Standard Issue – Article

Journal of Agricultural Engineering

https://www.agroengineering.org/

Assessment of the ecosystem services given by rural and urban green areas to preserve high quality territories from land take: the case of the Province of Monza Brianza (Italy)

Giulio Senes, Natalia Fumagalli, Paolo Stefano Ferrario, Roberto Rovelli, Federico Riva, Giovanna Sacchi, Paolo Gamba, Giacomo Ruffini, Giacomo Redondi

Please cite this article as doi: 10.4081/jae.2023.1526

Received: 03/05/2023
Accepted: 30/05/2023
Early View: 16/06/2023

Assessment of the ecosystem services given by rural and urban green areas to preserve high quality territories from land take: the case of the Province of Monza Brianza (Italy)

Giulio Senes,[1] Natalia Fumagalli,[1] Paolo Stefano Ferrario,[1] Roberto Rovelli,[1] Federico Riva,[1] Giovanna Sacchi,[2] Paolo Gamba,[2] Giacomo Ruffini,[2] Giacomo Redondi[2]

[1]Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Milan, Italy; [2]Studio Geologia Sacchi, Bergamo, Italy

Correspondence: Giulio Senes, Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Milan, Via Celoria 2, 20133 Milan, Italy.

E-mail: giulio.senes@unimi.it

Key words: ecosystem services, rural and urban green areas, land take.

Abstract

Rural and urban green areas are essential territories that support life and ecosystems. The significant reduction of these areas, due to the urbanization is a pressing issue. The process of land take not only consumes land resources but also the connected ecosystems and the benefits generated for the human society.

Reducing the quantity of land taken is imperative but preserving high quality territories is essential to achieving sustainable development. Evaluating the quality of non-urbanized areas can be performed by assessing the Ecosystem Services (ESs) provided by these areas.

In this paper, the authors present a further step, an evolution and deepening, of the previous methodology (published in 2020) for evaluating the quality of rural and urban green areas through the assessment of Ecosystem Services provided.

The methodology first allows the identification of the ESs provided by different typologies of rural and urban green areas according to the CICES - Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (provisioning, regulation and maintenance, and cultural). Then, it allows the calculation of several singular indexes and a final Composite Quality Index (CQI) through the use of GIS (Geographical Information Systems). An Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) was performed with the creation of different scenarios to consider the different importance of the singular indexes assigned by planners and communities involved.

The methodology was applied to the Province of Monza Brianza (Italy) for testing and validation purposes. The application to the Municipality of Sovico, which is presented in this report, allowed for the identification of areas with higher quality in the different scenarios that were created to consider the relative importance of the territorial characteristics.

Introduction

Non-urbanized areas, including residual urban green areas, urban parks, agricultural lands, natural areas, and semi-natural areas, are a crucial part of the Green Infrastructure. They are essential in supporting life and the future development of human society (Weber *et al*. 2006; Tzoulas *et al*. 2007; EU. 2013; La Rosa and Privitera. 2013; Fairbrass. 2018).

Through various chemical, physical, and biological processes, the natural heritage can provide long-term benefits that enhance the quality of human life. However, these benefits can only be sustained if the natural heritage is conserved over time and not consumed (Costanza *et al*. 1997), in accordance with the well-known principle of sustainable development.

Despite their vital role in ensuring the well-being of the population, green areas are continuously being consumed by the process of land take, which involves the irreversible transformation of natural or agricultural land into urbanized areas (Colsaet *et al.*, 2018; CRCS, 2018). Land take can be defined as *the change in the amount of agricultural, forest and other semi-natural and natural land taken by urban and other artificial land development. It includes areas sealed by construction and urban infrastructure, as well as urban green areas, and sport and leisure facilities* (European Environmental Agency, 2019).

The process of land take not only consumes the land resource but also destroys the connected ecosystems and the benefits they provide to human society, known as Ecosystem Services (MEA, 2005; Tassinari *et al.*, 2013; Senes and Cirone, 2018).

Reducing the amount of land taken is so an imperative action, and many countries have adopted various planning strategies (Rodela *et al.*, 2019; Ledda *et al.*, 2023) and reduction thresholds to achieve the European Union's target of zero net land take by 2050 (European Commission, 2016). However, this approach is not enough to counteract the loss of benefits provided to human society by the ‘taken’ green areas and their related natural, cultural and landscape resources.

In addition to quantitative aspects, qualitative aspects must also be considered. The types and amounts of Ecosystem Services lost due to the consumption of a portion of land depend on the territorial quality (Ronchi *et al*., 2019). In this sense, the Lombardy Region has introduced, in addition to quantitative thresholds of land take reduction, an obligation for municipalities to assess the quality of non-urbanized areas in their Land Use Plan. This assessment includes evaluating the agricultural, pedological, naturalistic and landscape values (Lombardy Region, 2014; Senes *et al*., 2020). Assessing the Ecosystem Services provided by urban and rural green areas can be a valuable approach to evaluating the overall quality of the territory (Albert *et al*., 2016; Logsdon and Chaubey, 2013, Koschke *et al.*, 2012; De Montis *et al.*, 2020).

In this framework, the goals of this study are: (1) to develop a methodology for the assessment of the quality of non-urbanized areas based on the evaluation of the Ecosystem Services provided; (2) to validate the methodology through an application at the municipal level.

Starting from the results of a previous study that defined a land quality index to preserve the best territories from future land take (Senes *et al.*, 2020), this present study modifies and deepens the methodology for assessing the Ecosystem Services provided by non-urbanized territories. It proposes a procedure for defining and calculating the provisioning ESs related to the agricultural activity, regulation ESs related to soil and natural resources, and cultural ESs related to the landscape resources, as well as an overall Composite Quality Index (CQI).

Moreover, the proposed methodology attempts to take in the due account the fact that the assessment of the overall quality of a territory depends not only on the characteristics of the territory itself, but also on the importance that each considered factor assumes in that particular place and time where the evaluation take place.

In a 'participatory' approach (Senes *et al.*, 2012), it is important to find a way to incorporate the needs and desires of the local community into the planning process. This can be considered a Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) problem since it involves assessing criteria that may conflict with each other (Malczewski, 2004; Fumagalli *et al.*, 2017; Türk, 2018) and allows for explicit stakeholders involvement (Burkhard *et al.*, 2012; de Groot *et al.*, 2010).

In this study, the authors performed an Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) with the creation of different scenarios to take in account the varying importance of the individual indexes assigned by planners and communities involved. AHP, introduced for the first time by Saaty (1980), is one of the most widely used MCDM tools by researchers and decision-makers in different fields (Dos Santos *et* *al.*, 2019; Itami *et al.*, 2001; Higgs. 2006). AHP is a quantitative method for selecting alternatives based on their relative importance with respect to different criteria (Boroushaki & Malczewski, 2008), through pairwise comparison according to the Saaty nine-point individual judgment scale (Saaty, 1980; Koschke *et al.*, 2012). AHP can also be easily incorporated into GIS procedures (Seyedmohammadi *et al.*, 2019), to calculate the weights to be associated with the various attributes of map layers (Mosadeghi *et al.*, 2015; Rovelli *et al.*, 2020).

The defined methodology was applied at the municipal level to the Province of Monza Brianza (Italy) using GIS and geographic data from regional, provincial, municipal, and Valle Lambro Park databases.

Materials and methods

The study area is the Province of Monza Brianza, which includes 55 densely populated municipalities with a high level of urbanization, located North of Milan. The method is applied at municipal level, and this paper refers to the application in the municipality of Sovico (area 324,9 ha) (Figure 1).

The methodology consists of three main steps, each of which is divided into one or more phases (Figure 2).

- Step 1 - Preliminary Step

Phase 1. Definition of the Ecosystem Services (ESs) provided by non-urbanized areas

Phase 2. Creation of the land use map of non-urbanized areas

Phase 3. Choice of the layers to be used for the calculation of the indexes

- Step 2 - Index calculation

Phase 4. Assessment of the Provisioning ESs related to agricultural activity: I_Prov_Agr index

Phase 5. Assessment of the Regulation ESs related to soil characteristics: I_Reg_Soil index

Phase 6. Assessment of the Regulation ESs related to natural resources: I_Reg_Nat index

Phase 7. Assessment of the Cultural ESs related to landscape resources: I_Cult_Land index

- Step 3 - Composite Index

Phase 8. Assessment of the Composite Quality Index (CQI) for different scenarios.

Phase 1 - Definition of the Ecosystem Services provided by non-urbanized areas

The Lombardy Region's identified territorial peculiarities, including agricultural, pedological, naturalistic, and landscape, have been used as a reference to define the Ecosystem Services provided by non-urbanized areas. The latest version (V5.1) of the Common International Classification for Ecosystem Services (CICES) has been used. The Ecosystem Services considered have been aggregated at the 'Group' level (Haines-Young and Potschin. 2018) (

).

Phase 2 - Creation of the land use map of non-urbanized areas

The starting point of the evaluation procedure is the identification of non-urbanized areas. Two vector databases produced by the Lombardy Region have been considered to produce the map: the regional Topographical Data Base (DBT) and the Agricultural and Forestry Land Use Database (DUSAF).

DBT represents the base map of the Regional Information System at the municipal level (Lombardy Region, 2005). It is produced at 1:2,000 scale and includes a series of layers that represent the different elements of the territory (buildings, transport network, hydrography, orography, green areas, agricultural areas, woods and vegetation, etc.). DUSAF, produced at 1:10,000 scale, contains a detailed classification of land uses (both urbanized and not urbanized areas) with specific reference to agriculture and forestry uses.

In this study, both databases were used, and a specific procedure was defined to integrate the two data sources. DBT was used as the graphical base due to its greater definition of the geometrical and spatial characteristics of the land use polygons. DUSAF was chosen as the information source only for extra-urban areas, since it is more precise and up-to-date for agroforest areas. The procedure defined includes the following stages (Figure 4):

a. selection of the non-urbanized areas from DBT;

b. check using satellite images;

c. overlay mapping with non-urbanized areas from DUSAF database;

d. homogenization and definitive classification definition.

Initially (a), polygons classified as non-urbanized areas were selected from DBT. Polygons with ‘particular’ land use class (uncertain or in-progress land uses) were added to the selection to verify them. The selected polygons were checked (b) using the most recent satellite images (2021-2022), to find and correct errors.

The corrected polygons were combined with the non-urbanized polygons of the DUSAF database, through a topological overlay in GIS environment (c). In this way, the information contained in the DUSAF (generally more up-to-date and specific for green areas) was associated with the polygons obtained in the previous stages (‘a’ and ‘b’). The necessary ‘editing operations’ were performed on small ‘sliver polygons’ resulting from the overlay process. Finally, the definitive classification was defined (d) through a homogenization process in which the extra-urban polygons were assigned to the corresponding land use class of the DUSAF classification.

The final map is represented in Figure 5.

Phase 3 - Choice of the layers to be used for the calculation of the indexes

For each ecosystem service, the information layers to be used for the calculation of the relative index have been identified. The databases used are derived from regional, provincial, and municipal sources, particularly the Geoportals of Lombardy Region and Province of Monza Brianza.

For the assessment of the provisioning ESs related to the agricultural activity (I_Prov_Agr index), agricultural land-use classes from DUSAF have been used, along with the belonging of the farm to the Official Register of agricultural companies of the Lombardy Region (Regional Agricultural Information System – SIARL). The ecosystem services provided refer to the following ‘sections’ of the CICES (Table 1):

- Provisioning (Biotic),

- Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic).

For the assessment of the regulation ESs related to the soil characteristics (I_Reg_Soil index), a complex set of information derived from different databases has been used:

- land capability, soil attitude for spreading slurry or urban sewage sludge, soil capacity for surface water or groundwater protection (Lombardy Region);
- underground cavities (Province of Monza);
- geological limitations, protection zones of wells (municipalities);
- green infrastructure suitability for stormwater infiltration (information coming from a previous study made by the authors; Senes *et al.*, 2021).

The ecosystem services provided refer to the following 'sections' of the CICES (Table 2):

- Provisioning (Biotic),
- Provisioning (Abiotic),
- Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic),
- Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic).

The categories 'A' and 'B' are relative to provisioning ESs, but they have been considered in the I_Reg_Soil index because they refer to soil characteristics and their 'provisioning' role is 'indirect'.

For the assessment of the regulation ESs related to the natural resources (I_Reg_Nat index), a complex set of information derived from different databases, has been used:

- natural value of soils, land-use (DUSAF), regional parks and protected areas, priority areas for biodiversity, Regional Ecological Network (Lombardy Region);
- Provincial Ecological Network (Province of Monza Brianza);
- Municipal Ecological Network (municipalities).

The ecosystem services provided refer to the Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic) 'section', Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection 'group' of the CICES (

Table *3*).

Finally, for the assessment of the cultural ESs related to the landscape resources (I_Cult_Land index), a complex set of information derived from different databases, has been used:

- landscape sensitivity, landscape restrictions, scenic trails, land-use (DUSAF) (Lombardy Region);
- historical gardens, monumental trees, geomorphological and water elements of historical interest, historical and cultural heritage, areas of landscape value (municipalities).

The ecosystem services provided refer to the following ‘sections’ of the CICES (Table 4):

- Cultural (Biotic),
- Cultural (Abiotic).

Phase 4 - Assessment of the Provisioning ESs related to the agricultural activity and calculation of the I_Prov_Agr Index

The calculation of the index was carried out by assigning a score (SAgr), which expresses the intensity and the economic value of the agricultural activity, to different land-use classes in non-urbanized territories. SAgr (Table 5) is based on the guidelines provided by the Lombardy Region for ‘*determination of agricultural value to define Strategic agricultural areas*’ at provincial level (Lombardy Region. 2008) and the Metland planning model (Fabos *et al.* 1978).

A further score (P_{SIARL} = 10) was assigned to cultivated areas belonging to farms included in the Official Register of agricultural companies of the Lombardy Region (SIARL), except for classes with the highest SAgr (Table 5).

The final I_Prov_Agr index was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale, with the following formula:

$$I\_Prov\_Agr_{[0-1]} = \frac{(SAgr + P_{SIARL})}{125}$$

where:

- *I_Prov_Agr* is the index that expresses Provisioning ESs related to agricultural activity;
- *SAgr* is the score related to the intensity and the economic value of the agricultural land-use class;
- P_{SIARL} is the score assigned to the cultivated areas belonging to farms included in the Official Register of agricultural companies of the Lombardy Region (SIARL).

Phase 5 - Assessment of the Regulation ESs related to the soil characteristics and calculation of the I_Reg_Soil Index

The index was calculated by assigning a score to each non-urbanized land polygon based on the Ess provided by the soil characteristics. The layers considered for calculation were divided into four categories (A, B, C, and D) according to the ecosystem service offered (see Table 2 in the previous paragraph). A specific score was assigned to each layer or class inside the layer (

Table *6*).

The ‘A’ score was calculated based on the values assigned to each land capability class (Table 7) by the Lombardy Region (2008) and the Metland planning model (Fabos *et al.* 1978). Land Capability represents a soil characteristic that affects the Provisioning (Biotic) Ess related to ‘Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy’ (CICES code 1.1.1). The ‘A’ score was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale with the following formula:

$$A_{[0-1]} = \frac{(LC_{[21-100]} - 21)}{(100 - 21)}$$

where *LC* is the land capability value.

The ‘B’ score was assigned to buffer areas around public wells for drinking water, which are protection zones for groundwater recharge areas to preserve drinking water for human consumption. These areas are fundamental for Provisioning (Abiotic) Ess related to the supply of ‘ground water used for nutrition, materials or energy’ (CICES code 4.2.2).

The ‘B’ score is equal to 1, given the strategic importance of the service provided:

$$B = 0 \vee B = 1$$

The ‘C’ score was calculated considering three soil characteristics.

The first is the ‘Green infrastructure Suitability for stormwater management’ (*Gsuit*), derived from a previous study of the authors (Senes *et al.* 2021). This suitability, which identifies the green areas most suitable for the creation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), can be effectively used as a measure of ‘Regulation & Maintenance – Biotic’ Ess linked to the ‘regulation of baseline flows and extreme events’ (CICES code 2.2.1).

The second characteristic refers to the ‘Geological Limitations’ (*GeoLim*) of the soils, which are defined by the municipalities based on the geological, hydrogeological, hydraulic and seismic risks. The territory is divided into classes and subclasses with increasing limitations to land-use changes, which can be effectively used to evaluate 'regulation & maintenance - Abiotic' ESs related to the 'regulation of baseline flows and extreme events' (CICES code 5.2.1). They are 'implicit' ESs that are provided if the territory is not transformed due to urban development.

The third characteristic refers to the presence of underground cavities in the subsoil (superficial sedimentary deposits) closely related to water infiltration and lithology. It is a well-known characteristic of the Monza Brianza Province soils (in Italian known as 'occhi pollini' phenomenon), which is connected with the geological and hydrogeological structure but also with the modifications to the underground water circulation produced by human interventions. The real occurrence and location of underground cavities in the subsoil is difficult to map without direct surveys such as penetration tests. For the Monza Brianza Province, only the information related to the probability of occurrence of the phenomenon, the 'Underground Cavities Susceptibility' (*SusUC*), is available. As for *GeoLim*, *SusUC* can be effectively used to evaluate 'regulation & maintenance – Abiotic' Ess related to the 'regulation of baseline flows and extreme events' (CICES code 5.2.1).

The 'C' score was calculated with the following formula:

$$C_{[0-2]} = (GSuit_{[0-1]} + GeoLim_{[0-1]}) \times SusUC_{[0.98-1]}$$

The 'D' score was calculated based on four soil characteristics: soil attitude for spreading livestock slurry (D1) and urban sewage sludge (D2), soil capacity to surface (D3) and underground (D4) water protection. These characteristics are based on the soil's pedological properties and are determined according to the following parameters such as flooding, slope; groundwater depth, permeability, hydrological group, and granulometry.

These characteristics can be effectively used to evaluate 'regulation & maintenance – Abiotic' Ess related to the 'mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances by non-living processes' (CICES code

5.1.1).

The ‘D’ score was calculated with the following formula:

$$D_{[0.84-1]} = \left(D1_{[0.96-1]} + D2_{[0.96-1]} + D3_{[0.96-1]} + D4_{[0.96-1]}\right) - 3$$

The I_Reg_Soil index was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale based on the criteria indicated below.

Firstly, to protect the most vulnerable areas from urban development, the maximum value (equal to 1) was assigned to the I_Reg_Soil index if any of the following characteristics had the maximum score: Land capability (A), Protection zone of wells (B), Green infrastructure suitability for stormwater management (Gsuit), and Geological limitations (GeoLim). Therefore, if:

$$A = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \; I\_Reg\_Soil = 1$$

$$B = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \; I\_Reg\_Soil = 1$$

$$GSuit = 1 \;\; \Rightarrow \; I\_Reg\_Soil = 1$$

$$FeaGeo = 1 \; \Rightarrow \; I\_Reg\_Soil = 1$$

In all other cases, the I_Reg_Soil index was calculated using the following formula:

$$\forall\, A \neq 1, B \neq 1, GSuit \neq 1, GeoLim \; \neq 1 \; \Rightarrow \; I\_Reg\_Soil_{[0-1]} = \frac{(A + C)}{2} \times \, D$$

If the calculated I_Reg_Soil was greater than 1, it was still considered to be 1 (maximum value).

Phase 6 - Assessment of the Regulation ESs related to the natural resources and calculation of the I_Reg_Nat Index

To calculate the I_Reg_Nat index, a score was assigned to each polygon of non-urbanized land based on the ESs provided by natural resources. Layers for calculation were divided into the following categories based on the ecosystem service offered: biodiversity protection, naturalistic value of soil, and land use (natural or agricultural) (see

Table *3* in the previous paragraph).

The ecosystem services provided by all the considered categories refer to the 'Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)' section, 'Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection' group of the CICES (CICES code 2.2.2

Table *3*).

The biodiversity protection category (*BioProt*) includes the layers related to the different types of parks and protected areas, ecological networks (at regional, provincial, and municipal level), and ‘priority areas for biodiversity’ defined by Lombardy Region. The scores assigned to each type considered are proportional to the importance for biodiversity protection and the relative level of protection (

Table *8*).

The second category refers to the 'naturalistic value of soils' (*NVS*), which depends on their pedological characteristics. This value can slightly increase the naturalistic quality of a territory and, therefore, has been considered as a 'multiplying factor' of the biodiversity protection value (Table 9). Similarly, land use (*L_Use*) can also represent a 'multiplying factor' of the biodiversity protection value. In this case, the score attributed to each land-use class, depending on the type ('natural' or 'agricultural') of land use/cover, can slightly decrease the naturalistic quality of a territory (Table 9). If the land-use class is neither 'natural' nor 'agricultural', the assigned score is equal to zero. Therefore, if a biodiversity protection area is characterized by an urban land-use (by mistake or due to changes that have occurred over time), the territory cannot provide the related ESs (CICES code 2.2.2).

Finally, to ensure the 'natural' land uses are not neglected, if they do not belong to any biodiversity protection area, they have been assigned a score of 0.10.

The I_Reg_Nat index was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale with the following formula:

$$I\_Reg\_Nat = \begin{cases} BioProt \times NVS \times L\_Use, & BioProt > 0 \\ 0.1 \quad , & BioProt = 0 \wedge L\_Use = 1 \\ 0 \quad , & BioProt = 0 \wedge L\_Use \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

If I_Reg_Nat > 1, the value is still considered to be 1 (maximum value).

Phase 7 - Assessment of the Cultural ESs related to the landscape resources and calculation of the I_Cult_Land Index

The index was calculated by assigning a score to each polygon of non-urbanized land based on the Ess provided by the landscape. The layers considered for calculation are listed in Table 4.

A specific score was assigned to each layer or class within the layer (Table 10).

The different landscape characteristics considered can be effectively used to evaluate the 'Biotic' and 'Abiotic' Cultural Ess related to 'physical and experiential interactions with natural environment' (CICES codes 3.1.1 and 6.1.1 respectively), 'intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment' (CICES codes 3.1.2 and 6.1.2 respectively), and 'spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment' (CICES codes 3.2.1 and 6.2.1 respectively). They can also be used to evaluate the 'Biotic' and 'Abiotic' Cultural Ess related to 'characteristics with non-use value' (CICES codes 3.2.2 and 6.2.2 respectively).

The 'Landscape sensitivity' (*Land_Sens*) describes the sensitivity of the landscape to territorial transformations and is used to preserve the landscape's peculiarities. Each class has been assigned a score proportional to the level of sensitivity.

Areas subject to landscape restrictions (*Land_Res*), as identified by the Regional Landscape Plan, are characterized by high landscape value (linked to natural and/or historical-cultural components) that is necessary to protect form transformation. Areas subject to landscape restrictions have been assigned the maximum score of 1.

Scenic trails (*Sc_Trail*) are linear elements of particular landscape importance due to naturalistic and/or historical-cultural reasons. Areas crossed by scenic trails (buffer of 150 meters) have been assigned the maximum score of 1.

Landscape elements from municipal plans (*LEMP*) represent what municipalities have identified as important landscape resources to be protected. They include:

(a) historical gardens (with the maximum score of),

(b) monumental trees (with the maximum score of 1),

(c) areas of landscape value (with a score of 0.8),

(d) other historical and cultural heritage elements (with a score of 0.8),

(e) water elements of historical interest (with a score of 0.2),

(f) geo-morphological elements of historical interest (with a score of 0.2).

Finally, some land-use classes (*L_Use*) have a landscape value due to natural and/or historical-cultural components that is important to preserve. Each considered class has been assigned a score proportional to the importance and/or the level of contribution to the overall landscape quality.

The I_Cult_Land index was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale by assigning the maximum score of the various layers considered, according to the following formula [9]:

$$I\_Cult\_Land_{[0-1]} = Max\ (Land\_Sens; Land\_Res; Sc\_Trail; LEMP; L\_Use)$$

Phase 8 - Assessment of the Composite Quality Index (CQI) for different scenarios

The Composite Quality index CQI was calculated on a 0 to 1 scale with the following formula [10]:

$$CQI_{0-1} = \frac{(W_{AGR} \times I\_Prov\_Agr) + (W_{SOIL} \times I\_Reg\_Soil) + (W_{NAT} \times I\_Reg\_Nat) + (W_{LAND} \times I\_Cult\_Land)}{4}$$

where,

$W_{AGR\ [0-1]}$ is the weight of the ESs related to agricultural activity,

$W_{SOIL\ [0-1]}$ is the weight of the Ess related to soil characteristics,

$W_{NAT\ [0-1]}$ is the weight of the ESs related to natural resources,

$W_{LAND\ [0-1]}$ is the weight of the ESs related to landscape resources,

$W_{AGR} + W_{SOIL} + W_{NAT} + W_{LAND} = 1$

Since each single index expresses the level of ecosystem services provided, CQI expresses the overall quantity of ESs provided by non-urbanized areas. It is possible to assign a specific weight to each index, based on the importance assumed by each characteristic in the specific context.

As anticipated in the introduction, in the present study authors performed an Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) with the creation of four different scenarios to evaluate the possible results of the different importance of the singular indexes eventually assigned by planners and communities involved. The four scenarios are the following (

Table ***11***):

- Scenario 1, in which the four components considered have the same importance;
- Scenario 2, in which soil characteristics are more important than the others;
- Scenario 3, in which natural resources are more important than the others;
- Scenario 4, in which landscape resources more important than the others.

Results and discussion

The value of each index was calculated for each non-urbanized polygon using the formulas defined in the previous section (Table 12), and the corresponding maps have been generated.

I_Prov_Agr Index

Areas with high quality from the agricultural activity perspective (I_Prov_Agr Index value greater than 0.6) occupy nearly 61% of the non-urbanized area in the municipality of Sovico (Table 12). These areas (shown in green in Figure 6) are concentrated in the western part of the municipality, although some can also be found in the Lambro river valley in the eastern part. Additionally, there is a 10% non-urbanized area with no provisioning ESs related to agricultural activities (shown in light blue in Figure 6) and another 23.5% with a very low capacity (with a value up to 0.2) to provide such ESs (shown in red in Figure 6).

I_Reg_Soil Index

Areas with high quality related to the soil characteristics (I_Reg_Soil Index value greater than 0.6) occupy nearly 27% of the non-urbanized area (Table 12). These areas (shown in green in Figure 7) are concentrated in the eastern part of the municipality (with a high ‘C’ value), although some can also be found in the western part (with a high ‘A’ value). Most of the non-urbanized territory (about 73%) has I_Reg_Soil value ranging from 0.41 to 0.6 (shown in yellow in Figure 7), while there are no areas with an index value lower than 0.4.

I_Reg_Nat Index

Areas with high quality related to the natural resources (I_Reg_Nat Index value greater than 0.6) occupy nearly 22% of the non-urbanized territory (Table 12). These areas (shown in green in Figure 8) are concentrated in the eastern part of the municipality, in the Lambro river valley. Almost 60% of the non-urbanized area has no regulating ESs related to natural resources (shown in light blue in Figure 8) or very few (shown in red in Figure 8). The western part presents I_Reg_Nat value ranging from 0.21 to 0.4 (shown in orange in Figure 8).

I_Cult_Land Index

Nearly 75% of the non-urbanized area has a great landscape value (I_Cult_Land Index greater than 0.6, with more than 70% greater than 0.8) (Table 12). These areas (shown in green in Figure 9**Figure *8***) are concentrated in the eastern and western parts of the municipality. Almost 23% of the non-urbanized area has a very low value of the index (shown in red in Figure 9) or equal to zero (shown in light blue in Figure 9). These areas are located in the central part of the municipality, close to the urban areas.

CQI Index Map

The calculation of the CQI for the study area led to the creation of four maps (one for each scenario) as shown in Figure 10.

As can be seen from the maps, the spatial distribution of areas with different CQI within the study area varies greatly depending on the scenario considered.

In Scenario 1, there is a prevalence of light green areas (with a CQI class equal to 4) on approximately 45% of the non-urbanized land (

Figure ***11***), and yellow areas (with a CQI class equal to 3) on approximately 29% of the non-urbanized land. In Scenario 2, yellow areas (with a CQI class equal to 3) prevail on approximately 67% of the non-urbanized land. In Scenario 3, orange areas (with a CQI class equal to 2) prevail on approximately 46% of the non-urbanized land. Finally, in Scenario 4, dark green areas (with a CQI class equal to 5) prevail on approximately 47% of the non-urbanized land.

In Scenario 2 (where soil characteristics are more important than the other factors), the most represented CQI class is number 3 (with a CQI value of 0.41-0.60), covering almost 67% of the non-urbanized area of the municipality of Sovico. This scenario emphasizes the large presence of areas with medium soil quality (Figure 7). However, this scenario may give too much importance to areas with poor soil quality compared to other ESs provided.

In Scenario 3 (where regulation ESs related to the natural resources are more important than the other factors), the most represented CQI class is number 2 (with a CQI value of 0.21-0.40), covering 46% of the non-urbanized area. In this scenario, the presence of territories in CQI class 1 (with a CQI value of 0.01-0.20) is also significant, while class 5 of CQI is absent. This is consistent with the scarce presence of territories with high-value natural resources (I_Reg_Nat > 0.6), concentrated only in the Lambro river valley, and the limited presence of areas with I_Reg_Nat > 0.8 (less than 6,000 sq.m, equivalent to about the 0.5% of the non-urbanized areas) (Figure 8).

As expected, the presence of a large area with I_Cult_Land > 0.8 (Figure 9) determines in Scenario 4 (where cultural ESs related to the landscape resources are more important than the others) the presence of almost 50 % of non-urbanized areas in CQI class number 5 (with CQI > 0.8).

Scenario 1 (where the four indexes have the same importance) appears to be the most balanced, showing approximately 45% of the territory in CQI class number 4, approximately 29% in CQI class number 3, approximately 18% in CQI class number 2, and the remaining divided between CQI class number 1 and 5.

From a planning perspective, it is crucial to identify areas that can provide more ecosystem services, both in terms of quantity and type. To identify such areas (i.e. those of higher overall quality), we analyzed the four scenarios simultaneously, firstly by identifying and quantifying areas with all the indicators (I_Prov_Agr, I_Reg_Soil, I_Reg_Nat, and I_Cult_Land) in class 4 or 5 (i.e. with a value > 0.6) in all the four scenarios (Table 13, first part), and secondly, those with indicator values in class 3 (i.e. with a value > 0.4) but with at least one indicator with a value in class 5 (Table 13, second part). We also verified the CQI class of these areas in the four scenarios (Table 13).

Only about 5% of the non-urbanized territory (approximately 55,000 sq.m) has all indicators with a value greater than 0.6 (i.e. in class 4 or 5) in all scenarios. This percentage increases to just over 8% (approximately 93,000 sq.m) if we consider also areas with index values in class 3 but with at least one index in class 5.

This 8% the non-urbanized territory represents the part with the highest quality, capable of providing more ecosystem services, regardless of the scenario considered (

Figure ***12***).

To better evaluate the remaining 92% of the non-urbanized territory, we analyzed the presence of the highest CQI classes (4 and 5) in the various scenarios, to extrapolate the location and extent of areas with higher quality regardless of the scenario considered (i.e. regardless of the relative importance of the ESs provided).

The analysis showed that the study area comprises 90,001 sq.m of territory (about 8%) with CQI in class 5 (i.e. CQI > 0.8) in two or three scenarios, and 429,616 sq.m (about 39%) with CQI in class 5 in at least one scenario (Table 14). These areas, which occupy approximately 47% of the non-urbanized territory of the study area, provide a large number of ESs in practically all scenarios and are concentrated in the eastern part of the municipality (Lambro river valley) and in the west (Figure 13).

The assessment of the data obtained from the application of the methodology to the study area indicates that Scenario 1, based on equal importance of all aspects considered and relative ESs provided, offers the most adequate interpretation of the quality of the non-urbanized territory. The analysis of the distribution of areas with the highest quality, those with CQI > 0.6 in at least one scenario (the green areas in Figure 13), in the different scenarios shows that (

Table *15*):

- Scenario 2 presents a high percentage (48.4%) of areas with CQI in class 2 and 3;
- Scenario 3 presents 56.4% of areas with CQI in class 2 and 3;
- Scenario 4 presents 99.9% of areas with CQI in class 5 in at least one scenario, which seems to be an overestimation of the contribution of cultural ESs related to landscape resources;
- Scenario 1 presents 8.3% of areas with CQI in class 5 in two or three scenarios, and 91.7% with CQI in class 4 in at least one scenario. This scenario is able to assess areas with the highest quality without overestimating any of the indexes considered.

Conclusions

The quality of non-urbanized territories is a crucial factor that must be considered when managing the phenomenon of land take. The goal should not only be to reduce the quantity of land taken but also to preserve the territories with higher quality, which are capable of providing more ESs, in terms of both quantity and typology.

The proposed procedure, applied in the study, makes it possible to identify the different ESs provided by territories, considering several characteristics, and assess them through the calculation of specific indicators using GIS. The method was applied to the municipalities of the Province of Monza Brianza (Italy) using official geographical data available from regional, provincial and municipal databases. This implies that expensive ground surveys or the implementation of new set of data are not required. The findings of the study provide useful information to planners to guide decisions regarding future land use in a more sustainable way, safeguarding high-quality territories from land take.

The proposed assessment methodology can be applied to territories with different characteristics (e.g. lowland rather than mountain areas) by identifying the most appropriate layers to be used for calculating the indexes.

The creation of scenarios allows for a more in-depth analysis, identifying areas with higher quality in different scenarios and considering the relative importance of the characteristics for a specific territorial context.

The study also revealed some limitations, linked to the possible overestimation of one index compared to the others (in the case of the presented application, the I_Cult_Land index). In this sense, it could be useful in the future to conduct a sensitivity analysis linked to the values attributed to the individual indices.

References

Albert C., Galler C., Hermes J., Neuendorf F., von Haaren C., Lovett A. 2016. Applying ecosystem services indicators in landscape planning and management: The ES-in-Planning framework. Ecological Indicator. Vol 61 part 1:100-113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.03.029.

Boroushaki, S., Malczewski, J., 2008. Implementing an extension of the analytical hierarchy process using ordered weighted averaging operators with fuzzy quantifiers in ArcGIS. Computers and Geosciences 34 (4), 399–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2007.04.003.

Burkhard, B., de Groot, R., Costanza, R., Seppelt, R., Jørgensen, S.E., Potschin, M., 2012. Solutions for sustaining natural capital and ecosystem services. Ecological Indicators 21, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.03.008.

Colsaet A., Laurans Y., Levrel H. 2018. What drives land take and urban land expansion? A systematic review. Land Use Policy. 79:339-349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.08.017.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, P. and van den Belt, M. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. Nature. 387:253-260.

CRCS. 2018. Consumo di suolo, servizi ecosistemici e green infrastructures: caratteri territoriali, approcci disciplinari e progetti innovativi. Rapporto 2018. INU Edizioni, Roma, Italy.

de Groot, R.S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., Willemen, L., 2010. Challenges in integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision making. Ecological Complexity 7 (3), 260–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2009.10.006.

De Montis A.; Serra V.; Ganciu A.; Ledda A., 2020. Assessing Landscape Fragmentation: A Composite Indicator. Sustainability, 12, 9632. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229632

Dos Santos, P.H., Neves, S.M., Sant'Anna, D.O., Oliveira, C.H.D., Carvalho, H.D., 2019. The analytic hierarchy process supporting decision making for sustainable development: An overview of applications. Journal of Cleaner Production 212, 119–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.270.

European Commission. 2016. Science for Environment Policy. Future brief: No net land take by 2050. Issue 14. Doi:10.2779/537195.

European Environmental Agency. 2019. Land take Indicator Specification. Indicator codes: CSI 014 , LSI 001 (Published 11 Dec 2019; Last modified 11 Dec 2019). Available from: www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/land-take-3

European Union. 2013. Building a Green Infrastructure for Europe. European commission. Bruxelles. Belgium. SBN 978-92-79- 33428-3. doi:10.2779/54125.

Fabos J.G. 1978. The Metland Landscape Planning Process: Composite Landscape Assessment, Alternative Plan Formulation and Plan Evaluation. Research Bulletin n. 653. University of Massachusetts. Amherst. USA.

Fairbrass A., Jones K., McIntosh A., Yao Z., Malki-Epshtein L., Bell S. 2018. Green Infrastructure for London: A Review of the Evidence. A Report by the Engineering Exchange for Just Space and the London Sustainability Exchange, Natural Environmental Research Council: London, UK.

Fumagalli N., Senes G., Ferrario P.S., Toccolini A., 2017. A minimum indicator set for assessing fontanili (lowland springs) of the Lombardy region in Italy. European Countryside, 1-2017, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1515/euco-2017-0001

Haines-Young R., Potschin-Young M. 2018. Revision of the Common International Classification for Ecosystem Services (CICES V5.1): A Policy Brief. One Ecosyst. 3:e27108. DOI:

https://doi.org/10.3897/oneeco.3.e27108.

Higgs G., 2006. Integrating multi-criteria techniques with Geographical Information Systems in waste facility location to enhance public participation. Waste Management & Research. 24:105-117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X060638.

Itami R.M., MacLaren G.S., Hirst K.M. 2001. Integrating the AHP with Geographic Information Systems for Assessing Resource Conditions in Rural Catchments in Australia. In: The Analytic Hierarchy Process in Natural Resource and Environmental Decision Making. Schmoldt D.L., Kangas J., Mendoza G.A., Pesonen M. (Eds.). Kluwer Academic Publishers. 269-287.

Koschke L., Fürst C., Frank S., Makeschin F. 2012. A multi-criteria approach for an integrated land-coverbased assessment of ecosystem services provision to support landscape planning. Ecological Indicators. 21:54–66.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.010.

Koschke, L., Fürst, C., Frank, S., Makeschin, F., 2012. A multi-criteria approach for an integrated land-cover-based assessment of ecosystem services provision to support landscape planning. Ecological Indicators 21, 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.010.

La Rosa D., Privitera R. 2013. Characterization of non-urbanized areas for land-use planning of agricultural and green infrastructure in urban contexts. Landscape and Urban planning. 109(1):94-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2012.05.012.

Ledda A.; Kubacka M.; Calia G.; Bródka S.; Serra V.; De Montis A.,2023. Italy vs. Poland: A Comparative Analysis of Regional Planning System Attitudes toward Adaptation to Climate Changes and Green Infrastructures. Sustainability, 15, 2536. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032536

Logsdon R.A., Chaubey I. 2013. A quantitative approach to evaluating ecosystem services. Ecological Modelling. 257:57–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.02.009

Malczewski, J., 2004. GIS-based land-use suitability analysis: a critical overview. Progress in Planning 62, 3–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2003.09.002.

MEA - Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis;

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Series; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2005; ISBN 9781597260404.

Mosadeghi, R., Warnken, J., Tomlinson, R., Mirfenderesk, H., 2015. Comparison of Fuzzy-AHP and AHP in a spatial multi-criteria decision making model for urban land-use planning. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems 49, 54–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2014.10.001.

Promoting ecosystem and human health in urban areas using Green Infrastructure: A literature review. Landscape Urban Planning. 81(3):167-178. 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.02.001

Regione Lombardia. 2005. Legge regionale 11 marzo 2005 n.12. Legge per il governo del territorio. BURL 16 marzo 2005 n.11.

Regione Lombardia. 2008. D.G.R. 19 settembre 2008. Criteri per la definizione degli ambiti destinati all'attività agricola di interesse strategico nei Piani Territoriali di Coordinamento Provinciale. BURL 29 settembre 2008 n.40.

Regione Lombardia. 2014. Legge regionale 28 novembre 2014 n.31. Legge regionale per la riduzione del consumo di suolo e per la riqualificazione del suolo degradato. BURL 1 dicembre 2014.

Rodela R., Tucker C.M., Šmid-Hribar M., Sigura M., Bogataj N., Urbanc M., Gunya A., 2019. Intersections of ecosystem services and common-pool resources literature: An interdisciplinary encounter. Environmental Science & Policy, 94, 72-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.12.021.

Ronchi S., Salata S., Arcidiacono A., Piroli E., Montanarella L. 2019. Policy instruments for soil protection among the EU member states: A comparative analysis. Land Use Policy. 82:763-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.01.017.

Rovelli R., Senes G., Fumagalli N., Sacco J., De Montis A., 2020. From railways to greenways: a complex index for supporting policymaking and planning. A case study in Piedmont (Italy). Land Use Policy, 99, 104835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104835.

Saaty T. 1980. The Analytic Hierarchy Process. McGraw-Hill. New York. US.

Senes G, Ferrario P.S., Cirone G., Fumagalli N., Frattini P., Sacchi G, Valè G. 2021. NatureBased Solutions for Storm Water Management—Creation of a Green Infrastructure Suitability Map as a Tool for Land-Use Planning at the Municipal Level in the Province of Monza-Brianza (Italy). Sustainability. 13, 6124. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116124.

Senes, G.; Fumagalli, N.; Crippa, R.; Bolchini, F., 2012. Nursing homes: Engaging patients and staff in healing garden design through focus group interviews. Neuropsychological Trends 12(1):135-146. https://doi.org/10.7358/neur-2012-012-sene.

Senes G, Fumagalli N., Ferrario P.S., Rovelli R., Sigon R. 2020. Definition of a land quality index to preserve the best territories from future land take. An application to a study area. Lombardy (Italy). Journal of Agricultural Engineering. LI:1006:43-55. https://doi.org/10.4081/jae.2020.1006

Senes G., Cirone G. 2018. I servizi ecosistemici del territorio rurale. La valutazione della qualità dei territori non urbanizzati come misura dei servizi ecosistemici a scala comunale. Rapporto nazionale 2018 del Centro di Ricerca sui Consumi di Suolo (CRCS). ISBN 978-88-7603-185-4. INU Edizioni, Roma.

Seyedmohammadi, J., Sarmadian, F., Jafarzadeh, A.A., McDowell, R.W., 2019. Development of a model using matter element, AHP and GIS techniques to assess the suitability of land for agriculture. Geoderma 352, 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.05.046.

Tassinari P., Torreggiani D., Benni S. 2013. Dealing with agriculture, environment and landscape in spatial planning: A discussion about the Italian case study. Land Use Policy. 30:739-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.05.014.

Türk, E., 2018. Multi-criteria Decision-Making for Greenways: The Case of Trabzon, Turkey. Planning Practice and Research 33 (3), 326–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2017.1378864.

Tzoulas K.,Korpela K.,Venn S., Yli-Pelkonen V.,Kaźmierczak A., Niemela J., Jamesp. 2007.

Weber T., Sloan A., Wolf J. 2006. Maryland’s green infrastructure assessment: development of a comprehensive approach to land conservation. Landscape Urban Planning. 77 (1–2):94-110. 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2005.02.002.



Figure 1. Study area



Figure 2. Methodological scheme.



Figure 3. Ecosystem Services considered for the indexes calculation.



Figure 4. Procedure for the creation of the land use map of non-urbanized areas.



Figure 5. Land use map of non-urbanized areas.



Figure 6. I_Prov_Agr Index map for the municipality of Sovico (MB).



Figure 7. I_Reg_Soil Index map for the municipality of Sovico (MB).



Figure 8. I_Reg_Nat Index map for the municipality of Sovico (MB).



Figure 9. I_Cult_Land Index map for the municipality of Sovico (MB).



Figure 10. Maps of the Composite Quality Index – CQI for the four scenarios.



CQI Value		Area (%) occupied by each class of CQI Value			
Class	Interval	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Class 5	0.81-1.00	3.85%	5.60%	0,00%	47.43%
Class 4	0.61-0.80	44.59%	22.59%	22.99%	25.64%
Class 3	0.41-0.60	28.71%	66.79%	10.32%	2.90%
Class 2	0.21-0.40	18.10%	5.02%	46.07%	17.34%
Class 1	0.01-0.20	4.75%	0,00%	20.62%	6.69%

Figure 11. Synthesis of the areas (%) occupied by each class of CQI value in the four scenarios.



Figure 12. Not urbanized areas with the 4 indexes (I_Prov_Agr, I_Reg_Soil, I_Reg_Nat, I_Cult_Land) values > 0.6 (i.e. in class 4 or 5) in all scenarios, or with the indexes values also in class 3 (i.e. with a value > 0.4) but with at least one index in class 5 (i.e. with a value > 0.8).



Figure 13. Synthesis of the CQI values in the different scenarios.

Table 1. Ecosystem Services and layers used for I_Prov_Agr calculation.

Layer: land use	Ecosystem Service (CICES)		
	Section	Group	Code
DUSAF class			
Farms, Agricultural production settlements	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1
Crops	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy Reared animals for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1 1.1.3
Meadows	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy Reared animals for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1 1.1.3
Horticulture, nurseries (also in greenhouses)	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1
Vegetable gardens	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1
Vineyards, Orchards, Olive groves, Chestnuts	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1
Poplars, Woods	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1
Pastures	Provisioning (Biotic)	Reared animals for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.3
Agricultural company			
Regional agricultural information system - SIARL	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy Reared animals for nutrition, materials or energy	1.1.1 1.1.3

Table 2. Ecosystem Services and layers used for I_Reg_Soil calculation.

Category	Layer	Ecosystem Service (CICES)		
		Section	Group	Code
A	Land capability	Provisioning (Biotic)	Cultivated terrestrial plants for nutrition, materials or energy.	1.1.1
B	Protection zone of wells	Provisioning (Abiotic)	Ground water for used for nutrition, materials or energy	4.2.2
C	Green infrastructure suitability to stormwater infiltration	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)	Regulation of baseline flows and extreme events	2.2.1
	Geological limitations	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Regulation of baseline flows and extreme events	5.2.1
	Underground cavities	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Regulation of baseline flows and extreme events	5.2.1
D	Soil attitude for spreading livestock slurry	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances by non-living processes	5.1.1
	Soil attitude for spreading urban sewage sludge	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances by non-living processes	5.1.1
	Soil capacity to surface water protection	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances by non-living processes	5.1.1
	Soil capacity to groundwater protection	Regulation & Maintenance (Abiotic)	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances by non-living processes	5.1.1

Table 3. Ecosystem Services and layers used for I_Reg_Nat calculation.

Category	Layer	Ecosystem Service (CICES)		
		Section	Group	Code
Naturalistic value	Soil naturalistic value	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	2.2.2
Biodiversity protection	Parks and protected areas	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	2.2.2
	Regional ecological network			
	Provincial ecological network			
	Municipal ecological network			
	Priority areas for biodiversity			
Land use class				
Agricultural land use	Crops	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	2.2.2
	Horticulture			
	Vegetable gardens			
	Meadows			
	Vineyards			
	Orchards			
	Olive groves			
	Poplars			
	Chestnut			
Natural Land use	Pastures	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	2.2.2
	Woods			
	Riparian woods			
	Bushes			
	Bushes with trees			
	Wetland vegetation			

Table 4. Ecosystem Services and layers used for I_Cult_Land calculation.

Layer	Ecosystem Service (CICES)		
	Section	Group	Code
Landscape sensitivity	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
Landscape restrictions	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment	3.2.1
		Biotic characteristics with non-use value	3.2.2
	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with abiotic	6.2.1

		components of natural environment	
		Abiotic characteristics with non-use value	6.2.2
Scenic trails (buffer 150 m)	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
Historical gardens	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment	3.2.1
		Biotic characteristics with non-use value	3.2.2
	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with abiotic components of natural environment	6.2.1
		Abiotic characteristics with non-use value	6.2.2
Monumental trees (buffer 50m)	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment	3.2.1
		Biotic characteristics with non-use value	3.2.2
Geo-morphological and water elements of historical interest	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
Historical and cultural heritage	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with abiotic components of natural environment	6.2.1
		Abiotic characteristics with non-use value	6.2.2
Areas of landscape value	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment	3.2.1
		Biotic characteristics with non-use value	3.2.2
	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with abiotic components of natural environment	6.2.1
		Abiotic characteristics with non-use value	6.2.2
Land use class			
Woods	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural	3.1.1

		environment	
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
		Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with natural environment	3.2.1
Tree rows (buffer 50m), vineyards, riparian woods, embankment vegetation, bushes with trees, wetland vegetation	Cultural (Biotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural environment	3.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with natural environment	3.1.2
Beaches and dunes	Cultural (Abiotic)	Physical and experiential interactions with natural abiotic components of the environment	6.1.1
		Intellectual and representative interactions with abiotic components of the natural environment	6.1.2

Table 5. Score assigned to land use classes and calculation of the I_Prov_Agr Index.

Land use class	**SAgr**	**P_{SIARL}**	**$S\_Agr_{\_TOT}$**	**I_Prov_Agr**
Vineyards, Orchards, Olive groves	125	0	125	1.00
Horticulture, Floriculture, and plant nurseries in greenhouses	110	10	120	0.96
		0	110	0.88
Farms and agricultural production settlements; crops, vegetable gardens, meadows, and chestnuts; horticulture, Floriculture, and plant nurseries (not in greenhouses)	100	10	110	0.88
		0	100	0.80
Poplars	90	10	100	0.80
		0	90	0.72
Pastures	75	10	85	0.68
		0	75	0.60
Woods and riparian woods	25	10	35	0.28
		0	25	0.20

Table 6. Scores assigned to layers (or class inside the layer) for I_Reg_Soil index calculation.

A		B		C						D							
Land capability		**Protection zone of wells**		**Green infrastructu-re suitability for stormwater infiltration**		**Geological limitations**		**Underground cavities susceptibility**		**Soil attitude for spreading livestock slurry**		**Soil attitude for spreading urban sewage sludge**		**Soil capacity to surface water protection**		**Soil capacity to groundwater protection**	
class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score	class	score
I	1.00	yes	1.00	H	1.0	3-4	0-1[c]	H	1.000	H	1.00	H	1.00	H	1.00	H	1.00
II[a]	0.91	no	0.00	H-M	0.8			H-M	0.995	M	0.99	M	0.99	M	0.98	M	0.98
II[b]	0.89			M	0.6			M	0.990	L	0.98	L	0.98	L	0.96	L	0.96
III[a]	0.66			M-L	0.4			M-L	0.985	N	0.96	N	0.96				
III[b]	0.63			L	0.2			L	0.980								
IV[a]	0.53			N	0.0												
IV[b]	0.52																
V-VI[a]	0.34																
V-VI[b]	0.32																
VII[a]	0.03																
VII[b]	0.00																
VIII	0.00																

H = high
M =medium
L =low
[a] = one soil limitation
[b] = two soil limitations
[c] = score from 0 to 1 assigned to specific classes reported in the municipal plans

Table 7. Scores assigned to land capability classes.

Land capability class	Land capability value	'A' score
I	100	1
II[a]	93	0.91
II[b]	91	0.89
III[a]	73	0.66
III[b]	71	0.63
IV[a]	63	0.53
IV[b]	61	0.51
V-VI[a]	48	0.34
V-VI[b]	46	0.32
VII[a]	23	0.03
VII[b]	21	0
VIII	21	0

[a] one soil limitation; [b] two soil limitations.

Table 8. Biodiversity protection: scores assigned to the different typologies.

Layer	**Typology**	**Score**
Protected area and local park	Natura 2000 sites	1.00
Protected area and local park	Priority areas of intervention	1.00
Protected area and local park	Natural parks	0.75
Regional ecological network	Primary elements	0.75
Priority areas for biodiversity	Priority areas for biodiversity	0.75
Regional ecological network	Secondary elements	0.50
Protected area and local park	Regional parks	0.50
Protected area and local park	Local parks	0.25
Regional ecological network	Primary corridors	0.25
Provincial ecological network	Provincial ecological network	0.15
Municipal ecological network	Municipal ecological network	0.15

Table 9. Scores assigned to the Soil naturalistic value and to Land-use classes.

Soil naturalistic value		**Land use**	
Class	*Score*	*Class*	*Score*
High	1.1	Natural	1.0
Medium	1.0	Agricultural	0.9
Low	1.0	Urban	0.0

Table 10. Scores assigned to layers (or class inside the layer) for I_Cult_Land index calculation.

Landscape sensitivity		**Landscape restrictions**		**Scenic trails**		**Landscape elements from municipal plans**		**Land use**	
class	*score*	*class*	*score*	*class*	*score*	*class*	*score*	*class*	*score*
VH	1.0	yes	1.0	yes	1.0	Historical gardens	1.0	Woods	0.8
H	1.0	no	0.0	no	0.0	Monumental trees	1.0	Vineyards	0.6
M	0.2					Areas of landscape value	0.8	Riparian woods	0.4
L	0.0					Historical and cultural heritage	0.8	Wetland vegetation	0.4
VL	0.0					Water elements of historical interest	0.2	Bush with trees	0.4
						Geo-morphological elements of historical interest	0.2	Tree rows	0.4
								Embankment vegetationn	0.4
								Beaches and dunes	0.4

VH = Very High
H = High
M = Medium
L = Low
VL = Very Low

Table 11. Weights assigned to the indexes in the four scenarios.

Index	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
I_Prov_Agr	0.250	0.125	0.125	0.125
I_Reg_Soil	0.250	**0.625**	0.125	0.125
I_Reg_Nat	0.250	0.125	**0.625**	0.125
I_Cult_Land	0.250	0.125	0.125	**0.625**
Sum of the weights	**1.000**	**1.000**	**1.000**	**1.000**

Table 12. Non-urbanized surface (in %) for each value class of each index.

Class value	Non-urbanized surface (in %) for each value class of each index			
	I_Prov_Agr	I_Reg_Soil	I_Reg_Nat	I_Cult_Land
0	10.1%	0.0%	30.7%	3.5%
0.01-0.20	23.5%	0.0%	29.0%	19.3%
0.21-0.40	5.7%	0.0%	17.7%	1.9%
0.41-0.60	0.0%	73.1%	0.4%	0.1%
0.61-0.80	41.7%	19.8%	21.6%	4.8%
0.80-1.00	19.1%	7.1%	0.5%	70.4%
Tot	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Table 13. Different combinations (and relative area) of non-urbanized territories with the values of all indexes in class 4 or 5 (i.e. with value > 0.6) in all scenarios, or with the indexes values also in class 3 (i.e. with a value > 0.4) but with at least one index in class 5, and the relative CQI class.

I_Prov_Agr Class	I_Reg_Soil Class	I_Reg_Nat Class	I_Cult_Land Class	CQI Class				Area	
				Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Sq. m	%
5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	34,533	3.09%
4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	6,752	0.60%
4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	6,353	0.57%
5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5,687	0.51%
4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	1,734	0.16%
Total								*55,059*	*4.93%*
5	3	4	5	4	4	4	5	25,243	2.26%
4	3	4	5	4	4	4	5	10,533	0.94%
5	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	1,152	0.10%
5	3	4	5	4	3	4	5	564	0.05%
4	3	3	5	4	3	3	5	318	0.03%
5	3	3	5	4	3	3	5	242	0.02%
4	5	3	5	4	4	4	5	162	0.01%
Total								*38,214*	*3.41%*
Overall Total								**93,273**	**8.34 %**

Table 14. Distribution of the CQI classes in the different scenarios (and relative areas occupied).

CQI	Area		Number of scenarios with CQI in class …					Area	
	Sq.m	%	Class 5	Class 4	Class 3	Class 2	Class 1	Sq.m	%
CQI in class 5 in 2 or 3 scenarios	90,001	8.17%	3	1				6,820	0.62%
			2	2				82,263	7.47%
			2	1		1		917	0.08%
CQI in class 5 in 1 scenario	429,616	39.01%	1	3				113,912	10.34%
			1	2	1			82,320	7.47%
			1	2		1		5,196	0.47%
			1	1	2			53,679	4.87%
			1	1	1	1		174,509	15.84%
CQI in class 4 in at least 1 scenario (no areas in class 5)	297,872	27.04%		4				2,450	0.22%
				3	1			15,040	1.37%
				2	2			922	0.08%
				2	1	1		14,520	1.32%
				1	3			2,357	0.21%
				1	2	1		225,712	20.49%
				1	1	2		71	0.01%
				1	1	1	1	36,801	3.34%
CQI in class 3 in at least 1 scenario (no areas in class 4 or 5)	230,969	20.97%			3	1		18,196	1.65%
					2	2		59,809	5.43%
					2	1	1	15,563	1.41%
					1	2	1	136,121	12.36%
					1	1	2	1,279	0.12%
CQI in class 2 in at least 1 scenario (no areas in class 3 or 4 or 5)	52,970	4.81%				3	1	550	0.05%
						1	3	52,420	4.76%

Table 15. Distribution of the areas with highest quality (with CQI in Class 5, i.e. > 0.8, in at least one scenario), in each of the four scenarios considered.

Scenario	Class	Area with CQI in Class 5: in 2 or 3 scenarios	Area with CQI in Class 5: in 1 scenario	Total	
Scenario 1	Class 5	43,116	0	43,116	519,617
	Area (sq.m) and %	*8.3%*	*0.0%*	*8.3%*	*100.0%*
	Class 4	46,885	429,616	476,501	
	Area (sq.m) and %	*9.0%*	*82.7%*	*91.7%*	
	Class 2 and 3	0	0		0
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.0%*	*0.0%*		*0.0%*
Scenario 2	Class 5	53,705	662	54,367	268,161
	Area (sq.m) and %	*10.3%*	*0.1%*	*10.5%*	*51.6%*
	Class 4	36,296	177,498	213,794	
	Area (sq.m) and %	*7.0%*	*34.2%*	*41.1%*	
	Class 2 and 3	0	21,456		251,456
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.0%*	*48.4%*		*48.4%*
Scenario 3	Class 5	0	0	0	226,676
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*43.6%*
	Class 4	89,083	137,593	226,676	
	Area (sq.m) and %	*17.1%*	*26.5%*	*43.6%*	
	Class 2 and 3	9178	292,023		292,941
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.2%*	*56.2%*		*56.4%*
Scenario 4	Class 5	90,001	428,954	518,954	519,204
	Area (sq.m) and %	*17.3%*	*82.6%*	*99.99%*	*99.9%*
	Class 4	0	249	249	
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	
	Class 2 and 3		413		413
	Area (sq.m) and %	*0.0%*	*0.1%*		*0.1%*