

ICOA1250: FROM TANGIBLE TO INTANGIBLE AND RETURN: HYBRID TOOLS FOR OPERATIONALIZING HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH

Subtheme 01: Integrating Heritage and Sustainable Urban Development by engaging diverse Communities for Heritage Management

Session 3: World Heritage, Regulations and Guidelines, Authenticity and Integrity

Location: Gulmohar Hall, India Habitat Centre

Time: December 14, 2017, 12:15 – 12:30

Author: Anna Onesti, Paolo Franco Biancamano, Martina Bosone

Member ICOMOS, is architect and PhD in "Methods of assessment for the integrated conservation, recovery, maintenance and management of the architectural, urban and environmental heritage". She is author of a research on the symbiotic integration of art and architecture in the recovery of public space as driver of human development. She is also interested in the issues of sustainability and local development, starting from the recovery of cultural heritage and landscape.

Abstract: UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (2011) highlights the need for a rethink of the framework of tools for integrating conservation and sustainable development. In the same way, United Nations recognizes the centrality of human beings in development processes, synthesized in 17 Sustainable Development Goals, while New Urban Agenda refers them in the urban/rural space. Operationalizing HUL approach means to translate UN criteria into actions directed on cultural heritage and, in particular, on landscape with high cultural and natural values. The tools aimed to operationalizing HUL are in turn able to pursue human wellbeing through cultural heritage.

Many communities are enhanced from recognizing the values of their built environment, which as cultural heritage in turn become social glue. In a short time, these bottom-up processes produce effective results as relationships between people, community and place but in middle-long time they progressively blow out. Our research focuses on a hybrid approach to strengthen the social empowerment process and to make it long-lasting through the actions on built environment.

An interdisciplinary and systemic approach aims to create physical and cultural conditions for a *creative milieu*. The integration of skills, knowledge, needs, values, visions of the different actors involved, brings economic, social and environmental impacts, that in turn are capable of circularizing relations between man, community and place, and activating a circular economy (Fusco Girard 2016). The project of built environment is a cultural project because, storing the intangible heritage of knowledge and adaptive capacity, becomes a source of innovation and a tool for managing the change. It not only promotes attachment to the place of daily life, but also produces connections between different communities. So the cultural diversity becomes a wealth for the community and an occasion to translate attentions of assets in actions that contribute to sustainable development, generating economic, social and cultural value.

Key words: *sustainable development, community, participation*

Introduction

Our epoch is characterized by extraordinary changes (globalization, climatic change, increasing urbanization, intense migratory flows, search of renewable energies, worsening on environmental conditions), that are affecting both on people and built environment.

Social dynamics are reflected in and in turn fuel the degradation of places: the loss of links between place and community determines a circularized degradation process that feeds on itself up to determine the crushing of social ties and the abandonment of the place.

This phenomenon is evident in the Vesuvian area and particularly in Ercolano, an ancient town that, together with Pompeii and Oplontis, belongs to UNESCO World Heritage. In the early nineteenth century since few decades ago, the town hosted a big thrift market, around which the local economy spinned. The importance of this vintage market has progressively declined over recent decades and has produced social, economic and physical decay, although a part of local community are still attached to this activity. As a “living” heritage (Poulios, 2014), landscape includes both the physical territory (tangible heritage) and the perception, values and norms of local communities (intangible heritage) (Council of Europe 2000, 2005), which in turn transform it for adapting to their ever changing needs (Angrisano et al. 2016). The intrinsic value of cultural heritage can be exploited through the adoption of innovative culture-led business and governance models and evaluation tools (Council of Europe, 2014).

The Circular Economy model (European Commission, 2015) is closely interdependent with the regeneration of landscape, which produces value through maintenance, recovery, reuse, restoration of landscape (Fusco Girard, 2016) and contributes to the quality of landscape enhancing the density of relations, symbioses, and synergies that multiply the flow of benefits in a virtuous loop. So actions on landscape and cultural heritage can ensure sustainable development (UCLG, 2015).

Theoretical framework

In front of the individualistic isolation, economy must recognize the value of reciprocity (Sacco, Vanin, Zamagni, 2005) exalting the strength of “among” which in economy is captured by the notion of “common goods”. The “we-rationality” put to the work the energies of the civil society organized for inventing unpublished forms of community management (Ostrom, 1990). The essential aspect of reciprocity is that the processes of exchange are inseparable from human relationships: this happens in the case of commons.

The paradigm of the “new economy” (United Nations, 2015, UNFCCC, 2015), proposes a reaction to the actual environmental, economic and social crisis, demonstrating the damage of capitalistic logic on commons, because it degrades the environment and it weakens the social cohesion. The proposed “regenerative capitalism” (Fusco Girard, 2016) reduces social inequalities, starting from the recognition of human person, the importance of intrinsic values and of relationships that creates synergies and therefore new chains of creation of value.

The re-appropriation of commons expresses the necessity to fill the cultural void that has progressively estranged the people from their places. Through actions of “care” based on collaboration and sharing, it has a social value because it rebuilds a sense of identity and affiliation to the place, a new conscience and a sense of responsibility towards the urban commons.

In the interaction between physical and social system, it is necessary to recompose a balance among the ability to innovating and to preserving specific identities, according to an evolutionary continuity. The relationship between urban regeneration and quality of life is directly linked to the quality of relations and connections between urban space, buildings and residents and may become a powerful force of social and economic inclusion. The physical regeneration of urban spaces presents a new challenge: to recompose human, social and physical qualities of the city as a “common good” into an inhabitable, collective, inclusive, open, communicative and accessible reality (Papa Francesco, 2015).

The role of cultural heritage in this process is critically recognized. Following the idea that any locality has «a path-dependently shaped - and through the course of history set - collection of predominant socio-historical phenomena, attitudes and preferences, called culture», the culture-based development model recognizes cultural capital as the proto-institution that shapes all such formal and informal institutions and ramifications of a place (Tubadji and Nijkamp, 2015).

The cultural capital can be defined as the stock of tangible and intangible cultural expressions (Throsby, 2001). Intangible and tangible cultural heritage are interconnected, as they are two sides of the same coin: both carry meaning and the embedded memory of humanity and both rely on each other when it comes to understanding the meaning and importance of each (Bouchenaki, 2003).

The concept of cultural heritage can be expanded up to include the ongoing process to create, build, use and modify heritage and landscape (Fairclough et al. 2014). In this sense, cultural heritage is not only the historical built heritage but also the project of recovery and reuse that in turn transforms the cultural heritage from passive reality to community activator.

Methodology

Physical and social dimension are strictly connected. In the physical dimension, communities develop their convivial dimension in which social cohesion and sharing of values revive.

The recovery of built environment is the basis for implementing new cooperative management models, as a “third way” which overcomes the conflicts between public and private interests. (Ostrom, 1990, Bertacchini et al., 2012). From knowledge to design phase, up to implementation and monitoring, the recovery of built heritage becomes an essential action of community empowerment, as «the process of increasing capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes» (World Bank, 2005). It helps to create a creative milieu (Törnqvist, 1983; Bertacchini & Santagata, 2012), capable to produce and disseminate projects regardless of their cultural, social, environmental and economic scope (Grefe, 2015). The integration of skills, knowledge, needs, values, visions of all involved actors, brings economic, social and environmental impacts, that in turn contribute to circularize the relations between man, community and place (Onesti 2017), and activating a circular economy (Fusco Girard, 2016).

In order to catalyze the regeneration of landscape and “close the loop” of landscape lifecycles, the recovery needs a hybrid approach, in which the “emotional” bottom-up approach with the “rational” top-down approach are integrated.

The project on built environment is a cultural project and a creative activity because, storing the intangible heritage of knowledge and adaptive capacity, becomes source of innovation and tool for managing the change. It can produce creative crossovers (Sacco & Sciacchitano, 2015) on cultural heritage, changing the behaviour of both individuals and groups. So the multi criteria evaluations are a topical aspect, which need to be integrated in the different phases.

The “architecture of value”, that describes the benefits of art experiences (McCarthy et al. 2001, Brown 2004), can be implemented in order to evaluating the benefits of cultural heritage and landscape, from individual through interpersonal to community and over time, from real time to surrounding up to cumulative benefits. In the new culture 3.0 regime (Sacco, 2011), individuals are not simply exposed to cultural experiences, but embedded with the production of contents. Expanding their capacity of expression, they challenge themselves, re-negotiate their expectations and beliefs and re-shape their own social identity.

By introducing culture into the productive processes, the recovery activates a process of cross-fertilization and improves local productive capacity and contributes to relocating the unemployed job force (Sacco & Ferilli, 2015).

Case studies

The practices of urban regeneration are characterized by four dimensions.

The first regards social connections, interaction scales, the inner structures of power that shape formal and informal organizations and skills development. It's the case of the *jardinspartagés*, *jardinsfamiliaux*, *jardinscollectifs*, *jardinspédagogiques*, and *jardinsd'insertion* in France, and of Cooperativa Coraggio in Italy, in which the actors involved “recreate” abandoned spaces, thus returning the dimension of everyday life within urban political activism (Pink, 2012). The second dimension is about the space: the reason for which some practices happen in some specific urban places and what connection is established between them and the whole city. For example, the illegal graffiti of Gezi Park, in Istanbul, are performative gestures that express the protest in a tangible way through physical space. The third dimension regards the relationship between the institutional dimension and new management models. The Teatro Valle in Rome and Asilo Filangieri in Naples, are community places, used by citizens everyday and open connected with everyone desires to make an experience with this space. In this way the political debate continues to spread within the artistic and cultural dimension, strengthening the relational dimension and configuring new modes for producing cultural policies. The last dimension is linked to cultural production: in experiences as MAAM museum, in Rome, the recovery, driven by art, of an abandoned factory have contributed to build a new inter-ethnic community and produced a new idea of museum, “real museum” (Pietroiusti 2015), as a place of artistic production inhabited and hospitable.

All these experiences demonstrate that the actions on the physical dimension of landscape produce impacts on its immaterial dimension, rediscovering the local identity. These cultural impacts in turn pave the way for the regeneration of intangible cultural heritage.

Discussion

Today in many cities bottom-up movements and initiatives, through actions of “care” based on the collaboration and sharing, are re-entering abandoned and unproductive parts of the urban context, in the urban “cycle of life”. Through understanding what kind of innovative elements emerges and shapes these practices, the challenge is to strengthen bottom-up process and to make it long-lasting, orienting the construction of a creative and regenerative environment, with the aim of implementing a new development.

From the analysis of community needs, the knowledge of the dynamics of change, the recognition of local and universal values of landscape, the comparison of alternative solutions, up to the evaluation and monitoring of multidimensional impacts contribute to introduce a “hybrid” methodology.

The resumption of relations between tangible and intangible heritage aims to fostering the active cultural participation of local community and creating networking between actors involved in the transformation of physical environment, in order to enhance intangible cultural heritage and to boost the development of local cultural and creative activities.

In Ercolano, identified as experimentation field by a research group of University of Naples Federico II, we would propose a project of reuse through which to connect the revitalization of the market (in physical, economic and social terms) to the local attractive context. Working on its specificity, connected to the fashion vintage market, our proposal has two aims: to use its scientific and technical approach to plan and guide the actions on built heritage, and to have a role as *medium* among different actors, creating new synergies for the revitalization of the territory, creating new forms of economy founded on local culture, enhancing its attractiveness and respecting local identity.

Finally these goals need to develop a framework of measurable indicators, capable to reconstruct correlations and causal links between built heritage, with its material and immaterial values, and community.

Conclusions

Cultural heritage is bearer of values that belongs to all the members of the community, and in this sense it's a common good (European Parliament, 2015). It recognizes the role of all public and private actors and the rights of the interested citizens groups (“heritage community” according to Faro Convention) to actively participate in the guardianship, management and development of the common heritage.

As common goods, its economic, cultural and social values are evolved: this change asks for politics and solutions of more innovative governance to facilitate the exploitation and the sustainable evolution of immaterial heritage and the material cultural expressions of the communities.

Stimulating a growth much more attainable, sustainable and inclusive (ICOMOS, 2015), Europe will become the global model of sustainable development driven by culture and cultural heritage, of a “human” economic growth directed to citizens’ wellbeing.

All the categories of heritage (material, immaterial, digital) are common goods and need an interdisciplinary approach, capable to generally tie together themes and aspects essays in separate way, and to put in evidence the matter of governance.

The recognition of the interaction among tangible and intangible components of cultural heritage and the increasing role of communities in a territory or in a virtual space can bring to the definition of “cultural commons” (Bertacchini et al., 2012).

The immaterial heritage and the tacit knowledge are essential elements for the production of cultural objects tightly connected to identity values and to the image and the marketing of places. The preservation, the promotion and the sharing of intangible cultural heritage reaffirm the wealth, the variety and the multiplicity of cultures and the “social and cultural landscapes” in the effort to realize/ build a public, social and communicative space, capable to reaffirm the value of the being People, the value of the being Citizens.

References

- Bertacchini, E., Santagata W. (2012). *Atmosfera creativa. Un modello di sviluppo sostenibile per il Piemonte fondato su cultura e creatività*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bertacchini, E., Bravo, G., Marrelli, M., Santagata, W. (2012). *Cultural Commons. A New Perspective on the Production and Evolution of Cultures*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bouchenaki M. (2003). *The interdependency of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage*. In: 14th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium: ‘Place, memory, meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites’, October 27-31, 2003, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe. <<http://openarchive.icomos.org/468/>>
- Brown A.S. (2006). *An Architecture of Value*. Grantmakers in the Arts Reader 17.1, pp. 18-25.
- Council of Europe, (2000). *European Landscape Convention*. Florence, October 20, 2000.
- Council of Europe, (2005). *Framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society* (Faro Convention). <<http://conventions.coe.int>>
- Council of Europe, (2014). *Intercultural city: governance and policies for diverse communities*.
- European Commission (2015). *Closing the loop - An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*.
- European Parliament (2015). *Report - Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe*.
- Fusco Girard, L. (2016). *Verso una “nuova economia”: il contributo del patrimonio/paesaggio culturale*. In Bobbio, R. (2016). *Bellezza ed economia dei paesaggi costieri*. Roma: Donzelli Editore.
- ICOMOS, (2015). Answer at Question “What can cities do to promote social cohesion, inclusion and equity? What practical approaches or solutions have you encountered that have helped make cities more inclusive and cohesive for all their populations?”, Habitat III, Urban Dialogues, Dialogue on Social Cohesion and Equity. <<https://www.habitat3.org>>
- McCarthy, K. F., Ondaatje, E. H., Zakaras, L., and Brooks, A. (2001). *Gifts of the muse: Reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*. Rand Corporation.
- Onesti, A. (2017). *Built environment, creativity, social art. The recovery of public space as engine of human development*. In *REGION*, 4(3), pp. 87-118.
- Ostrom, E., (1990). *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Papa Francesco (2015), Lettera Enciclica *Laudato Sì* del Santo Padre Francesco sulla Cura della Casa Comune. Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pietroiusti, C. (2015), *Possibili caratteristiche di un museo “reale”*. In de Finis G., Benincasa F., Facchi A. (eds.), *Exploit. Come rovesciare il mondo ad arte*. Roma: Bordeaux edizioni, , pp.737-742.
- Pink, S. (2012). *Situating everyday life. Practices and places*. London: Sage.

- Poulios, I. (2014), *Discussing strategy in heritage conservation: living heritage approach as an example of strategic innovation*. In Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development, Vol. 4 No. 1.
- Sacco, P. L., Vanina, P., Zamagni, S. (2006). *The economics of human relationships*, in S. Kolm et al. (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Sacco P.L. (2011). *Culture 3.0. A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funds programming*, OMC Working Group on Cultural and Creative Industries.
- Sacco P. L., Ferilli G., Tavano Blessi G. (2015). *Cultura e sviluppo locale. Verso il distretto culturale evoluto*. In Studi e ricerche. Ed. Il Mulino.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Törnqvist, G. (1983). *Creativity and the renewal of regional life*. In Buttner, A. (ed.), *Creativity and Context: A Seminar Report* (Lund Studies in Geography. B. Human Geography, No. 50), Lund: Gleerup, p. 91–112.
- Tubadji, A., and Nijkamp, P. (2015). *Cultural impact on regional development: application of a PLS-PM model to Greece*. The Annals of Regional Science, 54(3), pp. 687-720.
- UCLG (2015). *Culture 21: Actions. Commitments on the role of culture in sustainable cities*, Committee on Culture UCLG - United Cities and Local Governments. <<http://www.agenda21culture.net/>>
- UNESCO (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris.
- UNESCO (2011). *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Resolution 36C/23, Annex. Paris, France.
- UNFCCC (2015). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twenty-first session*, Paris.

ICOA1250: DU TANGIBLE À L'INTANGIBLE ET VICE-VERSA: DES MATÉRIAUX HYBRIDES POUR RENDRE OPÉRATIONNELLE UNE APPROCHE DES PAYSAGES HISTORIQUES URBAINS

Sous-thème 01: Intégrer le patrimoine et le développement urbain durable en engageant Diverses communautés pour la gestion du patrimoine

Session 3: Patrimoine mondial, Réglementations et directives, Authenticité et intégrité

Lieu: Hall Gulmohur, India Habitat Centre

Date et heure: 14 Décembre, 2017, 12:15 – 12:30

Auteur: Anna Onesti, Paolo Franco Biancamano, Martina Bosone

Anna Onesti, membre de l'ICOMOS, est architecte et professeure de « méthodes pour l'amélioration de l'intégration de la réhabilitation, du développement, de l'entretien et de la gestion du patrimoine architectural, urbanistique et environnemental ». Elle est l'auteure de travaux de recherche sur la symbiose entre art et architecture dans la réhabilitation de l'espace public en tant que facteur de développement humain. Elle s'intéresse également aux réalisations de développement durable au niveau local, en commençant par la réhabilitation du patrimoine et du paysage.

Résumé: Les recommandations de l'UNESCO sur les paysages historiques urbains (2011) insistent sur le besoin de repenser le réseau d'instruments permettant d'intégrer la conservation et le développement durable. De la même manière, les Nations Unies reconnaissent à l'être humain un rôle central dans les processus de développement, texte synthétisé dans les 17 objectifs pour le développement durable, alors que le nouvel agenda urbain fait référence à un espace à la fois urbain et rural. Rendre opérationnelle une démarche HUL implique de transcrire les critères des Nations Unies envers le patrimoine culturel, en particulier sur le paysage avec une haute valeur culturelle et naturelle. Les instruments utilisés pour rendre opérationnel le HUL sont en outre capables de favoriser le bien-être humain au travers du patrimoine culturel.

Beaucoup de communautés sont valorisées par la reconnaissance des valeurs de leur environnement architectural, qui forme un ciment social par le biais du patrimoine. En peu de temps, ce renversement des processus produit ses effets dans les relations entre les individus, la communauté et la zone concernée, mais à moyen et long terme, ils explosent progressivement. Notre axe de recherche utilise une approche hybride, capable de renforcer le processus de prise de pouvoir social et de le pérenniser par ses actions sur l'environnement bâti.

Une approche interdisciplinaire et systémique aide à créer des conditions physiques et culturelles pour un « milieu créatif ». L'intégration des techniques, des connaissances, des besoins, des valeurs et des points de vue des différents acteurs impliqués aboutissent à des impacts économiques, sociaux et environnementaux qui, à leur tour sont capables de fluidifier les relations entre l'individu, la communauté et son milieu, et d'activer une économie circulaire (Fusco, 2016). Tout projet sur un environnement bâti est un projet culturel, car accumulant l'héritage intangible des connaissances et de la capacité créative, il devient source d'innovation et outil de gestion du changement. Il ne s'attache pas seulement aux lieux de la vie quotidienne mais produit également des connexions entre les différentes communautés. Ainsi la diversité culturelle devient une richesse pour la communauté et une occasion de traduire les atouts

potentiels en autant d'actions qui contribuent au développement durable, générant de la valeur économique, sociale et culturelle.

***Mots-clés:** développement durable, communauté, participation*