning Perspectives* 29, no. 2 (2014): 154.

[20] Wassenberg, Turkington and van Kempen, 3.

[21] Franz Wassenberg, *Large housing estates: ideas, rise, fall and recovery. The Bijlmermeer and beyond* (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2013), 27.

[22] Daniel Baldwin Hess, Tiit Tammaru and Maarten van Ham, Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018), 9.
[23] Florian Urban "Mass Housing in East and West Germany - Controversial Success and Ambivalent Heritage", in *Postwar Mass Housing East + West*. Docomomo International: Conference, September 7–11, 2011. Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies, University of Edinburgh, 39.
[24] *Infra*
[25] Frank Wassenberg, 31.
[26] Frank Wassenberg, "Beyond an Ugly Appearance: Understanding the Physical Design and Built Environment of Large Housing Estates," in *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges,* eds. Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018), 35.
[27] Frank Wassenberg, 36.
[28] Pascal De Decker and Caroline Newton, "At the fall of Utopia," *Urbani izziv/Urban Challenge* 20, no. 2 (2009): 74.
[29] De Decker and Newton, 75.
[30] Gideon Bolt, "Who is to Blame for the Decline of Large Housing Estates? An Exploration of Socio-Demographic and Ethnic Change," in *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges,* eds. Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018), 59.
[31] Frank Wassenberg, 46.
[32] Gideon Bolt, 60.
[33] Frank Wassenberg, 50.
[34] Gideon Bolt, 61.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] Daniel Baldwin Hess, Tiit Tammaru and Marteen van Ham, "Lessons Learned from a Pan-European Study of Large Housing Estates: Origin, Trajectories of Change and Future Prospects," in *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges,* eds. Daniel Baldwin Hess, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018), 8.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] Niels L. Prak and Hugo Priemus, "A model for the analysis of the decline of postwar housing," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 10, no. 1 (1986).
[39] Sako Musterd, Szymon Marcińczak, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru, "Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich," *Urban Geography* 38, no. 7 (2017): 1076.
[40] Musterd, Marcińczak, van Ham, and Tammaru, 1063.
[41] Gideon Bolt, 61.
[42] Baldwin Hess, Tammaru and van Ham, 22.
[43] Baldwin Hess, Tammaru and van Ham, 21.
[44] De Decker and Newton, 80.
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid.*
[47] See: Antonio Tosi and Marco Cremaschi, *Housing policies in Italy* (Vienna: ICCR – Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in Social Sciences, 2001).
[48] *Supra*
[49] Marco Cremaschi, "Italy. High-rise as an urban way of life since the Roman Empire," in *High-rise housing in Europe. Current trends and future prospects,* edited by Richard Turkington, Ronald van Kempen and Frank Wassenberg (Delft: Delft University Press, 2004), 75.
[50] Liliana Padovani, "Italy," in *Housing Policy in Europe* 3rd edition, edited by Paul Balchin (London, New York: Routledge, 2003): 188–209.
[51] Liliana Padovani, 202.
[52] Liliana Padovani, 206.
[53] Antonio Tosi and Marco Cremaschi, 2.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] See: Leonardo Benevolo, *La fine della città* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2011).
[56] Leonardo Benevolo, *Brescia S. Polo. Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica* (Brescia: Morcelliana Editrice, 1976), 9.
[57] *Supra*
[58] Leonardo Benevolo, *Brescia S. Polo. Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica,* 13.
[59] Leonardo Benevolo, *Brescia S. Polo. Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica,* 10.
[60] See: Fulvia Premoli and Maria Beatrice Servi, Edifici residenziali quartiere San Polo." Lombardia Beni Culturali. Regione Lombardia, 2014. Accessed 29 March 2020. http://www.lombardiabeniculturali.it/architetture900/schede/p3010-00065/
[61] Leonardo Benevolo, *Brescia S. Polo. Un quartiere di iniziativa pubblica,* 59.
[62] *Ibid*.
[63] Translated from the Italian '*casa a spina*'.
[64] See: Paola Trapelli, "Il luogo di residenza come stigma. Il caso del quartiere San Polo a Brescia" (Master's thesis, Cà Foscari University of Venice, 2012).
[65] Paola Trapelli, 29.
[66] *Supra.*
[67] Paola Trapelli, 48.
[68] *Supra*
[69] J. E. Tunbridge and G. J. Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1996), 20.
[70] Mariusz Czepczyński, "Representations of Memories and Powers: Discursive Historical Landscapes". *Cultural Landscapes of Post-Socialist Cities* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008): 42.
[71] Caroline Humphrey. "Ideology in Infrastructure: Architecture and Soviet Imagination". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11.1 (2005), 39.
[72] *Ibid.*
[73] Sako Musterd, Szymon Marcińczak, Maarten van Ham and Tiit Tammaru, "Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich," *Urban Geography* 38, no. 7 (2017): 1076.
[74] Musterd, Marcińczak, van Ham, and Tammaru, 1063.

Nicola BELLI
Architektūros ir statybos institutas, Kauno technologijos universitetas, Kaunas

MODERNUS MIESTO PLANAVIMAS IR DISONANSINIS PAVELDAS: SAN POLO ATVEJIS

Santrauka

Šio straipsnio tikslas yra suprasti, kokiu mastu masinių gyvenamųjų namų kvartalai, pastatyti po Antrojo pasaulinio karo su naujais statybų metodais ir veikiami novatoriškų planavimo idėjų bei egalitarinės filosofijos, pastaruoju metu susiduria su atmetimo procesu. Visų pirma tyrimas skirtas suprasti, kaip tokios inovatyvios urbanistinės struktūros greitai virto stigmatizuotomis gyvenamosiomis vietomis ir disonansinio paveldo šaltiniais. Darbe daugiausia dėmesio skiriama San Polo rajonui, esančiam Brešos mieste Italijoje, atvejui. San Polo suprojektavo architektas, planuotojas ir istorikas Leonardo Benevolo (1923–2017), turėjęs galimybę eksperimentuoti ir įgyvendinti savo architektūrinius sumanymus „viešosios urbanizacijos“ sferoje. Galima teigti, kad L. Benevolo teorinis požiūris ir architektūrinė praktika puikiai atspindėjo modernaus būsto pokario Europoje, kai progresyvių politinių idėjų ir egalitarinio miesto planavimo ryšys buvo tobulas, aukso amžių. Nepaisant to, po politinės ir ekonominės tranzicijų, kurios buvo būdingos Vakarų Europai nuo 1980 metų, masiniai gyvenamieji namai tapo problema viešajame diskurse ir pateko į nuosmukio spiralę. San Polo atvejis nebuvo išimtis: problemos, ypač jo ikoniniuose blokiniuose bokštuose, greitai augo ir galiausiai optimistinius lūkesčius sužlugdė fizinis, socialinis ir ekonominis atmetimas. Dėl šios priežasties šiuo tyrimu siekiama įvertinti, kokio masto disonansinio miesto paveldo kontekste yra San Polo atvejis. Akivaizdu, jog San Polo esantis paveldas yra aiškų istorinį tarpsnį ir išskirtines architektūrines bei planavimo idėjas žymintis paveldas. Kita vertus, privalu pažymėti, jog pastarųjų dešimtmečių ideologinis kismas jo vertę ir siunčiamą žinutę pavertė pasenusiomis, o socialinė ir ekonominė segregacijos neigiamai paveikė rajoną: gyventojai turėjo susidurti su stigmatizacijos procesu, kurio atgarsiai nuskambėjo tiek formaliajame, tiek žurnalistiniame diskursuose.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: šiuolaikinis miesto planavimas, miesto kraštovaizdis, disonansinis paveldas, pokario istorija, Italija, Leonardo Benevolo.

Gauta: 2020-03-31
Parengta spaudai: 2020-05-27

Nicola BELLI
PhD Candidate History and Theory of Arts
KTU, Kaunas Technology University, Lithuania
E-mail: nicola.belli@ktu.edu
nicola.belli89@gmail.com