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Piazza Alessandria is a mixed-use neighborhood located at the boundary of Rome’s Municipio I and II, just outside of the historical Aurelian Wall. The community is relatively wealthy and diverse, and is populated throughout the day by a mixture of residents, working commuters and visiting users. The neighborhood is both physically and demographically old, which has prompted various regeneration efforts by the municipal government and community organizations in the past two decades.

In the spring of 2017, our team of four Urban and Regional Studies undergraduates from Cornell University participating in the Rome Workshop (CRP 4160) conducted an analysis of this neighborhood from the lens of child- and age-friendly urban planning, funded by an Engaged Cornell grant. We assessed Piazza Alessandria’s capacity to meet the needs and interests of children and the elderly, through desk-based research, field observation and community engagement.

Given an aged community undergoing regeneration, we were particularly interested in how this dialectic — age as a pre-existing condition, opposed by the impetus to transform and rejuvenate — was affecting young and old populations. By eliciting local perceptions of the effect of recent change on the child- and age- friendliness of Piazza Alessandria, we were able to understand how the needs and interests of children and the elderly were perceived to align or diverge. This engaged approach contributes to current debate on multigenerational planning, illuminating the potential and challenges to building coalitions between the elderly and young in urban planning.
When urban areas deteriorate, or their decline is perceived to be imminent, cities often engage in a process of urban regeneration to avert or reverse the decline. This process — laden with connotations of top-down overhauls and eventual gentrification of blighted urban areas — has been defined as a comprehensive vision that attempts to introduce long-term solutions to economic, physical, social and environmental problems of a community (Roberts 2016). But these solutions are often not targeted at everyone. Cameron (1992) shows regeneration efforts on city centers favors young, single adults. By focusing on working-age adults, regeneration pushes out the retail needs of the poor and the elderly (Pascual-Molinas and Ribera-Fumaz 2009). Other regeneration initiatives have targeted outside users — students and tourists — effectively undermining social structures and disregarding the needs of residents (Murzyn 2006). Similar top-down interventions that were intended to build safer communities instead “ignored social values in the pursuit of commercial profit;” (Raco, 1878, 2003). Planners place inadequate attention on the needs of children in regeneration structures, despite the fact that a common quality of well-functioning neighborhoods are their ability to integrate young people into community life (Elsey 2004, Chawla and Malone 2003).

Regeneration’s focus on the working-age adult, and the result inattention placed on children and the elderly, seems all the more worrying considering international demographic trends.. The UN (2015) reports that about 3.9 billion people currently reside in urban areas, with this figure expected to grow to about 5.1 billion by 2030, constituting approximately 60 percent of the global population. The dominant global trend is one of rapid aging — in most countries, the fastest growing age group is 60 and older (WHO 2015a) — while a swell in youth populations is also anticipated, primarily in developing countries (Biggs & Carr 2015). Despite the prominence of these twin challenges of population aging and urban growth, children and the elderly are consistently underrepresented in urban agendas. Planners have traditionally relied on the hegemonic view of cities as places of production and consumption. They typically privilege able-bodied, tax-paying adults, at the expense of the two age groups at the peripheries of the life course — children and the elderly — deemed to be dependents or burdens on the system (Warner et al. 2013).

Some scholars have responded to this bias by attempting to make an economic case for children and the elderly. Warner (2013) argues that families with young children contribute to economic growth for three reasons: firstly, they tend to be the largest spenders; secondly, child-targeted services are a critical element of local and regional economies; and thirdly, investment in children develops a productive future workforce leading to long-term growth. The WHO (2015b) argues that age-based assumptions of dependence ignore the contributions of the elderly to the economy, both through formal channels of taxation and consumer spending, and through informal modes such as care provision to grandchildren that allows parents to participate more actively in the workforce.

Others have argued for the interest of children and the elderly more from an emphatic standpoint, given that they constitute significant portions of the urban population regardless of their economic utility to society. Biggs and Carr (2015) argue that recognizing peripheral demographic groups conceived to be less economically productive “implies that cities are more than simply rat-runs between centers of work, consumption and closed door domesticity” (p. 109). Buffel et al. (2012) posit a “paradox of neighborhood participation,” in which the elderly tend to spend the most time in their neighborhood while...
being among the last engaged in decision-making processes, a juxtaposition of de facto and de jure participation in the right to the city. Both economic and rights-based approaches highlight the necessity to address, if not prioritize, the needs of the two peripheral age groups in planning.

The UN and the WHO have established prototypical frameworks to address these needs. UNICEF’s (2004) Child-Friendly Cities model advocates a rights-based approach on the basis of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, while the WHO’s (2007) Age-Friendly Cities project emphasizes active aging through civic participation. The manifestos have been fundamental to the development of child- and age-friendly planning, respectively. But while successive discourse has expanded the conceptualization of each field, there has been relatively limited literature consolidating the two. Child- and age-friendly approaches have predominantly remained discrete in practice and in theory (Biggs & Carr 2015, 104).

Authors advocating a synthesis of child- and age-specific interests have termed this ‘multigenerational’ or ‘intergenerational’ planning. They point to apparent and sometimes synergistic overlaps in the needs of these two age groups. This can include the physical environment — e.g. safe and walkable neighborhoods, access to public spaces, availability of fresh food and reliable public transport to support independent mobility — social elements — e.g. welfare services, civic engagement — or a combination of both. For example, schools that serve as community centers and senior centers might also offer childcare and afterschool programs, and can thereby simultaneously provide for the physical and social needs of both elders and children (Rowles & Bernard, 227-8).

At the same time, other scholars warn that this ‘multigenerational’ approach may be problematic because: “a rhetorical shift towards environments for all ages may indicate the use of the term as a trope, to advance the cause of design that takes specifically older adults into account while hitching it to the wagon of a universal good.” (Biggs & Carr 2015, 104-5).

The existing literature shows that child- and age-friendliness converge in several important neighborhood qualities. The WHO (2007) lists eight age-friendly city topic areas that cover the “structures, environment, services and policies” of a city. Similarly, UNICEF (2004) defines a series of 12 rights “of every young citizen” in a child-friendly city, and Haikkola & Horelli (2002) identifies 10 “normative dimensions of environmental child friendliness.” Synthesizing these criteria yields eight general domains: transportation, public spaces, housing, services, environmental quality, communication and information, respect and social inclusion, and civic participation. As the WHO (2007) acknowledges, these topics are not explicitly categorical; they “overlap and interact.” Thus, the list establishes a comprehensive picture of a community, holistically addressing child- and age-friendly themes.

To assess Piazza Alessandria’s child- and age-friendliness, we began with a thorough neighborhood analysis, examining the history, users, buildings, streets and circulation, public services and community actors of the neighborhood. With this preliminary research completed, we moved towards a more rigorous stage of engagement, using the literature to shape our research approach. We use the aforementioned eight domains to assess the child- and age-friendliness of Piazza Alessandria; understand how users of Piazza Alessandria perceive child- and age-friendliness compared to existing frameworks of understanding; and understand whether and where the needs and interests of children and the elderly converge or diverge, to shed light on the concept of multigenerational planning.
PART ONE

neighborhood analysis
Piazza Alessandria is a mixed-use neighborhood located northwest of the historical center of Rome, just outside of the Aurelian Wall at the boundary of Municipio I and II. It occupies most of Municipio II’s Quartiere Salario IV, the smallest district of Rome. The neighborhood has a population of 5,040 people within 0.37 square kilometers (92 acres), giving it a density more than eight times greater than Rome's average. A large portion of the northern end is occupied by the Villa Albani, a private estate. The rest of the neighborhood is relatively built-up (in a gradient of villini, condominiums and blocks), and these structures include a variety of residential, office, institutional and mixed-use functions. The residential buildings are, on average, older, larger and taller than the buildings of Rome. Major landmarks include a covered market that stands on Piazza Alessandria and Museo d'Arte Contemporanea di Roma, a contemporary art museum in the center of the neighborhood.

The community is relatively wealthy and diverse. It is populated throughout the day by a mixture of residents, working commuters and visiting users. The residents of the community are on average older than the residents of Rome, with one in four inhabitants older than 65. Given the financial, legal and professional services located in the community and its environs, thousands of workers commute to the neighborhood daily. Its proximity to the historic center, network of major arterials and range of public transport options make it highly connected to the center of Rome, and thus Piazza Alessandria is also frequented by transient users who patronize the myriad retail and food and beverage options, or consult the professional services in the neighborhood.

The wealth of the neighborhood plays a role in the neighborhood’s privileging of private space at the expense of public space. This preference is reflected by the dearth of quality and accessible public space. The community also disrespects sidewalks and intersections in the neighborhood, demonstrated by the poor use and maintenance of pedestrian areas.

Several renewal projects in recent years have strived to regenerate the community. These projects have had varying degrees of success in revitalizing the neighborhood. Large-scale interventions like the redevelopment of the Peroni Beer factory into a contemporary art museum show the government’s desire for regeneration. Parallelly, smaller scale grassroots interventions — like the Amici di Porta Pia, an organization composed of residents and shop owners — have also attempted to renew Piazza Alessandria, although a lack of community engagement and an ineffective governmental have all limited these groups’ effectiveness.

Figure 1: MACRO rooftop
The boundaries of the Piazza Alessandria neighborhood were designated according to physical boundaries and census tracts. Major roads border the neighborhood on the east, west and south, and also form the edges of the official quartiere (Quartiere Salario IV) in which our study area lies. We choose not to incorporate the only remaining section of the quartiere to the north because Villa Albani, a large private estate located in the north of our community, forms an impermeable barrier between our chosen study area and the northern component of the quartiere. The selected study area consists of 25 census tracts.

Statistical data was obtained from ISTAT. Census data from 2001 and 2011 for both the neighborhood (Piazza Alessandria) and the city (Roma Capitale) area of Rome was downloaded from ISTAT’s website. GIS shapefiles and building data were downloaded from the websites of the municipality of Rome and the region of Lazio. The statistical data was analyzed in Microsoft Excel and ArcGIS. All charts and graphs were made in Excel. Maps were made using a combination of Adobe Illustrator and GIS. Additional mapping data was drawn from Google Maps and Google Earth.

Fieldwork was conducted mostly on Monday and Thursday mornings and early afternoons, and occasionally on weekday evenings and weekends. Observations covered both physical and human aspects and included decoding building typologies, evaluating walkability, mapping service availability and noting the different user types. Days in the field typically began at 9:30 a.m. and would conclude around 3 p.m.

Informal interviews were used to verify our observations and statistical findings, understand local perspectives and gain deeper insight into the nuances of the neighborhood. Users were asked about their opinions of the physical environment and how they interacted with it on a day-to-day basis. A diverse group of individuals — differing ages, backgrounds and purposes for being in the neighborhood — was selected, with the goal of eliciting varying perceptions of the community from a cross-section of users. We also arranged for formal interviews with the leaders of two significant community organizations.

Translators were provided with a general series of questions and would engage with the chosen interviewee, while we stood nearby. After our translator talked with the subject — a chat lasting anywhere from a few sentences to a full conversation spanning 20 minutes or more — the translator would recount the conversation to us. Based on his or her translation, a string of sentences in the first person were put together, as if our interviewee spoke them in English.

In each category of the following neighborhood analysis, the specific methodology used will be described in detail.

**limitations**

There were various limitations to our research methodologies. Firstly, we had limited access to statistical data. Only the past three censuses were available online, and the earliest one, 1991, is organized by census tracts with different boundaries and labels than what is currently used, making the information on our specific study area largely inaccessible.

Census data from before 1991 is not digitized and exists only in physical copies in the city archives. Therefore, our temporal data is limited to just a 10-year time period, which forms the basis of our interpretation of demographic trends. Similarly, the most recent data available to us is from...
the 2011 census, which is now six years old. Based on the neighborhood’s considerable changes in the past 10 years, this data could already be outdated. Other desired information such as income breakdown, crime statistics, public transport ridership, absorption rates and total number of daily commuters was inaccessible or simply did not exist.

Secondly, since we were largely dependent on our Italian-speaking teaching assistants and professor for translation, our interviews were limited to Monday and Thursday mornings and early afternoons. This inadvertently marginalized the viewpoints of students and workers who commute out of the neighborhood during that time. However, we tried to address this bias by conducting field visits during weekday evenings and on the weekends, although interviews conducted on those occasions were less effective without a translator. We were also only able to capture the perspectives of individuals who agreed to talk with us, which was a minority compared to those who rejected our attempts to engage in conversation. This self-selection bias results in a limited sampling of people who are willing and able to speak with a group of strangers. This partiality potentially leaves a considerable section of the population voiceless in our research.

Finally, the element of translation may leave out important parts of interviews. While our translators were certainly fluent in both Italian and English, it is important to bear in mind a perfect translation from Italian to English for every word or phrase does not exist. The idiosyncrasies of Italian may have been lost when our translators relayed the subject’s message to us.
history
Piazza Alessandria is located within Rome’s smallest district — Quartiere Salario IV — and draws its name from one of its bounding roads, Via Salaria. This ancient Roman salt trade route passed through the Aurelian Walls which were completed in the third century under the reign of Emperor Aurelian. Along with a considerable amount of the Aurelian Wall circuit, Via Salaria continues to exist just beyond the boundaries of our neighborhood. Like much of the other areas outside of the walls, Piazza Alessandria remained undeveloped and predominantly rural until the late 18th and early 19th centuries with the exception of two developments, Porta Pia and Villa Albani. These two structures were built several hundred years before the urbanization of the neighborhood, and they mark the first permanent planned interventions on the Roman landscape within our study area.

**early transformations**

In 1561, Rome’s urban area could no longer sustain traffic through the previous gate of Porta Nomentana in the northeastern portion of the Aurelian Wall circuit. With this in mind, Pope Pius IV created a new road, Via Pia, that ended just a few hundred meters north of Nomentana. This newly conceived road prompted a grand gate at its intersection of the walled city circuit linking the expanding countryside to the urban center.

Pius IV received three proposals for the gate from Michelangelo. With no officially recorded plans for the gate except architectural sketches of a few of the building’s details, it is unknown if the built monument follows one of the three original proposed plans. This was Michelangelo’s last project, and he died a few months before Porta Pia’s completion. A commemorative coin issued in 1561 offers the only formal documentation from the era, however the gate’s depiction on the coin differs greatly from the completed project.
It was not until 1869 that the external facade of Porta Pia was completed. Neoclassical architect Virginio Vespignani designed the final portion of the gate, closely following the images on the commemorative coin. The following year, a group of Bersaglieri soldiers breached the Aurelian Walls at the end of what is now Via Alessandria. They stormed Rome and completed Italy’s Unification. This breach ended the papal control of the city, and Rome became the new seat of the newly unified Italian nation.

At the neighborhood’s northernmost boundary, Villa Albani — completed between 1747 and 1767 — is a leading example of Baroque and Neoclassical architecture (Fig. 1). The villa’s planned garden landscapes and series of buildings on the property were part of a former vast estate that extended far beyond the current walled boundaries into what is now Quartiere Salaria. Cardinal Alessandro Albani, nephew of Pope Clement XI (1700-1721) constructed the villa to house his vast painting, antiquities and ancient Roman sculpture collections. Ownership of the villa remained in the Albani family for roughly 140 years until 1867 when relatives of the former Cardinal sold the estate to the Torlonia family, a prominent group of Italian bankers who amassed their fortune through controlling the financial accounts of the Vatican in the 18th and 19th centuries. The Torlonia family still owns the property today (Massimo, 2011).

Prior to the Torlonia family’s acquisition, the city began to develop the outlying regions of the estate beyond the manicured gardens. A piazza and several radiating roads had already been built in the southern portion of the Villa’s gardens. Rome’s 1909 Piano Regolatore Generale — the city-wide master plan — governed the future development of the upper two regions of the neighborhood (Fig. 2). The urban fabric today of the neighborhood draws most of its governing ideas from the 1909 master plan, which
Situated in the first of the three development regions in the neighborhood, the former Peroni Brewery was built in 1864, due to increased demand for the growing beer brand (Fig. 3). The factory, along with its supporting facilities, were the first industrial developments in the area. Growing with the company’s expansions, in 1912 the brewery complex expanded to include a new ice factory and a garage for delivery carts. These expansions contributed to Peroni becoming Italy’s largest brewery.

At the height of the production in the area, increased industrial investments for the premium Italian brewery incited a real estate boom in the neighborhood, and the upper two regions of the neighborhood developed rapidly. In 1926, Piazza Alessandria, the open air public gathering space for the residents of the quartiere, was chosen for the location of an enclosed market space. This was named Mercato Nomentano. The Peroni factory remained operational until 1971. The former facilities took up a substantial amount of the neighborhood’s land, and remained vacant until 1983 when both the company and city authorities agreed upon the property’s redevelopment (Calabro, 2003).

The oldest part of the Peroni brewery, located adjacent to Mercato Nomentano, was privately redeveloped into a mixed-use complex that includes a gym, restaurant and condominium units (Fig. 5). As for the contemporary developments

focuses heavily on minimizing the need to cross the historical center, thus the neighborhood’s mix of land uses makes sense. With the introduction of a new range of building typologies in an attempt to control densities in areas of the city, the plan also introduced the first consideration for Rome's future growth.
northernmost lots of the former brewery, Museo d’Arte Contemporanea di Roma (MACRO, Museum of Contemporary Art) was chosen as the leading project for the redevelopment of the abandoned industrial spaces in 1999. An international competition was held in 2000, and in 2001, French architect Odile Decq Studios’ design was selected (Fig. 6, 7). Their restoration of the former Peroni packing facility into a contemporary art museum along Via Nizza attempts to integrate the new building’s use within the pre-existing network of the neighborhood. Though much of the project’s original public community spaces in the lower levels of the development was not realized, the building offers urban spaces for the visitors with its rooftop terrace, parking garage, library and restaurant (MACRO, 2006).
Porta Pia is constructed by Pope Pius IV as a gate in the Aurelian Wall, designed by Michelangelo

1864

The Peroni Beer Factory moves from Vigevano to Rome and sets up its headquarters in the area

1926

An Umbertine style covered market is built in Piazza Alessandria to house Mercato Nomentano

1999

MACRO, a city-run contemporary art museum, is established in the old Peroni Beer Factory

2015

The Mercati d’Autore project is launched in Mercato Nomentano
demographics

2.1 overview
2.2 population
2.3 family size
2.4 housing
2.5 education
2.6 employment
2.7 migration
Recognizing the diversity of users in Piazza Alessandria is fundamental to understanding the various stakeholders involved in the neighborhood’s regeneration. These users can be split into three distinct groups — residents, working commuters and transient visitors — that have different needs and interests. The latter two groups are attracted to Piazza Alessandria because it is a hub of commercial, professional and cultural activity, an aspect that will be addressed in Services.

Its residents, on the other hand, tend to be older and more wealthy than in most other Roman neighborhoods. While income data was not available, indicators such as residential space per person, levels of education and rates of unemployment are used as proxies to understand the wealth of the neighborhood. This gives rise to several trends highlighted in later chapters. For example, we posit that the community’s wealth leads to a sense of entitlement that manifests itself in a privileging of private space over public space, as well as a relative lack of civic engagement, described in later chapters. The prominence of elderly in the neighborhood, particularly ones living alone, predicates the age-friendly agenda. At the same time, a growing number of youth aged 5-19 anticipates an equally important child-friendly agenda. The diversity of users by age and background thereby forms a critical basis for understanding how the different needs and interests they represent drive and/or come into conflict with recent transformations in the neighborhood — and thus, for assessing child- and age-friendliness against the backdrop of regeneration.

**methodology**

Statistical data was downloaded from ISTAT by census tracts. Data analysis was executed in Microsoft Excel.
There are 5,040 residents in Piazza Alessandria, occupying 0.37 square kilometers. Excluding the villa, the population density of the neighborhood is about 18,500 persons per square kilometer. This is more than eight times as dense the city of Rome. It is also significantly denser than the historical city center (Municipio I) and the rest of the municipio it belongs to (Municipio II).

56 percent of residents in our neighborhood are females. This is particularly prominent at upper age brackets, given the higher life expectancy of Italian women compared to Italian men.

Our neighborhood is considerably older than Rome. Nearly 13 percent of all residents in Piazza Alessandria are older than 74, making it the largest age bracket by over four percentage points. For Rome as a whole, about 10.7 percent of people are that old.
Piazza Alessandria’s dependency ratio — the ratio of people younger than 15 and older than 65 to the population between 15 and 64 — is a nine percent increase above Rome’s. This high ratio puts a significant burden on those supporting young and elderly dependents.

The population of the neighborhood shrank by almost four percent from 2001 to 2011, with the most significant changes in the center of the population pyramid. The age group of 25 to 29 experienced the most dramatic drop of 41 percent. However, while the neighborhood still has considerably less children and adolescents than the city as a whole, there has been a sharp increase of those in the age bracket of 5 to 19, which indicates that children and young families are a growing demographic. There has also been a bump in population of residents in their forties.
Family sizes in Piazza Alessandria have been shrinking. In 2011, nearly half of households consisted of just one person in Piazza Alessandria, far above the percentage of single-person households city of Rome.

On average, family sizes in Piazza Alessandria are 1.97 people per household, below replacement rate of 2.1. Family sizes have decreased seven percent since 2001 despite out-migration of those in their 20s and what appears to be an influx of families — the increase of kids aged 5-19 and of adults in their 40s (see chart of population change on the previous page).
Like the rest of Rome, Piazza Alessandria is composed of significantly more owners than renters. Homeownership has increased slightly since 2001, which may indicate that people are becoming more invested in the community, a positive sign for grassroots developments and civic participation. Yet, as we’ll demonstrate later in the paper, that may not actually hold true.

While family sizes are considerably smaller in Piazza Alessandria, living spaces are considerably larger than in Rome, about a 38 percent increase. The average home size is about 103 square meters.
Residents of Piazza Alessandria have high levels of education attainment, and the difference in education rates between the neighborhood and the city has widened in recent years. Even though Piazza Alessandria experienced a 200-person decrease in population from 2001 to 2011, the number of college-educated individuals increased by 300. This is a strong indicator that Piazza Alessandria is considerably wealthier than Rome as a whole.

Across the city, there is a minimal education gap between men and women. In Piazza Alessandria, however, the gap is significant.
Just over 2,400 people in Piazza Alessandria are considered to be part of the labor force. The labor force participation rate is 54.5 percent, about two percentage points higher than Rome as a metropolitan city.

Among those 2,400 individuals in the labor force, 4.9 percent are actively seeking work. This figure is considerably below the city average of 6.5 percent, emphasizing the neighborhood’s economic vitality, despite a stagnant metropolitan economy.

Piazza Alessandria has a female-majority workforce. However, similar to the rest of Rome, females in the neighborhood also have a higher unemployment rate than males — 5.4 percent for women compared with 4.2 percent for men.
The composition of Piazza Alessandria’s foreign-born population by country of origin is similar to that of Rome. However, it tends to have relatively more middle-aged migrants compared to young or elderly migrants.

Two-thirds of foreign-born residents in Piazza Alessandria are female. This could be an indicator of a live-in badanti population, whom we observed and spoke to on several occasions.
Piazza Alessandria does not have a homogeneous building and street layout, but rather an organic one that reflects the lengthy development of the neighborhood over several centuries, as discussed in History.

The area to the south of the neighborhood has more structure than the regions in the north that follow the walls of Villa Albani. These street alignments and building positions separate the study area into different zones that each house their own activities, walkability and livability conditions. This section will provide insight to the neighborhood’s built form. Specific attention will be placed on the buildings’ age, conditions and real estate values.

Just as the rest of Rome can be viewed as a palimpsest, Piazza Alessandria is comprised of its own unique layers of history shown in the villini to the north, Villa Albani directly above, baroque style apartment blocks and modern interventions in former industrial buildings. Examining the structures within the neighborhood this section will provide insight to the area’s development and eventual regeneration.

In the figure ground map, patterns of the built form in the neighborhood become clear. The southern part is far denser than areas in the north, and in this southern section, the roads all radiate out of Piazza Alessandria.
The differences between our neighborhood and the overall city extend beyond the demographic factors. The buildings in the neighborhood are significantly older than those in the city of Rome. Over two thirds of the residential buildings in our neighborhood were erected before 1919. For comparison, only one in every 15 buildings in Rome is that old.

Figure 1: A new residential building has not been built since 1990.
Residential buildings in the neighborhood are taller and larger than the buildings of the overall city. In Piazza Alessandria, over 92 percent of residential buildings have more than four stories, compared to 40 percent in Rome.

88 percent of buildings in our neighborhood are composed of at least nine residential units, a dramatic increase over Rome, where only one in three buildings have as many units, underscoring our community’s dense residential fabric.
The average residential condominium in Piazza Alessandria has an assessed value of €4,850 per square meter and can be rented at a cost of €16 per square meter per month. In other words, an average condominium — using the census’ average size of residential space — costs €488,395. While apartment rentals in the community are offered at a discount from the historic center of Rome within the Aurelian Walls — where prices can average €22 per square meter per month — Piazza Alessandria has higher real estate values than almost all of the communities in the first peripheral ring of the city.

A similar story is found in an analysis of the commercial real estate prices of the neighborhood. An average commercial spaces rents for €26.75 per square meter per month. This figure makes our community more expensive than hip neighborhoods in Rome like Trastevere and Testaccio and considerably pricier than many other quartieres within the Aurelian Walls and on the first layer of the periphery.
A real estate agent in the community confirmed the high property values. He said the people that purchase apartments in the area are largely middle-aged professionals. Since prospective tenants and homeowners must guarantee that can pay for the apartment, they are usually wealthy.

According to the real estate agent, it is a very attractive neighborhood to live in. He highlighted the proximity to Termini as a main draw. Many people commute to other cities from Piazza Alessandria. He told us they will live in the neighborhood then take the train to Milan for a few days and then return. He advertises the community by telling clients that, although it is close to the city center, Piazza Alessandria is not part of all the chaos that is associated with that part of Rome.

Several of the large employers in the environs of the neighborhood — notably Enel and the ministry of transport — rent large swaths of apartments in the community for their employees. The real estate agent told us that if the large companies were to move out of the area, then there would be a problem selling apartments and prices would likely drop considerably.

**methodology**

Real estate data is the appraised values of abitazioni civili properties in the second half of 2016 for Quartiere Salario. Data was downloaded as a KML file from the Geopoi database — a site hosted by Agenzia Entrate — and then imported into GIS. Age, height and size of buildings was downloaded from ISTAT.
The vast majority of the buildings in Piazza Alessandria is mixed use. Notable exception to this are the residential blocks between Villa Albani and Via Savoia. However, one should bear in mind the dangers of blindly looking at a land-use map to understand a community. While vast swaths of the community are categorized as mixed use, a distinction must be made between some mixed-use sections and others.

Although it is true that all sections of the properties described as mixed-use offer a combination of uses, the types of services in different mixed-use parts of the community vary considerably. The buildings in the north of the community mostly include professional service firms and doctors offices on their ground floors, set back from the street. The mixed-use buildings in the south feature more typical retail. See Services [pg. 66] for a full analysis of this contrast and its implications.

A comparison to nearby communities shows Piazza Alessandria is unique amongst its neighboring quartieres. Many of the surrounding neighborhoods are strictly residential with few, if any, ground-floor retail options. On the other hand, Piazza Alessandria has hundreds of different restaurants, stores and other types of services [see Services, page 62].

- **Single-family residential**
- **Commercial**
- **Multi-family residential**
- **Mixed-use**
- **Institutions**
building typologies

There are four broad building typologies in the neighborhood: High Rises, Low Rises, Institutional/Semi-public and Villas. These typologies are explained in detail on the following pages. The High Rises are further distinguished by land use and presence of set backs, to produce the following seven categories reflected on the adjacent map:

- High Rise Residential (Set Back)
- High Rise Mixed Use (Set Back)
- High Rise Mixed Use (No Set Back)
- High Rise Commercial (No Set Back)
- Low Rise
- Institutional & Semi-Public
- Villa

methodology

We used walking surveys and aerial views of the physical structures to identify the seven distinct categories of buildings. Each typology aids the narrative of the individual building’s time, purpose and stages of development. Similar typologies are grouped together under the governing four typologies: High Rises, Low Rises, Institutional/Semi-public and Villas. These typologies will be explained further in the following pages.
Villa Albani is a cultural landmark of the community and aids in the narrative of the neighborhood’s development. The walled property still remains under private ownership and is not accessible to the public except for specific research pertaining to its vast sculpture and painting collection. The walled property occupies a considerable amount of the neighborhood and acts as a barrier forcing residents to take either Via Salaria or Viale Regina Margherita to access areas in the northern portion of the municipal quartiere.

These buildings are four to five stories tall and are typically designed in Renaissance revival style. Built in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, these buildings are classified as mixed-use or residential. Some have set backs, (fig. 4 has set backs, fig. 5 does not) which give the block arrangement of the neighborhood a much more spacious feeling, with trees and vegetation lining the roads. Parking spaces for residents and workers within the set back blocks reduce road obstructions.
Low Rises

Low Rises are comprised of small two- to four-story buildings that are predominantly mixed-use or residential with several exceptions such as the Spanish cultural embassy and IBL bank. This type is identifiable by its low floor area ratio and its walled lots and tree-lined properties with interior yards. Aside from Villa Albani, these developments comprise the least dense part of the neighborhood.

Institutional & Semi-public

The remaining buildings in the neighborhood are institutional and semi-public buildings. This grouping of typologies are combined for their semi-public uses within the area and general access to citizens of Rome. Mercato Nomentano, the MACRO and its parking garage, the Goethe Institute and the Enel Auditorium all are highlighted and do not fall under the three overarching typologies previously outlined.
circulation
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street typologies

Our neighborhood features four different kinds of streets:

- Arterials
- Connector Road
- Main Streets
- Neighborhood Streets

Arterials and main streets bound our community, creating an intimate neighborhood crisscrossed by neighborhood streets. A connector road divides the community into two halves: the southern section is defined by a radiating pattern of neighborhood streets out of Mercato Nomentano, the northern half is similarly composed of neighborhood streets, albeit with less through traffic.

methodology

The street typologies were determined by walking through Piazza Alessandria and keeping track of each street section's width, parking situation, lanes of traffic and general materials. Google Maps was later used to better estimate the widths of the streets and sidewalks.
Arterials are the central thoroughfares of Rome, with several wide lanes of traffic and considerable amounts of parking. These streets often have medians with large trees, tram lines or designated lanes for buses. Since they are wide, busy and relatively impermeable, arterials form some of the boundaries of our neighborhood and are the main way Piazza Alessandria is connected to greater Rome.
Main streets are bustling roads that lack the impressive width of arterials but still offer multiple lanes of traffic and designated public transportation lanes. This typology has one side of parking and also occupies edges of the neighborhood.
Connector roads are relatively narrow and straight streets with an absence of parking. With few traffic signals or other speed reducing mechanisms, cars tend to move quickly along these roads. They are frequented by buses but lack a lane dedicated to public transport. Since there is no parking, cars will occasionally illegally park half on the sidewalk, half in the street.
Neighborhood streets are generally one-way roads and have two sides of parking — usually one parallel and one slanted. These roads serve as the interior network of the community. The neighborhood streets near the market are mostly paved, while those in the north tend to be made of cobblestone. These streets are occasionally lined with small trees.
walkability

For a neighborhood to be considered walkable, pedestrian infrastructure has to be designed well, maintained attentively and used correctly. A street could be designed perfectly, yet if it is not regularly maintained or if it is not properly used, then it could be just as dangerous as a poorly designed street with excellent upkeep and usage.

The necessity to delineate these three criteria is evident in Piazza Alessandria. Parked cars block well-designed curb cuts; crosswalks have almost entirely faded from sight; high curbs make even the simplest street crossings treacherous. Pedestrians expressed their distaste for the streetscape, noting that it is “dangerous to walk,” and that “everything is broken.” An old man told us that he wished there was someone who could help the elderly cross the street.

By isolating the problem at each intersection or sidewalk — or in some cases highlighting a trio of problems — we can better understand the shortcomings of this neighborhood’s walkability.

Overall, our analysis of the sidewalks and intersections reveals that the walkability in the neighborhood is vitiated by negligence and improper utilization. For the most part, design is strong: sidewalks are just about everywhere and most intersections have curb cuts and traffic signals. Despite this strength, usage and maintenance consistently lag behind.

Very few sets of sidewalks, and no intersections, earned perfect pedestrian marks across the three criteria. Overall, the design of the sidewalks was good — about 60 percent were rated as ‘three’ and none were ‘ones.’ In terms of maintenance, far fewer sidewalks were in good condition, and about one in eight were classified as poor. Usage was slightly better, but still considerably worse than design.
In order to analyze the walkability of the blocks and intersections of Piazza Alessandria, we traversed the entirety of the neighborhood. After establishing a clear set of criteria for the three categories, we walked from intersection to intersection, covering each block. We compared notes and assigned values at regular intervals. We discussed the attributes of the intersection or block until a consensus was reached. The sidewalks and intersections of Piazza Alessandria were evaluated for design, maintenance and use on a scale of one to three, ranging from poor to good.

Items evaluated for design: presence and quality of curb cuts; presence of pedestrian infrastructure at street crossings (i.e. crosswalks, pedestrian signals, crosswalk buttons); cross-slope, width and material of sidewalks; sight distances at corners and driveways; and presence of buffer from street traffic.

Items evaluated for maintenance: presence of trash; presence of potholes; and visibility of painted crosswalks.

Items evaluated for usage: presence of illegally parked cars on streets and in crosswalks; presence of other obstacles (i.e. restaurant signs, street vendors, bike racks, construction, dumpsters); speed of cars; and tendency for cars to stop at crosswalks.

There are a few potential shortcomings in our methodology. Since we only assessed walkability once, our maintenance and usage data points may not accurately represent what an intersection is like on a daily basis. For instance, the day we walked through the neighborhood may have been the one day of the month that a flower salesman chose to park his truck in a particular sidewalk. Conversely, we may have witnessed rare occasions when, on certain streets, parking was nowhere near its capacity.

Our analysis also only shows the state of walkability at one moment in time: a Thursday morning. An examination of the streets in the evening or on a weekend may have yielded different results for usage.
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Our neighborhood is home to nine bus stops and two tram stops, totaling 20 bus or tram routes that cut through Piazza Alessandria or run along its borders. The 11 transit stops are well spread out in the neighborhood. Few areas in Piazza Alessandria are more than 400 meters from a bus or tram stop, making these public transportation options accessible for people like children and the elderly for whom long distances may be imposing.
These routes connect the community to the central city and various parts of the periphery. Residents, workers and visitors we spoke to all cited connectivity to the city center as a major reason why the neighborhood is an attractive place to live, work or visit. One elderly woman we spoke to told us, “You can go everywhere very easily with public transportation.”
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The elderly make up a disproportionately large percentage of Piazza Alessandria’s residents, many of whom live alone. Face-to-face human interaction is critical for retirees with small social circles and who lack the routine of school or work as settings for social interaction. However, the community has minimal quality public space and what space it does have is often inaccessible. The midday migration of hundreds of office workers poses significant challenges to the community; in the Peroni courtyard, we observed workers occupying the majority of available public seating areas during the lunch hour, effectively displacing the elders whom we had seen enjoying the same space several hours earlier.

Thus, the underlying need for a large quantity of well-designed, accessible public space in this community is apparent. And yet, despite this necessity, the neighborhood lacks quality public space, which residents and commuters certainly notice. An elderly writer that we spoke to summed up the existing stock of public space succinctly, saying “The public space around here is boring.”

Yet there are signs that the government, the private sector and the community are trying to change that. The neighborhood’s regeneration has centered on the public space in the community. The creation of the MACRO was predicated on its ability to provide additional public space for the neighborhood (see page 71). The Peroni courtyard is now one of the most-used public spaces in Piazza Alessandria. The recently renovated Mercato Nomentano features a small library with room for 30 diners. The Community Actors section will provide a more robust analysis of the way these regeneration attempts have occurred (see page 69).
Mercato Nomentano is the centerpiece of public space in the neighborhood. The market — an 1,800-square meter building — features approximately 25 stalls including a cafe, a pizzeria, many fruit and vegetable stands and several salamerias and gastronomias. Save for a few vacant stalls in the western part of the market, Mercato Nomentano is usually lively and bustling with activity.

The market is full of all kinds of people; working commuters shop for sandwiches and pizza around lunchtime, residents pick up the day’s groceries in the morning, elders grab a coffee at the cafe. As mentioned earlier, old people, especially those who live alone, often lack large social networks. The market acts as a hub for the elderly, where, according to a few of the shop owners, old people meet up to talk and shop together. In the summer months, the role of the market is especially critical. Old people seek out the market because it has great circulation and is generally quite a bit more comfortable than outside in the sweltering Rome sun, according to a vendor. The elderly also rely on the shop owners themselves for companionship. A baker in the market told us, “There’s a relationship of confidence between me and my clients. They tell me personal things about family matters.”
There is almost no on-street public seating in the neighborhood. The one exception is at the intersection of Viale Regina Margherita and Via Alessandria. These two streets meet at a piazza called Piazza Regina Margherita, a diamond-shaped intersection dotted with trees. There are groups of seats at each of the four corners of the intersection, and during the day these benches are populated by the three types of users of our community: transient visitors, working commuters and residents. The high-volume of car, bus and tram traffic along Viale Regina Margherita, however, makes this a noisy, noxious and potentially unsafe space, scaring off some elderly and young families in search of a quiet place to rest.
The Museum of Contemporary Art of Rome (MACRO), like the market, also features considerable public space. Just up the stairs from the main lobby, there is a modern seating area set underneath a huge, multi-colored skylight. The rooftop is a spectacular setting, with huge wall paintings on neighboring buildings. However, this seemingly attractive space is not actually used by individuals that frequent the community. Many people that were interviewed about public space dismissed the museum’s role in the community. One commuter went so far to say, “It’s as if the MACRO doesn’t exist.”

With a sleek and modern, perhaps even uninviting, entrance, the MACRO is not as physically woven into the community as Mercato Nomentano is. The actual doors into the complex are set at the end of a 25-meter pathway off the street. Within the building itself, the existence of the public space is not obvious; there is no clear signage publicizing the areas of the museum that offer free entry.
The MACRO also has a free, public restroom, a rarity in our neighborhood. However, once again, modern, edgy design seems to work against the museum in becoming a true asset for the community. The bathrooms are confusingly laid out and “bubblers” that are used as sinks are difficult to use. Furthermore, the lighting and a series of mirrored walls makes navigating the bathroom difficult.
In contrast to the MACRO, the courtyard across the street from the market is very popular in the community. Unlike the museum, the courtyard is accessible and appealing; the elderly come to relax and commuters spend their lunch breaks here. The space — a 900-square meter, L-shaped open area — is part of a private redevelopment of a Peroni Beer factory completed in the mid-1980s. Surrounded by various shops and services — most of them with a health and wellness focus — the courtyard features seating and attractive potted plants.

To illustrate the value of the courtyard to the community, examine the ways users think of the courtyard. An elderly woman walking with her caretaker referred to the courtyard as a park, revealing that community members view this courtyard — a semi-private space with no green space — like a public park. We witnessed a father playing in the courtyard with his daughter in the early morning. He later told us he liked the space because it is “quiet and well-maintained.”
In order to find any real green space, you must venture outside of Piazza Alessandria. Residents frequently travel at least half a kilometer to Villa Borghese to the west or Villa Torlonia to the east for green space. While such a walk may not seem insurmountable to many people, to an elderly person or a family with young children, a 500-meter walk can be laborious, if not simply impossible. These difficulties surrounding the necessity of traveling to experience green space are compounded by the neighborhood’s poor walkability, so while these fantastic parks may neighbor Piazza Alessandria, they are relatively inaccessible to those on the edges of the age spectrum. To illustrate this, one older woman who lives in the neighborhood commented that she enjoys spending time in Villa Borghese but, since she stopped driving many years ago, she can only access the park when her son has free time to drive her over there. Her ability to enjoy green space is entirely dependent on her son’s availability.
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overview

Piazza Alessandria offers a wide array of services of varying types. Nearly all the buildings to the south of Via Nizza offer some sort of retail in their street-level space. In contrast, few buildings to the north of Via Nizza have any retail options. Consumer services constitute the biggest sector in the area and these stores are largely comprised of clothing stores and food and beverage establishments, the latter of which includes everything from Brazilian sushi buffets and authentic Chinese food to grab-and-go pizzerias and traditional trattorias. In interviews with residents and visiting users, most people spoke highly of the services provided, citing the range of services as a major positive of the community. Many of our interview subjects said they rarely had to leave the community to do any of their shopping.

However, despite the breadth of retail options offered, most these services have short hours of operation, resulting in decreased activity by late afternoon. One commuter we spoke to said that, while she had worked in Piazza Alessandria for the past three years, she never stays after hours because “this place dies in the evenings.”

important findings

An analysis of the types of services reveals that the number of services for elders outweighs that of children. Important child services, like schools and daycares, are located in adjacent communities. Much like educational services, centers for play like bowling alleys and football fields are also outside of the community. One father expressed concern that the community was “not a neighborhood for families.” His major concern was lack of adequate services for young children. The father told us that when he goes to the store to buy diapers for his baby, all he can find are diapers for the elderly.

methodology

All services were registered based on information available on Google Maps. This information was then verified using on-street signage. Services without clear signage were not noted, due to their limited accessibility.

Child- and Age-friendly Categorization. Child- and age-friendly service information was gathered from Roma Capitale’s online service inventory, which separated institutions throughout the municipality based on each institution’s targeted age group. Other less formally documented services were chosen based on perceptions of the needs and common desires of both groups, including health services like pharmacies as well as recreational services like libraries and gyms. It is important to acknowledge, therefore, an implicit bias in that the creators of this document are not in either age group and cannot completely relate the needs and desires of either group. Hence, it was important to engage with members of both these groups to better access their needs and desires and thus further understand the strengths and weaknesses of the community.
child- and age-friendly services

Public amenities like water fountains allow users to spend more time outside and reduce their reliance on commercial establishments. Unlike water fountains, public seating areas and bathrooms are in limited quantity.

dining
The food and beverage sector in Piazza Alessandria has grown in recent years to accommodate the large working population within the neighborhood. The cafes and casual restaurants serve as third spaces, providing seating and access to restrooms.

grocers
There are a variety of grocers in the neighborhood, ranging from small-scale enterprises in the market to international franchises like Carrefour. These stores are located mostly on or nearby Via Alessandria.
There are several pharmacies throughout the community and in adjoining neighborhoods. The area is also served by the Sapienza University Hospital, located to the southeast of the neighborhood.

Private daycares are the only schools in the neighborhood. However, the surrounding areas are serviced by a wide range of elementary to high schools, as well as a major tertiary institution in Sapienza University.

Recreational services are located in and around the neighborhood’s boundaries. The majority of these recreational activities target a wide audience, like libraries, cultural institutions and parks. However, there are age-specific services, including a senior center in Villa Torlonia and a playground in Villa Borghese.
Active facades are storefronts of businesses that are inviting — with open doors, clear windows and street seating — and are often filled with people shopping, eating or engaging with others. These activities are usually associated with consumer services like dining and retail. Inactive facades do not add much to the vibrancy of the street, including parking lots, vacant stores, private entrances and offices.

This facade inventory is an abstraction of three main streets in the neighborhood. The bright colors represent storefronts with active facades and the neutral colors represent storefronts with inactive facades. The hues of the bands change based on the type of service located in that location and the width of the bands represent the number of storefronts associated with that store.

Together, these elements provide an image of the vibrancy of each street, ranging from very vibrant — like both sides of the street of Via Alessandria located in the heart of the commercial area — or very dull — like the northern side of Via Nizza which marks the beginning of a more residential region.
When considering only services with on-street access and clear signage, consumer services like dining and retail are the largest sectors within Piazza Alessandria. However, when considering all services including businesses with private entrances and no signage, professional services become the largest sector in the neighborhood.

These invisible services are predominantly comprised of law firms and medical practices, and can range in size from one to three individual offices in a building to occupying multiple floors. Based on our business service inventory, which took account of all businesses in condominiums, there are approximately 415 offices of this type in the neighborhood.
Beyond the several hundred professional services firms in our neighborhood, other working-age adults commute to the large corporate offices located just outside of Piazza Alessandria. Companies like Enel and MetLife and large government organizations like the Ministry of Transport and the state railroad are located close to the neighborhood’s borders. Because they employ thousands of workers, the community’s population swells during the day.

There are also dozens of embassies located within 500 meters of the community. Along with the MACRO, landmarks like Porta Pia and the diverse food and beverage options, these institutions draw transient users to the neighborhood, who come to Piazza Alessandria for a few hours to run errands or have a meal.
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community actors
One of our main focuses has been the community’s regeneration in recent years. Interventions that further this regeneration have occurred on three different scales: the government, the private sector and the community. These different actors intercede in the community in a variety of ways, but they share a goal of regenerating Piazza Alessandria. The government — both the city and the municipio — effects change by engaging in such projects as the MACRO redevelopment and renewal of public space. The private sector, in tandem with the city, commercialized another part of the Peroni Beer factory, creating a health and wellness center. The private sector has also worked alongside grassroots organizations, evident in the Mercati d’Autore revitalization of the Mercato Nomentano. Finally, grassroots organizations, like Amici di Porta Pia and Come Un Albero, have similarly strived to parlay civic engagement into regeneration. This section will describe the actors in detail and outline their initiatives, specifically looking how and why they went about these regeneration efforts. Through this analysis, we seek to understand the ways in which top-down and bottom-up actors seek to regenerate this neighborhood.

methodology

We interviewed presidents of three community organizations in order to gain their insights into the community as a whole and their respective organizations. While we had an interview scheduled with a director from the MACRO, he, perhaps characteristic of the museum’s disconnectedness from the community, failed to show up to the meeting. We were not able to meet with a representative from the city or the municipio, so information on government interventions was drawn from scholarly texts and the city’s website.
government initiatives

In 1971, the Peroni Beer factory ceased production and fell vacant. Between 1974 and 1982, the Peroni company worked out a deal to sell part of the plant to the city with the goal of realizing “public neighborhood facilities,” (Museo Macro). The 1982 Piano di Recupero — recovery plan — was put in place, and it attempted to mix uses in and around Lot C of the old factory by introducing commercial, service and cultural institutions (Docci 2010).

In 2000, the city of Rome held a design competition for an addition to the museum. The city requested that the submitted designs include open spaces and gardens, a conference hall, educational areas and a library, among other items. Odile Decq’s design was chosen based on its ability to “link with the neighborhood and the city” (Eriksson 2013). The museum’s own website heralds Decq’s expansion as one that “removes the traditional boundaries and ignores the dichotomous perceptions of public versus private, urban versus cultural existences,” (Museo Macro). The city’s attempt to alter the traditional idea of a museum — a closed-off space accessible only by paid ticket — shows the government’s apparent desire to regenerate the community by providing more quality public space. Analysis of our community engagement [See page 81] shows this regeneration largely missed the mark.

More recently, the Municipio has attempted its own revamping efforts in the quartiere. These initiatives include a redevelopment project of the spaces outside bars and restaurants along Via Alessandria. By creating 10 platforms — for bike racks or outdoor dining — where parking spots normally would have been, the Municipio is attempting to “renew concessions of public land.” Other efforts have attempted to encourage “sustainable mobility” by pedestrianizing Piazza Regina Margherita (Comune Roma).
private sector initiatives

Aside from working exclusively autonomously, the government has also intervened with the help of private sector groups. The most notable example is the redevelopment of Site A of the Peroni Beer factory in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Along with Renato Bocchi — referred to in a 1986 La Repubblica article as “the Berlusconi of Rome” because of his combination of politics and real estate (Scipioni 1986) — the city worked to turn “huge abandoned large rooms” into offices, apartments and shops, offering users of the community additional places to live, work and play, (L’Unita-Nuova Serie, 1988). Presently, the retail of the redevelopment has a health focus and includes a gym, a pool, a physical therapist and a health store.

Furthermore, the private sector has worked alongside community organizations to intervene in the community. The organization of shopkeepers at Mercato Nomentano, like both the city government and municipio, has attempted to regenerate the community. In 2015, the Mercati d’Autore was launched at the market, revamping unused parts of the interior of the market by introducing public seating and a small-scale library. The new space — which features table service from a cafe in the market and wifi — offers “a new chance to eat at Nomentano market,” according to the website of the markets of Rome (Mercati di Roma). The president of the market association, the owner of the lone pizzeria in the market, told us the renovation cost about 200,000 euros. Mercati d’Autore states that it wants to “revitalize [Rome’s markets’] priceless heritage of the capital.” The organization’s mission statement said the goal of the initiative is to “harness the skills, experiences and peculiarities of individuals and turn them into strengths on which to build a new development model,” (Mercati d’Autore). This mission, typical of grassroots organizations, shows the desire
of the private sector and community members to start a process of change in the neighborhood. The president of the association — who was inspired by the markets of Barcelona that are busy day and night — told us it has been hard to obtain authorization from the city and from the municipio for this initiative. When he tried to extend the hours of the market so that residents could shop when they returned home from work, he said the municipio would not allow it. He claimed the municipio has a certain view of the market, and, despite the fact that 90 percent of shopkeepers agree with him, his challenge of this vision was not well-received.

**community organizations**

Finally, the two most notable grassroots organizations in the area are Come Un Albero and Amici di Porta Pia. These organizations, both of which are based in the southern portion of our neighborhood, seek to create a better Piazza Alessandria for the residents, shopkeepers and visitors of the community. Although they attempt to accomplish this task in different ways, both associations have encountered similar problems. These obstacles include: an ineffective, and at times uncooperative, government and an apathetic community motivated only by money.

Come Un Albero is a non-profit organization that operates a small bistro and museum in Piazza Alessandria. Located just off of Via Alessandria, the restaurant employs five mentally disabled adults who work with trained chefs and a group of volunteers to operate the bistro five days a week. The association also organizes events, including Via Alessandria in Fiore — a friendly flower decoration competition between shops and residents along Via Alessandria — and Il Natale Diffuso — a “grassroots” Christmas event that featured a series of four different actors giving monologues about
the holiday throughout the neighborhood and culminated with a large celebration at the restaurant.

While the organization strives to integrate people with mental disabilities into society, it is important to also note that the association wants to “make a project for all people with people with disabilities,” as the president of Come Un Albero told us. In other words, the organization sees its role as bettering the entire community, not just the lives of people with mental disabilities. It is a cultural association, not just a social one, according to the president.

Amici di Porta Pia similarly wants to shape a better Piazza Alessandria. This organization, a collection of about 160 shopkeepers and residents, tries to improve the physical environment of the neighborhood, making it a more pleasant place to live. They have engaged in initiatives such as cleaning the area around the Aurelian Walls, placing an eight-meter Christmas tree at Porta Pia and adding lanterns and trees to the streetscape.

For both organizations, the government has largely been a non-factor, and in some cases, it has even hampered some of their initiatives. The president of Amici di Porta Pia went so far as to say he has been “fighting” against the municipio for 15 years. “I never win,” he told us, “but I never give up.” When the president of Come Un Albero launched the social cooperative almost 13 years ago, he specifically avoided government assistance, preferring autonomy from the government over subsidies. By starting on its own “legs,” as he phrased it, the organization was able to pursue its own agenda and develop the way it wanted. Since the organization is more visible now and its mission is easier to understand, he has sought municipio recognition, hoping to add some formal credibility to Come Un Albero’s events. He has also sought acknowledgement from the organization of museums in
Rome. Both of these attempts have so far been fruitless, revealing the government’s inactive role in grassroots organizations.

Amici di Porta Pia has not only encountered an ineffective government, according to the president, the government has pushed back against many of his organization’s efforts. The president, who has worked at his shop for 24 years, told us that the municipio has disregarded his suggestions for how to create a better neighborhood. The association has tried to beautify the streets with lanterns and trees but the municipio has “limited” their activities. Despite his suggestions and local knowledge, the municipio has altered the neighborhood as they see fit. The president compared the municipio’s decision not to seek out feedback from the community to the controversial top-down planning of Bangkok in the 1990s. He also said that the government disregards the efforts of Amici di Porta Pia of making Piazza Alessandria an attractive and accessible place to walk around by selling licenses to street vendors. He told us that the government does not ask the community if they want these vendors — popup stands that sell books, flowers or clothing, among other things — and they just sell the licenses so they can make money off of it, regardless of the actual benefits these stands provide. This reveals the government’s tendencies to disregard community feedback, a common criticism of top-down regeneration efforts.

The theme of money as a motivating factor was a recurring motif in our conversation with the president of Amici di Porta Pia. He discussed his struggles in getting people to follow his lead whenever he engages in an initiative to improve the neighborhood. He has found it impossible to get people to rally behind something if it is not related to their own business. He told us residents will let the community fall into disrepair without doing anything but blame other people. Once their property values begin to fall, that is when they begin to really care. Similarly, when the president of Come Un Albero tried to organize the flower decorating competition, many of the shopkeepers “didn’t see any value” in participating since there was not a discernible financial impact for the stores that participated.

Both presidents also noted the lack of community engagement in the neighborhood. They expressed concern that residents are generally apathetic. To illustrate this, the president of Amici di Porta Pia said that people will complain about the ubiquitous dog excrement in the neighborhood while their own dog is defecating on the sidewalk. The president of Come Un Albero told us there are some 250 people in a Facebook group for residents along Via Alessandria, yet just five showed up to a meeting to discuss how the street could become better. The president of Amici di Porta Pia compared this to the United States, where, at a football tailgate, everyone chips in to bring seats or food. According to him, in Piazza Alessandria, the reaction to anything is, “I don’t care.”

**Conclusion**

The city, the municipio, the private sector and grassroots organizations are all attempting to regenerate Piazza Alessandria. Their efforts, however, have conflicted with each other: the government does not take into account residents’ opinions; commercial businesses ignore neighborhood organizations; community members do not care about the city or about the neighborhood. Through top-down overhauls and bottom-up initiatives, Piazza Alessandria is undergoing several transformations, each one hoping to make the community better, but for whom? Part Two of this report will attempt to answer that question and establish the results of these regeneration efforts.
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Our neighborhood is unique because of its narrative as “an old community striving for regeneration.” This presents a dialectic, with two opposing conditions of age and renewal. It begs the question of whether one group is being privileged at the expense of the other. While we observed that wealthy elderly residents were privileged in their access to private green space, we also recognized that peripheral age groups might be marginalized amidst the transformations geared towards attracting the working crowd. Thus, our research was motivated by the question:

**Can regeneration be multigenerational?**

In order to answer this question, we created the following tripartite research agenda:

1. Assess the child- and age friendliness of Piazza Alessandria
2. Understand how users of Piazza Alessandria perceive child- and age-friendliness compared to existing frameworks of understanding; and
3. Discover whether and where the needs and interests of children and the elderly converge or diverge, to shed light on the concept of multigenerational planning.

Figure 1: Eight domains of multigenerational planning, consolidated from UNICEF (2004), WHO (2007), Haikkola et al. (2007) and Lui et al. (2009)
logistics

We used an interview methodology adapted from Haikkola et al. (2007). We targeted three different groups of people: children and their parents, the elderly and their caregivers and working adults. We engaged in somewhere between seven and 10 intercept interviews per group. The interviews took place at six different public spaces within the neighborhood, where members of the public might be inclined to engage with us. We also prepared attractive A5-sized bulletins with a more formal description of our project and contact information. Since many elderly we attempted to engage on our trial sessions were hard of hearing, we printed versions of the interview questions translated into Italian.

Locations
1. Daycare center
2. MACRO
3. Mercato Nomentano
4. Pza Fiume
5. Pza Porta Pia
6. Pza Regina Margherita

intercept interviews

We used a combination of interview questions and a cognitive mapping exercise (see page 80). While interviews were very open-ended, we structured a series of questions that began with their patterns of activity, in order to understand children and the elderly’s perceptions of and interactions with the neighborhood. The maps helped us to elicit these opinions. We framed follow-up questions to address our eight domains of multigenerational planning. However, we did not follow the structure of questions closely but rather preferred to allow the conversation to deviate to focus on our respondents’ areas of concern. A sample framework of interview questions is as follows:

Beginning questions:

Where do you like to go to socialize in this neighborhood? Why do you go there? Do you go there often? How do you get there?

Which places do you not like to go to socialize in this neighborhood? Why don’t you like them? What changes can be made to improve them?

Other questions to weave into the conversation:

How do you come and go in this neighborhood?
Are there opportunities for you to interact with the community?
Do you ever feel isolated in this community?
Do you feel respected/included in this community?
Do you feel included in this neighborhood?
Do you feel like you have a say in this community?
Do you feel like you can make change in the neighborhood?
How do you obtain information or news about the community?
1. Assess the child- and age-friendliness of Piazza Alessandria

We focused our questions on recreation, specifically on areas for socializing because of our theme of public versus private space. By the end of each interview we attempted to come away with responses assessing positive and negative perceptions of space. Therefore, questions had a spatial dimension — where activities occur — and a social dimension — why these activities occur in that specific space. By providing interviewees with baseline maps, we tried to orient users of the community and allow them to better talk through the types of places they like or dislike. We were also curious about how participants get to these places. As such, responses to this question informed us of the physical environment related to qualities like walkability or of the social dimension like services, social networks and health. For the negative questions, we addressed the same points of where and why.

2. Understand how users of Piazza Alessandria perceive child- and age-friendliness compared to existing frameworks of understanding.

We organized the response from our interviews using the eight general topics of intergenerational planning. This categorization helped reveal the range of criteria that participants considered as child- and age-friendliness in general. After organizing the criteria, we compared them to the dimensions of environment and governance mentioned in the framework (see Fig. 2), considering questions like: Do the criteria for one group align more closely with aspects of the physical environment or social environment? Do the criteria for one group show evidence of bottom-up governance in their ability to participate in the decision-making processes or top-down governance in their inability to effect change?

3. Discover whether and where the needs and interests of children and the elderly converge or diverge, to shed light on the concept of multigenerational planning.

A firm understanding of whether interventions have exclusively benefitted one peripheral age group or both or neither leads us to our final analytical lens: the general theoretical level of insight. After categorizing the perceptions of each of the three target groups according to the above framework, we compared results across groups to see whether they agree or disagree and where this overlap in needs and interests occurs. Understanding how the requirements for child- and age-friendliness converge — or how they clash against one another — provided us with a more complete picture of the usefulness of multigenerational planning.

Full summaries of the interview responses can be found in the Appendix.

![Figure 2: Lui, et al., "Dimensions of Age-friendly Community Discourse"](image-url)
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overview

Participant responses can be categorized into four domains: positive similarities, negative similarities, positive specificities and negative specificities. Positive similarities are elements of the community which at least two or more groups find positive while negative similarities are those elements which at least two or more groups find negative. Specific positive and negative responses are linked to individual age groups. Most of these responses from our engagement can be divided into three of our child- and age-friendly domains: public spaces, services and transportation.

positive similarities

Public Space

Children and their caretakers, working age adults and the elderly all lauded the parks of the community’s environs as major positives of the neighborhood. Members of each of the groups praised the accessibility to Villa Borghese and Villa Torlonia, and several elders and children of the community said they enjoy walking to these parks alone or with friends. The parks provide both a place in which a group of old men can talk and where a group of young boys can skateboard. The presence of these large, well-maintained green spaces is a unique feature of this neighborhood when compared to Rome as a whole, according to a mother of a 10-year-old boy. This commonality across the three groups underscores the importance of public space in an urban neighborhood.
Services
Residents of all ages and commuters extolled the community’s wide array of services. Among the residents interviewed — specifically the elderly — a common desirable quality of the community was that, since the service availability was so broad, there was never any reason to leave the community. Children cited the availability of gelaterias throughout the community as a major positive of Piazza Alessandria. The breadth of services in walking distance is particularly important for children and the elderly. Since these age groups have limited driving capabilities — youths are not legally allowed to drive, many elders stop driving after a certain age — access to services just by walking is a key quality of the community.

Transportation
A theme across the interviews with residents and commuters is Piazza Alessandria’s connectedness. From the neighborhood, one can easily travel nearly anywhere in the city, and people of all ages considered this connectivity a strong positive feature of the community.

One old man said he and his wife moved to Piazza Alessandria specifically so they could sell their car, relying instead on the vast public transport network of the neighborhood to get around. While several elders similarly said there was no need for private transportation, other old people said they still used their Vespas to get around. Children also said they used the public transportation system, noting that the only way to visit friends outside of the community was to take the bus.

negative similarities
Public Space
Almost all respondents made disparaging remarks about the quality of sidewalks and intersections. There was near universal condemnation of the informal parking situation. Some people framed the problem as a citywide problem — “Roma è Roma” — while others said it was specific to Piazza Alessandria. Another important point of difference is that, while each age group was critical of the maintenance and norms of use of Piazza Alessandria’s sidewalks and intersections, only those at the edges of the age spectrum described how the decreased walkability affected their daily lives. Working-age adults commented that the neighborhood was dirty and poorly maintained, but failed to mention the effect, if any, this had on them.

On the other hand, children and the elderly offered specific examples of the limitations imposed by the neighborhood’s lax parking rules and busy streets. For example, a mother who had previously lived in Austria with her family said, “Kids in Vienna can go anywhere alone, but here they can’t.” Even though they only live seven minutes from school, she does not let her son walk to school by himself because it is difficult to cross the street. Another expat — a German woman with two daughters — said that Germany is a better place to raise children than Rome. Like the Austrian woman, she criticized the neighborhood, saying, “Children are not free to move around by themselves.”
positive specificities

Services
The elderly said Anziani Center — a senior center in Villa Torlonia — was a great place to go to meet friends. The center has programming specifically targeting the elderly.

negative specificities

Public Space
When compared to the peripheral age groups, working age adults were much less likely to offer criticism of the surrounding green space, but they were also less likely to mention the presence of nearby green space as an overall positive of the community.

Despite the parks located in close proximity to the neighborhood, a mother said that in bad weather — too hot or too cold, or in the rain — there is little for children to do in Piazza Alessandria. On days like this, she used to take her son to Ikea to play, because there was nowhere else in the community to go. The mother of a 10-year-old said she used to take him to Villa Torlonia when he was younger, but after the park fell into disrepair in recent years, she stopped going. A father of a small child also said that the maintenance of Villa Torlonia had soured recently, specifically complaining that it was no longer easy to walk with a stroller in the park.

One old lady said that Villa Torlonia was too far away and she does not have the energy to get there. Because of this, she said she goes to the Peronia Courtyard to sit and rest. Elderly members of the community similarly acknowledged that the neighborhood’s informal parking and crowded streets forced them to take circuitous routes to their desired destinations. A group of old men showed us the path they took to Villa Borghese, a route that specifically avoided the “crowded” Corso D’Italia.
can regeneration be multigenerational?

**macro**

**Negative**

Community members were decidedly mixed on the impact of the MARCO. Old people tended to view the museum more negatively and children did not have much of an opinion. A group of elderly men were the most critical, since they had firsthand experience with the museum. One of the men submitted some of his work as a possible exhibit in the museum, but the director said the space was meant to host the works of international artists. They said the MACRO has had a negative effect and they called it "wasteful."

According to residents across the age spectrum, the MACRO is responsible for some of the community’s increased traffic and informal parking, two reasons for the neighborhood’s declining walkability.

While the MACRO does have a didactic arm targeted at children, none of the youths or their caretakers we spoke to mentioned anything, positive or negative, about the museum’s programming. The MACRO’s absence in our conversations with children and their parents shows its overall absence in the community.

**Positive**

This sentiment runs contrary to the beliefs of some working commuters who think highly of the museum. One middle-age worker told us the MACRO gives the neighborhood "prestige," and that it draws people from other areas of Rome to Piazza Alessandria.

**mercato nomentano**

**Negative**

While it was abundantly clear during site visits that the working age population used the Mercato D’Autore during their lunch breaks, based on their interviews it did not seem as though it was a priority for them. The few that were responsive to questions about the new development worked as vendors in the market and thus commented on their inability to modify the building to suit the changing times and to attract a new audience.

**Positive**

Elders said they use the newly created public seating space in the market to meet and talk. However, the most important part of Mercato D’Autore seemed to be its location in Mercato Nomentana, where elders had longstanding relationships with vendors, rather than the appeal of the new seating area. The new seating space has simply made it easier to spend time in a familiar location, as opposed to creating a brand new place to socialize.

**peroni courtyard**

**Positive**

Elders were the only group that had an overwhelmingly positive response to the Peroni courtyard. Quite a number of our interviews took place there and elders believed that the courtyard was easy to access, quiet and a good place to rest.

Only one of our interviews with children and their guardians mentioned the Peroni courtyard, “the courtyard is the nicest place in the neighborhood.”
Interestingly, this comment came from an elderly couple that was walking with their grandchild, which suggests that the Peroni courtyard was appealing, yet again, to a group of elders and not necessarily beneficial for children.

new commercial activities

Negative

Some interviewees noted that transformations in the types of services provided in the past few years favored certain groups over others. According to a group of old men in the market, a law which prevented the establishment of similar shops within a close proximity of each other was recently repealed. As a consequence, many of the new dining options in the community are targeted towards the working population and usually serve quick lunches like, “Pizza, Pizza, Pizza.”

A porter working at an apartment in the neighborhood echoed this sentiment, claiming the transformation of services to food and recreation establishments is a negative thing for elders because, with all these new shops catering to working people, there are no stores for residents and the problems they face. He specifically used the lack of cobblers in the community to illustrate his point. In the market, a shopkeeper said the organizers of the market had recently focused on bringing in more street food stalls to serve the office workers. He told us this change has eroded the market culture.

Positive

Yet these opposing viewpoints were not held by all members of the community. Some people, both old and working age, commented that the “traditional fabric of the community is still intact,” despite the increase in and high turnover of new shops.

conclusion

It is hard to provide a definite answer on the multigenerational nature of regeneration in Piazza Alessandria. This is because there have been both positive and negative outcomes and perceptions of regeneration. Negative outcomes of regeneration projects include the MACRO’s inability to engage with residents, leaving its public space largely unused by locals, and its negative influence on vehicular traffic. Regeneration has also overstaturated the local market with lunch stores to appeal to the working age population, which has been perceived as damaging to the community’s identity.

However, despite these negative outcomes, there have also been beneficial results. The Peroni courtyard and Mercato D’Autore are oft-used public spaces, where elders can sit and talk. The influx of new users is seen as positive, adding life to the community. Although services are changing, basic services remain within walking distance and some of these new activities add cultural vibrancy to the area.
We contend that regeneration can indeed be multigenerational. Through our community engagement, we saw that there are complementarities among the needs and interests of children, working adults and the elderly.

Moving forward we believe that neighborhood regeneration projects should be geared towards those commonalities. Based on our work in Piazza Alessandria, we emphasize two main focuses for planners seeking to regenerate a neighborhood in a multigenerational way: improve the pedestrian experience and build community identity.

Improving the pedestrian experience can be accomplished by maintaining sidewalks regularly and effectively enforcing parking rules. Doing this can activate streetscapes, broaden the walking radii of children and the elderly and increase independence for these peripheral age groups.

To build community identity, planners have to focus on increasing community participation. By inviting residents to contribute in the decision-making process, planners can better assess the needs and values of residents in order to properly create designs and enact policies that satisfy all groups.

In summary, regeneration can be multigenerational once all groups are considered, aware of and engaged in the process.
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Rights of Young Citizens in a Child-Friendly City

Influence decisions about their city
Express their opinion on the city they want
Participate in family, community and social life
Receive basic services such as health care, education and shelter
Drink safe water and have access to proper sanitation
Be protected from exploitation, violence and abuse
Walk safely in the streets on their own
Meet friends and play
Have green spaces for plants and animals
Live in an unpolluted environment
Participate in cultural and social events
Be an equal citizen of their city with access to every service, regardless of ethnic origin, religion, income, gender or disability.

UNICEF

Haikkola & Horelli

Normative Dimensions of Environmental Child-Friendliness

Housing and dwelling
Basic services
Participation
Safety and security
Family, kin, peers and community
Urban and environmental qualities
Resource provision and distribution
Ecology
Sense of belonging and continuity
Good governance

WHO

Age-Friendly City Topic Areas

Outdoor Spaces and Buildings
Transportation
Housing
Social Participation
Respect and Social Inclusion
Civic Participation and Employment
Communication and Information
Community Support and Health
### Interview Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>General Topic</th>
<th>Specific Details</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Criteria (Explicitly Stated)</th>
<th>Criteria (Inferred)</th>
<th># Positive Responses</th>
<th># Negative Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Outdoor Spaces and Buildings</td>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Go for walks</td>
<td>Pleasant and Clean Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Spaces and social participation</td>
<td>Villa Torlonia</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Go for walks; Location of Anziano center for which one of these men is the president</td>
<td>Encouraging Participation and Addressing Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Mercato D’Autore</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Place they come to socialize</td>
<td>Building accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New restaurants</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>“Negative feature to this part of Rome.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Not inclusive of community members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MACRO</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Wasteful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Private and expensive</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Overstressed local market with both shops caused by the corporations in the area.</td>
<td>Variety of services that meet needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Private + Public Transportation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Can take the bus or motorcycle.</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Outdoor Spaces</td>
<td>Villa Torlonia</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Too far</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Peroni Courtyard</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Place to sit and rest</td>
<td>Somewhere to rest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Place to socialize because it’s quiet</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercato Momentano</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Shops there everyday because she trusts the vendors</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peroni Courtyard</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MACRO</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Has changed traffic flow but nothing to complain about because traffic is a Roman issue.</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Shops are more expensive</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>It’s not hard to walk around and so he always goes for walks</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Torlonia</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Goes there to walk</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Transportation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Inexpensive, always have discounts</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Keeps the neighborhood alive</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New shops</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>The traditional fabric of the community is still intact</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elder that’s a caretaker of her mother (99 years old)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Outdoor Spaces</td>
<td>Piazza Regia Margherita</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Close; plans to move to Via Cavour</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>It’s not hard to walk around and so he always goes for walks</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercato Momentano</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Close; green market in Trieste</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child-friendly?</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>A lot of parks nearby</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MACRO</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>贡献 to the improvement of the community or help maintain a beneficial characteristic of the community</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In general</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>There are more services than years before</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>You can go everywhere easily</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Safe, though there is little police presence</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Poor maintenance, “everything on the floor needs trash bins”</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Outdoor Spaces</td>
<td>Mercato Momentano</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Close; plans to move to Via Cavour</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>It’s not hard to walk around and so he always goes for walks</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercato Momentano</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Close; green market in Trieste</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child-friendly?</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>A lot of parks nearby</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MACRO</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>贡献 to the improvement of the community or help maintain a beneficial characteristic of the community</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In general</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>There are more services than years before</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>You can go everywhere easily</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Safe, though there is little police presence</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Poor maintenance, “everything on the floor needs trash bins”</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>There's no identity or neighborhood spirit; People are anonymous here</td>
<td>Sense of community identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder responses</td>
<td>23 10</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Working Age

| Resident | Housing | Condominiums | Negative | | | | |
|--------|---------|--------------|---------| | | | |
| Services | New restaurants | Negative | | | | | |
| MACRO | Positive | | | | | | |

| Elder responses | 1 | | | | | | |

### Working Age (Young)

| Resident | Outdoor Spaces | Villa Torlonia | Positive | Proximity: Meets her friends there | Accessible; Meet friends and play | | |
|----------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------| | | |
| Services | Community in General | Positive | Uses it occasionally because it's on her way to work | Accessible | | | |
| Services | Mercato Nomentano | Positive | Shops there because it's convenient and good but it's loud in the morning | Accessibility | | | |

| Elder responses | 2 3 | | | | | | |

### Working Age (Middle-aged)

| Commuter works at | MACRO | Outdoor Spaces | Community in General | Negative | It’s dirty and poorly maintained: crowded | Pleasant and Clean Environment | |
|-------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------| | | |
| Services | Commercial Activities | Negative | Constantly changing with list of vacancies which contribute to a weak commercial fabric | | | | |

| Elder responses | 1 | | | | | | |

### Working Age (Young Adult)

| Commuter and store owner | Transportation | Positive | Central | Accessibility | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------|---------|---------------| | | |
| Services | Positive | A lot of activities which are good for business | Variety of services that meet needs; Entrepreneurship | | | | |

| Elder responses | 2 0 | | | | | | |

### Working Age (Middle-aged)

| Services + Housing | Community in General | Negative | Too expensive | Affordable Housing and Affordable Services | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------|---------------|------------------------------------------| | | |
| Government’s effect on Outdoor Spaces & Buildings | Mercato Nomentano | Negative | Hard to modify and build a chimney for the market; hygienic restrictions are a problem | Ability to modify to suit changing needs | | | |
| Services | Informal services outside market | Negative | People don’t come inside because of the stalls outside | | | | |
| Services | Shop owners | Positive | Market culture is eroding | | | | |

| Elder responses | 2 | | | | | | |

### Working Age (Middle-aged) (president of the market association)

| Government’s effect on Outdoor Spaces & Buildings | Mercato D’Autore | Negative | Hard to obtain authorization: to adapt market to new phase of the neighborhood for hygienic reasons. Can’t stay open until night | Ability to modify to suit changing needs | | | |
| Services | Shop owners | Positive | Support improving the market and the community members as well | Ability to modify to suit changing needs | Community inclusion in decision making | | |

| Elder responses | 1 2 | | | | | | |

### Working Age Commuter

| Transportation | Community in General | Positive | Fantastic | Accessible | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|----------|-----------|-----------| | | |
| Outdoor Spaces & Buildings | Private Transportation Roads | Positive | Short commute of 10 minutes | Nice built environment and a lot of green space nearby | | | |
| Services | Cultural Services Library | Positive | A list of cultural things: book club that meet with authors | | | |
| MACRO | Positive | Exhibits open to the public and a bar | | | | | |

| Elder responses | 5 1 | | | | | | |
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The page discusses various aspects related to community, services, and housing. It includes opinions from working-age residents of different ages, focusing on elements such as outdoor spaces, transportation, housing affordability, and cultural services. The table format allows for a clear representation of positive and negative perceptions, as well as the impact on sense of community identity and other social aspects.
Adam Bronfin is from Ridgewood, N.J., a midsize suburb outside of New York City. Adam is a third-year student in the Urban and Regional Studies Program with a minor in real estate. Back in Ithaca, he served as sports editor of The Cornell Daily Sun and is a member of the Organization of Urban and Regional Studies. He’s currently a senior editor for The Sun, working on long-form features. Adam enjoys traveling, small-boat sailing and gummy bears. This summer, he returns to New Jersey to work for Prudential in their investment management group. His favorite gelato flavor is Stracciatella.

Rachel Liu is an Urban and Regional Studies junior from Singapore. Next semester, she looks forward to joining AAP NYC’s urban planning and design studio. On campus, she participates in the Rawlings Presidential Research Scholars program, Christian Union, Campus on a Hill, Big Red Bikes and BASE Productions, a contemporary and hip-hop dance group. She interned with the Cornell Plantations, enjoys cooking and baking for friends, and loves to explore Ithaca’s natural and gastronomic landscapes. Her favorite Roman pastime has likewise been urban and food adventures with friends. Her favorite gelato flavors are Pistachio from Gelateria la Romana, Dark Chocolate and Mango Sorbet from Venchi, Herb-based flavors at Gelateria del Teatro, or Ricotta and Fig.
Steven Switzer is from a small town in Arksansas where he spent most of his time volunteering at a local library, creating keyboarding classes for children and helping elderly with their cellphones. According to Steven, a nice plate of chicken strips and some biscuits and gravy is a sure way to a full and happy stomach. In his spare time, you can find him hiking, sketching or watching obscure documentaries. Hands down, his favorite gelato flavor is Strawberry.

Kai Walcott is from Kingston, Jamaica and is a junior in Cornell’s Urban and Regional Studies program. She is interested in community development. In her spare time she likes to watch sad foreign movies that make her cry. She also enjoys reading memoirs and watching inspirational videos on Youtube. Kai enjoys listening to Solange and the internet. Her favorite gelato flavors are Strawberry, Mixed Berries and Lemon from Giolitti.