

Slow increase of population

Heavy land take



Zero land take

Decrease of population

Scenario 1

“Sobborgo individualista”

In this scenario in 2040 more people live in Valposchiavo than now, and the population is younger and more active. The soil consumption is much higher than now all the land available for construction is developed. The landscape is characterized by a lot of single-family homes, more roads and parking infrastructure and more facilities such as a bigger hospital, museums, bars and clubs. All of this infrastructure is funded thanks to the increase of taxpayers. The valley is attractive for young people and foreigners because all of the services provided.

The **winners** in these scenarios are people working in the local manufacture business. Loser are the farmers, the tourist sector and the environment (less land available would mean less space for biodiversity). Also, low-income families/individuals could be penalized, because not everyone would be able to afford a single-family home.

Possible **allies** for this scenario could be the owners of construction companies. Also, investors in the real estate market could be interested in such a development.

Enemies of this scenario could be the tourism sector, the agricultural sector as well as the legislators on a higher level (due to a change in the swiss planning law the available construction land in every municipality must be reduced so it would be difficult to be able to build this much).

Scenario 2

“Borgo vivo”

In this scenario the amount of soil used by locals in 2040 is not different than now but the population is younger and has increased slightly. The valley is still able to offer the same level of facilities (hospital, schools, museums, sport facilities etc.) without the need of building new structures. The low soil consumption was made possible by the redevelopment of existing structures and the densification of existing agglomerations (higher buildings). Locals are employed in local companies or, thanks to investments in digitalization, they work remotely. Thanks to the higher number of inhabitants the local economy is going well (bakeries, butchers, bars, cinemas and restaurants have enough clients). This makes the area more attractive to young people and the region more lively. Thanks to the density of the development people can walk or cycle to work or for their daily activities, reducing the need of a car.

The **winners** in this scenario are the environment (lower impact on the land use), the local population (this scenario offers a high quality of life), young people (more opportunities are created in this scenario) as well as the tourist industry.

This scenario was seen as ideal by all participants and no real **looser** in the local area was identified. One participant suggested that maybe neighbouring regions could loose attractiveness and therefore be possible looser.

Possible **allies** for this scenario could be the tourism sector, the local society (especially younger people and families) as well as environmental organisations.

Possible **enemies** could be the construction sector or people interested in real estate speculations.

Scenario 3

“Sobborgo fantasma”

This scenario is characterized by a higher soil consumption and a decrease in population. In this scenario the landscape would be filled by industrial activities, large buildings and several holiday homes. The soil is not used efficiently, and a lot of buildings would be abandoned. This development would hurt the economy, making the area less attractive. Less taxpayers would live in the valley and the local infrastructure (roads, hospitals, schools) could not be sufficiently funded. People would live more scattered, and the sense of community felt at the moment would be lost.

This scenario was seen as the less desirable by all participants, so it was hard to find real **winner**. Possible people that could benefit from the situations could be the owners of the industrial plants or the people that sold their land before the development (short term benefit).

The **looser** in this case would be the people that stay in the valley (they would have less services and no sense of community, as well as the tourism industry and the environment).

Allies for this scenario could be a few wealthy entrepreneurs.

Enemies in this scenario could be the local population (the majority of the population would oppose such a development), the agricultural sector and legislators on a higher level (the new planning laws would oppose such a development).

Scenario 4

“Borgo vuoto”

In this scenario soil consumption would remain the same and the population would decrease. This would mean that less taxpayers would live in the area and less services could be financed. The quality of life would decrease in the region. On the other hand, the decrease in population and soil consumption would reduce the conflict between land users (farmers/predators) and would allow nature to take back space that is now being used for agricultural or other human activities (this could also allow big predators such as bears and wolves to live in the valley). In this scenario Valposchiavo would become a bit like a natural reserve.

In this scenario possible **winner** could be environmental activists and NGOs.

Looser could be the people that stay in the valley, the municipalities as well as public institutions (it would be hard to find people willing to work or pursue a political career).

The tourism sector could be seen both as a winner and a loser. On the one hand, the region could attract more tourists thanks to its wilder nature, on the other hand, the tourist offer could be compromised by the lack of people who keep the landscape and local customs alive (the promotion of local traditions and local products are an integral part of the tourism strategy at the moment).

Allies for this scenario could be environmental organisations as well as part of the tourism sector.

Enemies for this scenario would be local institutions as well as the local population.



This graphical elaboration has been realised within a collaboration of Fondazione Edmund Mach with Igloo incubator at Istituto Pavoniano Artigianelli as part of the Trentino Alta Formazione Grafica (TAG). Members of the team involved were: Stefania Berlanda & Federico Gazza (coordinators), Emil Larcher, Elena Paolazzi, Alex Zanella, Alice Segà, Rebecca Segata (Crew Lead)