

LIBRO COMUNICACIONES
PAPERS BOOK



**III Congreso Internacional sobre Documentación,
Conservación, y Reutilización del Patrimonio
Arquitectónico y Paisajístico | VALENCIA 2015**

Colección Congresos UPV

Los contenidos de esta publicación han sido evaluados por el Comité Científico que en ella se relaciona y según el procedimiento que se recoge en <http://reuso2015.blogs.upv.es/>

© Comité Organizador (Editor)

Diseño Gráfico y maquetación
Pedro Verdejo Gimeno
Paula Porta García
Raquel Torres Remón
Irene Palomares Hernández

Diseño Página Web
Pedro Verdejo Gimeno
Serena Matta

© de los textos: los autores.

© 2015, de la presente edición: Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València.
www.lalibreria.upv.es / Ref.: 2137_05_01_01

Duplica: Esmap

Las actas completas del Congreso se encuentran disponibles en acceso abierto <http://riinet.upv.es>

ISBN: 978-84-9048-386-2
Depósito Legal: V-2020-2015



ReUSO 2015 - III Congreso Internacional sobre Documentación, Conservación y Reutilización del Patrimonio Arquitectónico por REUSO 2015 se distribuye bajo una Licencia Creative Commons Atribución-CompartirIgual 4.0 Internacional.

Basada en una obra en <http://ocs.editorial.upv.es/index.php/REUSO/>

Dado el carácter y la finalidad de la presente edición, el editor se acoge al artículo 32 de la vigente Ley de la Propiedad Intelectual para la reproducción y cita de las obras de artistas plásticos representados por VEGAP, SGAE u otra entidad de gestión, tanto en España como cualquier otro país del mundo. Estas actas son de libre acceso on-line y se edita sin ánimo de lucro en el contexto educativo de la Universitat Politècnica de València.

COMITÉ DE HONOR

Giovanni Carbonara
Professore Università La Sapienza Roma

Carlos Conde Lázaro
Rector Magnífico Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Carolina Di Biase
Professora, Politecnico di Milano

Marcello Fagiolo
Professore, Università La Sapienza, Roma

Javier G^a-Gutiérrez Mosteiro
Catedrático y Director, Máster Programa de Conservación, ETSAM, UPM

Alfonso García Santos
Catedrático y Director, DCTA, ETSAM, UPM

Angela García Codoñer
Catedrática de la UPV

Andrzej Kadluczka
Professor, Polytechnic University of Cracow

Luis Maldonado Ramos
Catedrático y Director, ETSAM, UPM

Alessandra Marino
Soprintendente, Soprintendenza per i Beni Arch.,
Paesaggistici, Storici, Artistici ed Etn., per le province di
Firenze, Pistoia e Prato

Vicente Más Llorens
Catedrático y Director, ETSA, UPV

Saverio Mecca
Professore e Direttore, Dipartimento di Architettura,
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Francisco Javier Medina Ramón
Titular Universidad y Director, ETSIE, UPV

Francisco José Mora Más
Rector Magnífico de la Universitat Politècnica de
València

Ildelfonso Muñoz Cosme
Subdirector General, Instituto de Patrimonio Cultural
de España

Luis Perez de Prada
Jefe del Departamento de Planificación y Gestión
Técnica del Patrimonio Nacional

Nuno Santos Pinheiro
Profesor, Universidade Lusíada de Lisboa

M^a Rosa Suarez-Inclan Ducassí
Presidenta, ICOMOS España

Alberto Tesi
Magnifico Rettore, Università degli Studi di Firenze

Manuel Valcuende Payá
Director de Departamento de Construcción Arquitectónicas UPV

Luigi Zangheri
Presidente, Accademia delle Arti del Disegno Firenze

DIRECCIÓN

Luis Palmero Iglesias

SECRETARIO

Francisco Javier Sanchis Sampedro

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO

Adolfo Alonso Durá
Universitat Politècnica de València

Eva María Álvarez Isidro
Universitat Politècnica de València

Jesús Anaya Díaz
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Quiteria Angulo Ibáñez
Universitat Politècnica de València

Stefano Bertocci
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Graziella Bernardo
Università degli Studi della Basilicata

Mario Bevilacqua
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Ignacio Bosh Roig
Universitat Politècnica de València

Diego Cano-Lasso Pintos
Universidad San Pablo CEU

Javier Cárcel Carrasco
Universitat Politècnica de València

María Emilia Casar Furió
Universitat Politècnica de València

Pepa Cassinello Plaza
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Antonio Conte
Università degli studi della Basilicata

Luis Cortés Meseguer
Universitat Politècnica de València

Máximo Cruz Sagredo
Universidad de Extremadura

Riccardo Dalla Negra
Università degli Studi di Ferrara

Xavier Das Neves Romão
Universidade do Porto

Francesco Doglioni,
Università IUAV di Venezia

Debora Domingo Calabuig
Universitat Politècnica de València

Nadia Eksareva
Odessa State Academy of Civil Engineering and
Architecture

Julián Esteban Chapapriá Conselleria de
Cultura i Esport – Generalitat Valenciana

Fauzia Farneti
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Marco Antonio Garcés Desmaison
Universitat Jaume I

Juan Antonio García Esparza
Universitat Jaume I

Jorge Luis García Valledcabres
Universitat Politècnica de València

Antoni González Moreno-Navarro
Servicio de Patrimonio Arquitectónico Local de la
Diputación de Barcelona

Antonella Guida
Università degli studi della Basilicata

Francisco Hidalgo Delgado
Universitat Politècnica de València

Lorenzo Jurina
Politecnico di Milano

Raffaella Lione
Università degli Studi di Messina

Jaime Linares Millán
Universitat Politècnica de València

María del Carmen Linares Millán
Universitat Politècnica de València

María Concepción López González
Universitat Politècnica de València

Mario Manganaro
Università degli Studi di Messina

Carlos Alberto Mariottoni
Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Ippolita Mecca
Università degli Studi della Basilicata

Giovanni Minutoli
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Juan Monjo Carrió
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Susana Mora Alonso-Muñoyerro
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Andrea Nanetti
Nanyang Technological University

Juan Carlos Navarro Fajardo
Universitat Politècnica de València

Olimpia Niglio
Kyoto University

Antonello Pagliuca
Università degli Studi della Basilicata

Luis Palmero Iglesias
Universitat Politècnica de València

María Teresa Palomares Figueres
Universitat Politècnica de València

Sandro Parrinello
Università degli Studi di Pavia

Salvador Pérez Arroyo
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Ángel Pizarro Polo
Universidad de Extremadura

Manuel Jesús Ramírez Blanco
Universitat Politècnica de València

Eduardo Robles
Florida A&M University

M. Pilar Roig Picazo
Universitat Politècnica de València

Adriana Rossi
Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli

Maria Luisa Ruiz Bedía
Universidad de Cantabria

Jose Miguel Rueda Muñoz de San Pedro
Arquitecto, Madrid

Javier Saenz Guerra
Universidad San Pablo CEU

Francisco Javier Sanchis Sampedro
Universitat Politècnica de València

Jolanta Sroczynska
Cracow University of Technology

Riziero Tiberi
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Silvio Van Riel
Università degli Studi di Firenze

Humberto Varum
Universidade do Porto

Pedro Verdejo Gimeno
Universitat Politècnica de València

Juan Carlos Navarro Fajardo
Universitat Politècnica de València

Paula Porta García
Arquitecta

Santiago Tormo Esteve
Universitat Politècnica de València

Isabel Tort Ausina
Universitat Politècnica de València

Pedro Verdejo Gimeno
Universitat Politècnica de València

COLABORADORES

Stefania De Gregorio

M^a del Mar González Vázquez

Rafael Marín Tolosa

Jorge Martínez Piqueras

Irene Palomares Hernández

Raquel Torres Remón

COMITÉ ORGANIZADOR

Juan José Alcayna Orts
IRP, Universitat Politècnica de València

M^a Teresa Doménech Carbó
IRP, Universitat Politècnica de València

Javier Cárcel Carrasco
Universitat Politècnica de València

Luis Cortés Meseguer
Universitat Politècnica de València

Enrique David Llácer
Universitat Politècnica de València

Igor Fernández Plazaola
Universitat Politècnica de València

Adrián Hernández Ballesteros
Universitat Politècnica de València

Jaime Linares Millán
Universitat Politècnica de València

Maria del Carmen Linares Millán
Universitat Politècnica de València

Joaquín Ángel Martínez Moya
Universitat Jaume I

José Miguel Molinés Cano
Universitat Politècnica de València

Serena Motta
Arquitecta

PATROCINADORES

Organized by



UNIVERSITAT
POLITÈCNICA
DE VALÈNCIA



ESCUELA TÉCNICA SUPERIOR
INGENIERÍA DE
EDIFICACIÓN



Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Cultura y la Educación



UNITEUN
Ciencia UNESCO
Español Universidad
y Patrimonio



forum UNESCO



INSTITUTO DE
RESTAURACIÓN DEL
PATRIMONIO
INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE INVESTIGACIÓN



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE

DIDA
DIPARTIMENTO
DI DIDATTICA



Institucional support



GENERALITAT VALENCIANA
CONSELLERIA D'EDUCACIÓ, CULTURA I ESPORT



ESCOLA TÈCNICA
SUPERIOR
D'ARQUITECTURA



MASTER OFICIAL EN
CONSERVACIÓN DEL
PATRIMONIO ARQ.
CPA



D R B C
DIPARTIMENTO DE RESTAURACIÓN DEL PATRIMONIO

Participating entities

Collaborator



CAATIE VALENCIA



BÓVEDAS VALENCIANAS
INSTITUTO DE RESTAURACIÓN DEL PATRIMONIO
UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE VALÈNCIA



Construcciones
Hinc. Carrís Bequerri, s.l.



arqCube

AGRADECIMIENTOS

En primer lugar agradecer a los Comités de las anteriores ediciones del Congreso Madrid 2013 Departamento de Construcciones Arquitectónicas de la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid y Florencia 2014, DIDA Università degli Studi di Firenze por aceptar y apoyar la candidatura de Valencia y en consecuencia la realización del mismo. A la Generalitat Valenciana, Conselleria d'Educació, Formació y Ocupació, al Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Valencia, a la Universitat Politècnica de València, a la Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingeniería de Edificación y a los departamentos universitarios implicados, Cátedra Forum Unesco Universidad y Patrimonio, al Instituto Universitario de Restauración del Patrimonio, a la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Valencia, al Máster de Conservación del Patrimonio Arquitectónico, al Ilustre Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de la Comunidad Valenciana y al Ilustre Colegio Oficial de Aparejadores, Arquitectos Técnicos e Ingenieros de Edificación de Valencia, a los patrocinadores, a todos aquellos que han contribuido y colaborado para que el congreso fuese una realidad y un agradecimiento de forma destacada a los participantes, por su sensibilidad e interés por los temas tratados, ya que, con una mirada nueva, reconocen el valor por el patrimonio arquitectónico, urbanístico y paisajista construido.

Valen-

cia, septiembre 2015

El Comité Organizador del III Congreso Internacional Documentación, Conservación y Reutilización del Patrimonio Arquitectónico y Paisajístico ReUSO

2015 Valencia

PRESENTACIÓN

En Junio del año 2013 se celebró en la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid la primera edición del Congreso Internacional que ahora nos ocupa y que con el nombre de La experiencia del ReUSO trataba de intercambiar experiencias y criterios sobre nuevos usos en los espacios arquitectónicos. Esta iniciativa compartida con el DIDA, Dipartimento di Architettura de la Facultad de Florencia, pretendía la repetición del evento en la ciudad italiana tal y como sucedió en el mes de noviembre de 2014, donde además se incorporaban en el título de la convocatoria dos palabras, *conservazione e recupero*, que daban mayor amplitud a la convocatoria motivadas por la diversidad de propuestas presentadas y tratadas en Madrid. Florencia, como no podía ser menos, fue un éxito de participación y sirvió para comprobar de nuevo el interés de las secciones del Congreso, a nivel europeo y mundial, por lo tanto no podíamos (y aquí es en origen donde interviene Valencia), dejar cerrado un evento entre dos Universidades amigas con las cuales desde hace años venía colaborando personalmente... queríamos más. Se aceptó la propuesta de Valencia, Universitat Politècnica de València y en este caso, una escuela tecnológica como es la Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingeniería de Edificación, para organizar la III edición del Congreso, abriendo una nueva etapa de futuras sedes. Por ello con gran satisfacción puedo anunciar la continuidad del evento para el próximo 2016 en la ciudad italiana de Pavía, quedando a la espera nuestra querida ciudad de Granada para el 2017, a las cuales les deseamos éxitos futuros. El Programa como en las ediciones anteriores es variado en cuanto a temas y secciones, incorporando en Valencia como novedad la sección 6 relativa a la intervención sobre el patrimonio histórico y la experiencia educativa. Todas las escuelas arriba mencionadas, reflejan en sus programas docentes asignaturas sobre intervenciones en edificios históricos, por lo que pensamos que inculcar la pasión por los temas del Congreso ya desde las aulas, es algo que dará sus frutos tanto en la concienciación hacia la sensibilidad a la hora de actuar sobre estos edificios, como en la apertura de nuevos horizontes profesionales. Asimismo, también se incorpora la compatibilidad de la eficiencia energética, aspecto fundamental hoy en día para una rehabilitación eco-eficiente. Las demás secciones que componen la estructura del congreso abarcan prácticamente la totalidad de cuestiones en el campo de la conservación y recuperación y no solo en el campo edificatorio, es necesario

THE 'USE' IN THE RELIABLE INTERVENTIONS ON THE MEDITERRANEAN ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

Maria Luisa, Germanà¹

Università di Palermo, Scuola Politecnica, Dipartimento di Architettura¹

ABSTRACT

The multifaceted crisis of the Mediterranean area on the background of the global scenario introduces the strategic significance of the architectural heritage as an element of shared identity and factor of durable development. Some aspects of contemporary crisis referring to the specific operational field are discussed. The paper points out the research of reliable interventions as a tool to face many of the common critical situations and to prevent the technical risk. The 'use' is proposed as a term of reference, aimed to guide synthetically the decision process, to evaluate the achieved results, and contributing to the reliability. After introducing the topic of the use in the architectural heritage, the relationships between the quantitative and qualitative features of the use and the categories of intervention are discussed. The challenge of improving the uses of the archaeological sites are briefly pointed in conclusion as a instance, highlighting the need of responsible approaches to face the current times of crisis in Mediterranean area.

Keywords

Architectural heritage, use, reliability.

1. THE RELIABLE INTERVENTIONS TO FACE THE CRISIS

The Mediterranean architectural heritage has some main specificities: the accepted meaning of physical support of a shared deep-rooted identity; the rich stratigraphy due to the continuity of human presence; the intertwined links with intangible heritage; the role of testimony of cultural thousand-year old contaminations (Germanà, M.L., ed., 2011). The current crisis threatens these specificities in different ways, on the background of the global scenario where epochal demo-economical trends caused by wars and climate change, are already influencing the Mediterranean identity.

The most often complained evidence of the current times of crisis for cultural heritage in Southern Europe is the financial stringency. There is no money to support any activity, above all because cultural heritage is not a directly cost-effective field. In addition, given that the client is mostly public, the scarcity of financial resources for the interventions on cultural heritage reflects the wider governmental *spending review*, and tends to be regarded as less serious than the constraints in public infrastructures, health, security, civil protection and so on. The financial scarcity is a worse threat for the built heritage than for the generic cultural heritage. Even in absence of any intervention and use, a building needs resources to be handed down the generations, while a nearly zero cost conservation process can be supposed for the movable objects.

Nevertheless the financial scarcity could be regarded as a misleading problem: the crucial issue is *how* to use the available resources and not only *how much* money is employed, as many unreliable conservation interventions have demonstrated (Germanà, M.L. 2004). This proves the need of a *qualitative* approach to face the threats that the current crisis poses to the Mediterranean architectural heritage. Many studies carried out in the last decades have focused on the definition of theoretical and operative methodological tools for the interventions on built heritage. Aiming the goal of the *efficacy* in the operational field of the built heritage (whose strategic role in long-lasting development is universally recognized), the current crisis could be regarded optimistically as an incentive to find more *efficient* tools (Fig. 1). Concepts as efficacy and efficiency may appear extraneous regarding the architectural heritage itself (because its intangible values), but they become crucial issues if the focus is shifted on a procedural level. The main activities related to the architectural heritage (knowledge, conservation, enhancement) are evidently the consequences of intentional processes that – for the purpose to be effective and especially efficient – must be clear in terms of intended results and of available resources. In order to increase the exchange between the procedural and object levels, the topic of the *reliability*, better than the topic of the *efficiency*, could help the research of methodological tools for the interventions on the architectural heritage.

The goals, the resources, and the constraints are intertwined topics: the programming phase must to define, case by case, how to balance these fundamental references of every intervention. Keeping in mind the current time of crisis in the Mediterranean region, here the 'use' is proposed as a term of reference, aimed to guide synthetically the decision processes and to evaluate the achieved results.



Figure 1. «Necessità è un essere della cosa in modo che non possa stare altrimenti (...), intendendo la necessità dell'operazioni». The need hasn't an alternative. From Ripa C. (1603) *Iconologia*, Roma, pp. 358-359, available at <<<http://bivio.filosofia.sns.it>>>.

2. THE 'USE' IN THE ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

The use is related to the utility, one of the three pillars of the architecture, since *Vitruvian triad*. The use is also the main reference of the building quality, when it is defined as the compliance with the requirements posed by the needs, deriving exactly from the uses. Even leaving aside the regulatory aspects, the use has always been a focus of the architects' activity. Around the function, justified by the use, and its relationship with the form, many architectural theories have pivoted during the last century [1].

The use is also the main distinguishing feature of the architectural heritage, compared to the wider cultural heritage: *pure contemplation does not belong to the architecture* (Bellini, A. 1998). The functional features contribute to the whole identity of the architectural heritage: the full understanding of the ancient settlements comprises their original uses and their evolution. In addition, many theories have regarded the use as one of the terms of reference for the dialectic relationships of the manifold meanings of the architectural heritage, between antiquity and newness values (Riegl, A. 1903).

Many ancient buildings have lost their original utilization; otherwise the same activity has deeply changed through time. These physiological circumstances have very often recurred in the past, but by now the reuse poses both theoretical and design challenges, due to the conflicting goals of use requirements and conservative requests. Many researchers have faced this problem, highlighting the issue of the appropriateness of the new utilizations [2].

Here the use is proposed as a term of reference for the interventions on architectural heritage, aimed to define, develop, and verify their *reliability*, to be interpreted as the permanence of the expected results and as the process quality as a whole (Germanà, M.L. 2004). Nevertheless the complete use of the architectural heritage is a priority in an intangible,

rather than physical, dimension. This means that there is a need of a broader and careful consideration of the theoretical meanings of the *uses of the Past* [3]. When the individuals and/or the societies attribute the meaning of heritage to a well definite built settlement, its use means something different, not comparable to an ordinary situation. Even if the use usually distinguishes between market and nonmarket values of built heritage (Getty 2002, 13), this issue isn't expressed only in term of price and comprises the processes that embody the identity, both for individuals and communities. The architectural heritage, even without a direct and tangible relationship with the users, improves as well the *place attachment* and the *place identity* (Lewica, M. 2008).

The ideological conflict between form and function arisen and developed during the last century in the architectural theories has produced serious consequences also on the architectural heritage, particularly evident in the operational field. The prevalence of certain formalism could explain a sort of repression of the functional aspects in the intervention on heritage, despite the recurring statement of theoretical principles.

Even if (at least from the European perspective) the conservation of the physical consistency is the main objective of any intervention on architectural heritage, it can't be an end in itself. The lack of any use after a conservative intervention causes a more disconcerting scandal than the disuse caused by the abandonment and produces through the time similar risks of decay. The preliminary phase of the interventions is a crucial step to avoid the carelessness with the functional features of the architectural heritage, only if the use is regarded as a sort of bound variable between the design issues, whose the qualitative and quantitative characteristics succeed to influence the decision process [4].

The quantitative features of use depend on the typology, the conditions, and the surroundings of the architectural heritage. In most circumstances, it isn't possible to use the entire built settlement in the same way and many parts aren't utilisable strictly speaking. The ruined condition, the difficulties in access, the potential risks are the main limitations to the use from the quantitative perspective. Many studies and experiences have been aimed in the last years to improve the accessibility to architectural heritage for persons with motor difficulties (including children and elderly), also on the base of some European Parliament resolutions [5]. The topic of accessibility well shows how the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the use are intertwined in the architectural heritage.

The qualitative features hinge on the direct or indirect use. Regarding the direct use, the user is a person (citizen or tourist) that, as individual or as part of a community, spends its time in or near the architectural heritage. Regarding the indirect use, the user is anybody that, also living very far from the built heritage, recognizes a cultural value in it, following the motto *Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*. The coherence between the current utilizations and the entire consistency of the heritage prevails in case of direct uses. The main aspect of the indirect uses is the integration between the manifold meanings of the heritage and the level of awareness of the users, always to be maintained and improved.

The quantitative and qualitative features of the use correspond ultimately to the tangible and the intangible constituents of the architectural heritage whose evolutions are differently dynamic and need a holistic engagement (Vit-Suzan, I. 2014).

3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USE AND RELIABLE INTERVENTIONS

A close relationship connects the quantitative and qualitative features of the use and the categories of intervention. A zero level of the use (disuse) usually corresponds to a zero level of intervention and, for this, it doesn't have anything with the reliability. The abandonment is an effect of the disuse and produces two main consequences: it is the harbinger of the physical destruction and the premise of the use *incompleteness* that originates the loss of meanings and the difficulties to understanding (Germanà, M.L. 2015).

Starting from the zero level, the progressive increasing of the sphere of the intervention (from the knowledge, to the conservation, and to enhancement) makes the technical risk higher. The issue of the use is closely connected to the difficulties in pursuing reliable interventions: generally, the level of consideration of the current or expected uses is directly proportional to the reliability of the interventions made.

The knowledge process corresponds to the first and basic level of any other intervention and it is an intervention by itself. The lack of knowledge is very serious, due to the repercussions on the successive levels of intervention. The issue of the use as an object of knowledge is often neglected, despite the confirmed importance of original uses and their evolution in understanding the specific historical and cultural meanings and the well-known consequences of the current uses in the vulnerability of architectural heritage. It is highly significant that in the Italian Cultural Heritage database (*Carta del Rischio del patrimonio culturale*), the field "USAD – Uso oggetto" is mostly empty (see: www.cartadelrischio.it).

This means that the conservative activities will tend to consider the use as a *necessary evil* (Della Torre, S. 2012) and that the choice of a current destination will be unplanned or, even worse, indefinitely postponed. In order to support this choice, the knowledge must include the understanding of the contextual conditions (the environmental surroundings and anthropic context, the relationships between the urban fabric and the impacts of all the human activities, the socio-economical background). Changing scale, the knowledge must embrace some aspects as the general typology of the building system, the shape and the dimensions of the interior and exterior spaces and the connections between them, through the horizontal and vertical ways. In addition, the issue of the use is related to all the material features of the building components, from the structures to the finishes.

The relationship between the conservative interventions and the use is widely confirmed. More frequent and intensive maintenance activities correspond to more demanding levels of use. In addition, the direct participation of the user in conservation processes improves them, by tools aimed to an awareness and responsible utilization contributing to a reliable, and durable, conservation (for instance, failure signals form, to be filled during or at the end of the visit; Germanà, M.L. 2010, 65-66).

The relationship between the use and the enhancement intervention is even closer. The use is precisely the object of the enhancement, because it is impossible to enhance the

meanings, the values, or the physical consistence of the architectural heritage. Enhancing the use means improving it, in its both direct and indirect forms. The reliability in this case depends on a more complex and a wider range of factors. In most cases there is a need to face many clashing goals and the issue of use becomes strategic to reach balanced solutions.

The enhancement processes must interface with the knowledge and conservative processes in order to be reliable. Many studies and experiences show that the use, as the main object of these processes, is improved by communications strategies, also by adopting new technologies. A full and reliable use is easier when choosing a wider viewpoint, that avoids a narrow perspective and that embraces the entire material and intangible heritage that identifies a city, a district, or a region.

4. IMPROVING THE USE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: A FALSE PARADOX

The archaeological sites have often been kept away from the issue of the use, due to the well-known distinction between *dead* and *living monuments* [6]. This kind of architectural heritage has indeed lost every relationship with the original use and, in most cases, with all the uses, except the visit itself. A recently completed research project has focused on the topics of conservation and enhancement of domestic Punic, Hellenistic and Roman architecture between Sicily and Tunisia, two different realities that share the same Mediterranean identity, well characterised in its material and intangible aspects [7]. This experience has given the opportunity to highlight the need to a wide perspective to face the conservation and enhancement of the archaeological sites. Three case studies have been chosen, putting in evidence some common features, that are differently related to the issue of use: the few number of visitors notably lower compared to the cultural interest and the potential touristic attractiveness; the absence of adequate communication strategies; the difficulties in understanding by non-experts. The 3D models acquired thanks to the laser scanner surveys have been proved as a tool with multiple purposes. As well as offering the base for the knowledge of the current situation, they have supplied the information for the planned maintenance and they have evoked the virtual reconstructions aimed to improve the understanding by the non-experts. The proposal of cultural routes that link the archaeological site to the other material and intangible heritage and to the natural attractions of the district has been pointed as a parallel strategy for the sustainable touristic development.

The challenge of improving the uses of a settlement so far from any pragmatic usefulness is hard, but stimulating due to its urgency much more pressing in the current times of crisis for Southern Europe. Keeping in mind the etymology (*κρίνω* means I distinguish, I judge), it is clear that this crisis imposes a turning point of our approaches, where the judgment and the prudence (Fig. 2) are indispensable.

NOTES

1. There is a need to consider separately the *function* (something that disregards the user and is understandable in a machine) and the *use* (something that is highly correlated to every user as human being). For the very wide issue of the relationship between form and function in the architectural theories in the last century, see for instance: Anay, H. (2012); Blake, P. (1974). Regarding the use as the main focus of

the architect's activities, compare the definitions of *Architect* by Leon Battista Alberti (*De re aedificatoria*, 1485, IX) and by the Directive 2005/36/EC.

2. The research contributions are mainly related to the disciplinary fields of *Architectural Restoration* and *Architectural Technology*. See for instance: Di Battista V. *et al.* (eds.) (1995); Manzelle M. (1998); Kealy L. Musso S.F. eds. (2011), De Medici S., Pinto M.R. (2012).

3. See for instance the recently closed HERA (*Humanities in the European Research Area*) call *Uses of the Past*, available at: <http://heranet.info/hera-jrp-documents-1>.

4. The use of the restored buildings in a long period vision (post-renovation) has been focused on, with particular reference to convents and monasteries (Della Torre, S. 2012).

5. See: TeMa 1/1998; MIBAC 2008; Arengi A. *et al.* (2011); EU (2011).

6. See the Resolution adopted during the 6th UIA (International congress of architects) in Madrid, 4-9 April, 1904, based on the paper by M. Cloquet (Belgium), in ICCROM (2005), 13.

7. The APER Project was funded by the European Union as part of the Italie-Tunisie 2007-2013 cross-border cooperation programme. See Ferjaoui A., Germanà M.L. eds. (2014).



Figure 2. «Prudenza. Le due facce significano che la prudenza è una cognitione vera et certa, la quale ordina ciò che si deve fare et nasce dalla considerazione delle cose passate et delle future insieme». The prudence arises from considering the past and future things together. From Ripa C. (1603) *Iconologia*, Roma, pp. 416, available at <http://bivio.filosofia.sns.it>>>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anay H. (2012), (Epistemological) formalism and its influence on architecture: a concise review. *ITU AJZ* 9, n. 1, 70-85.

Arengi A., Della Torre S., Pracchi V. (2011), Conservation, Accessibility, Design. Discussion and Practice. In Kealy L. Musso S.F. eds., 55-66.

Bellini A. (1998), La pura contemplazione non appartiene all'architettura. *TeMa*, 1/98, 2.

Blake P. (1974), *Form follows fiasco. Why modern architecture hasn't work*. Boston: Atlantic.

De Medici S., Pinto M.R. (2012), Public cultural heritage properties enhancement and reuse strategies. *Techne* 3, 140-147.

- Di Battista V., Fontana C., Pinto M. R. (eds.) (1995), *Flessibilità e riuso*. Firenze: Alinea.
- Della Torre S. (2012), *Renovation and post-intervention management*. In *Annales. Ser. hist. sociol.* 22 2012/2, 533-538.
- EU (2011) *Mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities*; European Parliament resolution 25/10/11.
- Ferjaoui A., Germanà M.L. eds. (2014), *Architecture domestique punique, hellénistique et romaine. Sauvegarde et mise en valeur*. Pisa: ETS.
- Germanà M.L., (ed.) (2011), *Mediterranean Architecture between Heritage and Innovation* (). Firenze: FUP, 133-136.
- Germanà M.L. (2004), *Significati dell'affidabilità negli interventi conservativi*. In Sposito A., Germanà M.L. (eds.), *Reliable conservation of architectural heritage*. Palermo: D. Flaccovio, 24-31.
- Germanà M.L. (2010), *Il piano di manutenzione e il costruito con valore culturale*. In: Talamo C. (ed.), *Procedimenti e metodi della manutenzione edilizia*. Napoli: Esselibri, 59-70.
- Germanà M.L. (2015), *How to face the incompleteness of the Urban Archaeological Buildings*. In *EDA*, 2, 69-79.
- Getty Conservation Institute (2002), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage Research Report*. Los Angeles, available at: <www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources>.
- Kealy L., Musso S.F. eds. (2011), *Conservation/Transformation*. Leuven: EAAE.
- ICCROM, 2005. *Definition of cultural heritage references to documents in history*, available at: <http://cif.icomos.org/pdf_docs/Documents%20on%20line/Heritage%20definitions.pdf>.
- Lewicka M. (2008), *Place attachment, place identity, and place memory: Restoring the forgotten city past*. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 28, 209–231.
- Manzelle M. (1998), *Uso – Abuso – Disuso – Riuso. Il Progetto di utilizzazione nel restauro* (), in Biscontin G. and Driussi G. (eds.), *Progettare i restauri*: (). Padova: Arcadia, 149-157.
- MiBAC (Agostano M. et al. eds.), 2008, *Linee guida per il superamento delle barriere architettoniche nei luoghi di interesse culturale*. Roma: Gangemi.
- Riegl A. (1903), *Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung*, it. tran. in La Monica G. ed. 1982, *Scritti sulla tutela e il restauro*. Palermo: Ila-Palma.
- Vit-Suzan I. (2014), *Architectural Heritage Revisited: A Holistic Engagement of its Tangible and Intangible Constituents*. London: Ashgate.



UNIVERSITAT
POLITÈCNICA
DE VALÈNCIA



ESCUELA TÉCNICA SUPERIOR
INGENIERÍA DE
EDIFICACION



GENERALITAT VALENCIANA
CONSELLERIA D'EDUCACIÓ, FORMACIÓ I OCUPACIÓ