

# BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

## 15

numero 1 anno 2015





# BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

## 15

numero 1 anno 2015

**Cultural landscapes:  
evaluating for  
managing the change**



# BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

Via Toledo, 402  
80134 Napoli  
tel. + 39 081 2538659  
fax + 39 081 2538649  
e-mail [info.bdc@unina.it](mailto:info.bdc@unina.it)  
[www.bdc.unina.it](http://www.bdc.unina.it)

Direttore responsabile: Luigi Fusco Girard  
BDC - Bollettino del Centro Calza Bini - Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II  
Registrazione: Cancelleria del Tribunale di Napoli, n. 5144, 06.09.2000  
BDC è pubblicato da FedOAPress (Federico II Open Access Press) e realizzato con Open Journal System

Print ISSN 1121-2918, electronic ISSN 2284-4732

#### Editor in chief

**Luigi Fusco Girard**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

#### Co-editors in chief

**Maria Cerreta**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Pasquale De Toro**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

#### Associate editor

**Francesca Ferretti**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

#### Editorial board

**Antonio Acierno**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Luigi Biggiero**, Department of Civil, Architectural  
and Environmental Engineering, University of Naples  
Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Francesco Bruno**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Vito Cappiello**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Mario Coletta**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Teresa Colletta**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Ileana Corbi**, Department of Structures for Engineering  
and Architecture, University of Naples Federico II,  
Naples, Italy  
**Livia D'Apuzzo**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Gianluigi de Martino**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Francesco Forte**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Rosa Anna Genovese**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Fabrizio Mangoni di Santo Stefano**,  
Department of Architecture, University of Naples  
Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Luca Pagano**, Department of Civil, Architectural  
and Environmental Engineering, University of Naples  
Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Stefania Palmentieri**, Department of Political Sciences,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Luigi Picone**, Department of Architecture, University  
of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Michelangelo Russo**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Salvatore Sessa**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

#### Editorial staff

**Alfredo Franciosa**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Francesca Nocca**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

#### Scientific committee

**Roberto Banchini**, Ministry of Cultural Heritage  
and Activities (MiBACT), Rome, Italy  
**Alfonso Barbarisi**, School of Medicine, Second  
University of Naples (SUN), Naples, Italy  
**Eugenie L. Birch**, School of Design, University  
of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, United States of America  
**Roberto Camagni**, Department of Building  
Environment Science and Technology (BEST),  
Polytechnic of Milan, Milan, Italy  
**Leonardo Casini**, Research Centre for Appraisal  
and Land Economics (Ce.S.E.T.), Florence, Italy  
**Rocco Curto**, Department of Architecture and Design,  
Polytechnic of Turin, Turin, Italy  
**Sasa Dobricic**, University of Nova Gorica,  
Nova Gorica, Slovenia  
**Maja Fredotovic**, Faculty of Economics,  
University of Split, Split, Croatia  
**Adriano Giannola**, Department of Economics,  
Management and Institutions, University of Naples  
Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Christer Gustafsson**, Department of Art History,  
Conservation, Uppsala University, Visby, Sweden  
**Emiko Kakiuchi**, National Graduate Institute  
for Policy Studies, Tokyo, Japan  
**Karima Kourtiti**, Department of Spatial Economics,  
Free University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
**Mario Losasso**, Department of Architecture,  
University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**Jean-Louis Luxen**, Catholic University of Louvain,  
Belgium  
**Andrea Masullo**, Greenaccord Onlus, Rome, Italy  
**Alfonso Morvillo**, Institute for Service Industry  
Research (IRAT) - National Research Council of Italy  
(CNR), Naples, Italy  
**Giuseppe Munda**, Department of Economics and  
Economic History, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,  
Barcelona, Spain  
**Peter Nijkamp**, Department of Spatial Economics,  
Free University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
**Christian Ost**, ICHEC Brussels Management School,  
Ecaussinnes, Belgium  
**Donovan Rypkema**, Heritage Strategies International,  
Washington D.C., United States of America  
**Ana Pereira Roders**, Department of the Built  
Environment, Eindhoven University of Technology,  
Eindhoven, The Netherlands  
**Joe Ravetz**, School of Environment, Education  
and Development, University of Manchester,  
Manchester, United Kingdom  
**Paolo Stampacchia**, Department of Economics,  
Management, Institutions, University of Naples  
Federico II, Naples, Italy  
**David Throsby**, Department of Economics, Macquarie  
University, Sydney, Australia





- 7 Editorial  
*Luigi Fusco Girard*
- 17 Dinamiche dello spazio privato a Pompei:  
progettare la storia  
*Nicola Flora*
- 39 Le pressioni perturbative del sistema  
insediativo di Torre Annunziata (NA)  
*Donatella Diano*
- 61 Sistema edilizio e risorsa idrica.  
Il caso studio di Torre Annunziata (NA)  
*Teresa Napolitano*
- 71 Identità sedimentate e nuova prosperità  
per il paesaggio urbano produttivo  
*Maria Rita Pinto, Serena Viola*
- 93 Cultural heritage and collaborative urban  
regeneration: the Sansevero Chapel Museum  
for the Historic Centre of Naples  
*Massimo Clemente, Alessandro Castagnaro,  
Stefania Oppido, Gaia Daldanise*
- 113 Cultural landscape by the sea as commons:  
collaborative planning for the metropolitan  
waterfront of Naples  
*Massimo Clemente, Eleonora Giovane di  
Girasole, Daniele Cannatella,  
Casimiro Martucci*
- 131 Community engagement for cultural  
landscapes: a case study of heritage  
preservation and tourism development  
*Gabriella Esposito De Vita, Stefania Ragozino,  
Maurizio Simeone*

- 151 Il progetto LEO: un approccio duale per lo sviluppo di Carpineto Romano (RM)  
*Antonio Caperna, Guglielmo Minervino, Stefano Serafini*
- 167 Cultural landscapes as driver for territorial innovation: A methodological approach for the Valle Vitulanese  
*Maria Cerreta, Maria Luigia Manzi*
- 191 Paesaggi culturali e centri storici minori abbandonati. Restauro, tutela e valorizzazione del borgo medievale di San Severino di Centola (Sa)  
*Rosa Anna Genovese*
- 211 Pianificare paesaggi marginali: le aree interne del Cilento  
*Antonio Acierno*
- 233 Fuzzy logic and spatial analysis in GIS environment  
*Ferdinando Di Martino, Salvatore Sessa*



## EDITORIAL

*Luigi Fusco Girard*

### 1. Setting the scene

All over the world, cities have to face three critical challenges: a) the economic crisis and the related wealth production; b) the increasing unemployment and its other social impacts; c) the decay of environmental resources. The question here is: can the culture, the cultural heritage, and in particular the cultural landscape play a positive role in relation to the three above mentioned problems? In the positive alternative, in which way can we produce empirical knowledge so that to become able to convince public and private decision-makers? In which way can we improve this positive role of the cultural urban landscape for the local development? In which way can we include the heritage/cultural landscape in the planning activity, towards the New Urban Agenda that will be proposed in Habitat III Conference in 2016?

The United Nations General Assembly in New York last September has recognized 17 strategic development goals (and 169 targets) for the next 15 years. They offer an accepted “future vision” of our society for the 2030 years for improving the quality of life of people in the general context of actual extraordinary changes. The last 17th goal is about evaluation and monitoring tools (effective impact analysis, approaches, indicators, etc.), for checking the achievement of the objectives and targets, and for improving the effectiveness of choices. The 11th goal is about making the city more inclusive, resilient, safe and sustainable. One of the targets of the 11th goals is about the role of cultural heritage for implementing the 11th goal. All the above requires a new role of Universities and Research Centres to produce new specific knowledge for contributing to social, economic and environmental development: to face climate change impacts, increasing poverty, energy decarbonisation, urbanization processes, urban re-generation, water management, etc. A “circular” process between society, public institutions and university is absolutely required to achieve the goals and targets of the Agenda 2030. For example, in the economic field we have to recognize that the economic/financial crisis of 2008 has demonstrated that the traditional/conventional economic organization has shoved its limits: it is necessary to re-design and re-generate the economy in a new way, that is able to respect people and natural environment. This new economy for becoming stable, resilient, and sustainable in a globalized context, should be organized on the:

- conservation/maintenance of local existing resources, and not on their waste;
- restoration/rehabilitation/regeneration of local resources, and not on their destruction;
- de-carbonization processes, for de-coupling the wealth production from environmental impacts.

The general model of this new local economic organization is the one offered by nature: the economy of nature is based on circular processes, where every waste is transformed into resources. The circular economy is the “new economy” for the city regeneration: for making really “smart” the city.

Circular organization of economic processes reduces the consumed natural resources, increasing productivity. Also the new forms of social/collaborative/cooperative economy

are characterized by circular processes in the wealth production, and therefore they well can be integrated in the above.

## **2. The role of the cultural landscape: the UNESCO and the EU approaches**

The term “cultural landscape” includes a diversity of interactions between humankind and its natural environment: cultural landscapes reflect tangible and intangible values and their relations. In 1992 the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes, adopting guidelines concerning their inclusion in the World Heritage List and acknowledging that cultural landscapes represent the “combined works of nature and of man”. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. In the Nara Document (1994), the Burra Charter (1999), and the UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes (2011) has been encouraged greater community involvement in the identification and management of landscape characters and values, considering some key points:

1. Understanding local knowledge for the enhancement of value perception of community cultural landscapes, where knowledge of a landscape cannot be separated from knowledge of its history and recognition of the identifying characteristics of a territory and must also be understood as awareness on the part of local populations of such values. The models of knowledge of the cultural landscape, stimulated by tools and methods for identification of the material and immaterial values and assessment of the social and economic drivers, can support the identification of innovative valorisation approaches.
2. Advocating a bottom-up approach for landscape protection through the active participation of local communities in the governance and decision-making process, considering that changes affecting various landscapes are often driven by the desire to enable economic dynamics, ignoring the specific needs of communities and territories. The involvement of the community is the basis of the processes of re-appropriation of places that should underpin every action for an integrated conservation, conceived as a dynamic and integrated action that manages the change and the related transformations.
3. Articulating the role of the cultural landscape as a driver for community-based socio-economic development, considering the cultural landscape as a suitable resource for an innovative model of sustainable local economy and focusing on approaches and tools for assessing and monitoring landscape quality and evaluate sustainable transformations, where cultural values offer an integrated conceptual framework.

Cultural heritage and cultural landscape are more and more recognized as resources for the economic local/regional development, because they are able to produce at certain conditions new employment, to stimulate the localization of creative, green, ICT activities, to increase inclusiveness and social cohesion.

The Historic Urban Landscape proposed by UNESCO (2011) is a clear example of this interpretation: landscape conservation and economic development are complementary.

The European Union Landscape Convention (2000) offer another key example about the role of the landscape in the development strategy. The EU approach and the UNESCO approach about cultural landscape have come similarities, some complementarities and also some differences.

They need, in any case, a more in depth interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary analysis. ICOMOS, as technical body working for UNESCO committed to the conservation, restoration and valorisation of the world's tangible and intangible cultural heritage/landscape, has recognized the cultural landscape as a "general and complex indicator of sustainable development" (Hosagrahar *et al.*, 2015).

The role of the "comprehensive/complex urban landscape" for city regeneration is proposed in the Interdepartmental Research Centre Alberto Calza Bini researches (Fusco Girard *et al.*, 2015) in its relations with circular/symbiotic/hybridization processes: they increase the territory productivity, the local attractiveness and development capacity. When there is health in urban landscape, there is high quality of life, and attractive capacity. A high landscape quality enhances the city attractiveness and thus relations and exchanges. The landscape quality depends on the density of circular processes, symbiosis, synergies, which multiply the flow of benefits. When landscape is ill, the quality of life decreases, and also the local attractiveness. The "complex landscape" (Fusco Girard, 2014) is the indicator to read the local productivity.

### 3. The research on landscape

The research activity of the Interdepartmental Research Centre Alberto Calza Bini is oriented to interpret the "complex landscape" as a key local resource for economic, social and environmental regeneration/development; providing specific operational tools (evaluation tools, financial/economic tools, etc.) for implementing circular processes, symbioses and hybridization processes in cities/areas.

The challenge of generating synergies between conservation and transformation issues requires adequate evaluation methods and financial tools, engaging civil society and local stakeholders, capturing both tangible and intangible values. Transforming conflicts into opportunities, cultural heritage/landscape regeneration can produce economic attractiveness and also strengthen social awareness and cohesion: thus, it enhances on its turn the "city multidimensional productivity". In particular, the Calza Bini research aims to:

- compare and find common elements/complementarities between UNESCO and EU approaches;
- produce empirical knowledge about the role of cooperation in stimulating new economic value creation chains;
- suggest approaches and tools for urban heritage/landscape regeneration and management (adaptive evaluations, financial tools, etc.);
- deduce a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators for comparing different programs, plans, projects and for proposing a new comprehensive evaluation approach, that can integrate the ICOMOS Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) (ICOMOS, 2011), through multi-criteria analysis.

The research activities of the annexed International Laboratory on Creative and Sustainable City has been charged by UN-HABITAT to coordinate the new knowledge production about the topic of "Urban Regeneration".

The general outcome of the research is the production of new knowledge for the "Science of the City" (Fusco Girard, 2012) that is useful to contribute to the city decision-making processes in the regeneration creative strategies. Specific attention is paid to urban cultural landscape, and to its potential capacity. Many problems arise. Which synergies between conservation and development? Which symbiosis or circular processes between heritage

and community can be identified and promoted? How the role of the community in the conservation, valorisation, management of cultural heritage/landscape can be enhanced? Which indicators to produce empirical evidence about the capacity of the cultural heritage/landscape in promoting the community, and thus a local development?

It is assumed that an economic approach is absolutely necessary, but it is not sufficient to identify the limits to manage change. It needs, therefore, “hybrid evaluation methods” in which the quantitative economic matrix is enriched with qualitative indicators, expressed by social components (*social matrix*), and environmental components (*bio-ecological matrix*). Multi-criteria and multi-group evaluations are key hybrid tools for the management and the comparison of the positive and negative effects to balance and compensate for the different impacts for all stakeholders (public, private, financial, social and civil ones).

Thus, the cultural landscape approach necessarily requires an adaptation of evaluation tools to improve decision-making processes related to planning/managing changes, towards an “Integrated Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment”. The challenge is to deduce a more effective evaluation approaches/methods, that can make integrated conservation more effective in implementing “human sustainable development strategies”. This perspective of city humanization process through cultural heritage/landscape regeneration suggests to stress the attention on human and social impacts of conservation/valorisation: in particular, on direct, indirect, induced created employment, on the production of social capital and communities (networks of relationships, bonds, synergies, etc), on new associations created for managing heritage, on social inclusion/social cohesion, on the impacts on wellbeing/health of people because of the new attractive atmosphere for the life of people, etc., and also, on its turn, on the capacity of these impacts to implement new value creation chains, in a virtuous and self-reproducing spiral in the time. In other words, the research is oriented to identify practical tool for addressing the highly complex situation faced by city authorities in their position as decision-makers, integrating conservation of cultural heritage/landscape into an inclusive economic development perspective.

#### **4. Urban planning, urban landscape and urban productivity**

Urban planning is all over the world the tool for making the city more inclusive, resilient, safe and sustainable. Planning is the institutional tool to transform the existing into the new city organization, based on symbiosis and circularization principles. Integrated urban planning improves the city complex landscape, creating new values. The general goal of planning is to increase the city comprehensive productivity (the economic one, the social one, the environmental one). There is a relationship between the quality of planning choices and the increase of the city economic, social, environmental productivity. The cultural heritage contributes to the increase of urban comprehensive productivity. Many indicators can be proposed in this perspective. All circular processes and synergies can be implemented in the space of the city/territory, through planning.

In particular, planning is “the tool to valorise places”, transforming them in catalyst of regeneration, enlarged to all urban space: in urban laboratories of creativity. In many cities the regeneration process is started from the heritage places and from the cultural landscape regeneration. Thus, cultural heritage and cultural landscape are assuming a central role in the city planning, all over the world. Through tools, it is possible to pass from general principles to operational practices. The need is not only to adapt but also to find creative solutions in transforming/re-shaping the organizational structure of the city. The challenge

of generating synergies between conservation and transformation issues requires adequate evaluation methods and financial tools, engaging civil society and local stakeholders, capturing both tangible and intangible values. Transforming conflicts into opportunities, cultural landscape regeneration can produce economic attractiveness and also strengthen social awareness and cohesion: thus, it enhances the city multidimensional productivity with new added values in economic, social and environmental dimensions.

### **5. Which tools for managing the change of the cultural urban landscape?**

Planning requires specific tools for managing change in urban landscape transformation and management: in particular, it requires new tools for evaluating different alternatives on the base of their multidimensional impacts. New specific multidimensional indicators should be identified and tested. The economic approach can be the main leverage in defending landscape, if soft values (as visual, social and cultural landscape) are converted into monetary values. The economic approach in evaluation through willingness to pay is able to better communicate values, and in particular the values change coming from different actions on cultural landscape. But economic approach, if necessary, it is not sufficient to identify limits to change. Multi-criteria-multi-group evaluation techniques are a key tool in management of positive and negative impacts to compare, to balance, to compensate different impacts for all involved stakeholders (public, private, financial, social, civil, etc.). Economic, social, environmental, cultural, symbolic both quantitative and qualitative, short and medium-long term perspective, impacts are to be assessed and compared to deduce priorities for actions.

Evaluation processes are fundamental tools in integrated planning for checking feasibility of creative and resilient alternatives. Choices regarding each form of capital/landscape change require specific evaluation approaches. For example, the social impact evaluation, the environmental impact evaluation, when social and natural landscapes are involved, etc. Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment, Economic Impact Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessment, Landscape Impact Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Social Impact Assessment, are examples of evaluation tools.

Heritage Impact Assessment proposed and suggested by ICOMOS is effective and useful for understanding the “visual impacts” in the landscape and to stimulate citizens participation. Landscape Impact Assessment, Visual Impact Assessment, Heritage Impacts Assessment, etc., should be reunited into a more general “spatial integrated evaluation strategy” to identify limits to acceptable change and to manage smart sustainable changes: to assess landscape value change due to new volumes of malls, tall buildings, new roads, etc., to be construed and to evaluate, through specific indicators, the “absorption capacity” of a specific urban landscape.

### **6. Some concluding considerations**

High quality of complex landscape enhances the city attractiveness and thus development perspectives. This quality depends on the density of circular/synergistic processes.

The complex urban landscape has the greater values in specific areas, in urban public spaces, the urban “piazza”, which become the catalyst for regeneration, symbioses and hybridization (because of the dualities between private and public spaces, etc.). They should be multiplied in the city and territory, for the city regeneration. A better understanding of the economic impacts of heritage conservation is required in our society

that speaks the only language of economy, promoting the research to identify most suitable performance indicators. Rigorous and innovative economic evaluation methods are required to convince private, public and social actors that the integrated conservation of the cultural urban heritage/landscape is an investment and not a cost (because benefits overcome costs). Economic matrix is absolutely necessary. But it is not sufficient. Hybrid evaluation methods are required, able to integrate quantitative and qualitative impacts.

Specific evidence based indicators are to be identified, for assessing in an operational way the changes of the city landscape. Thus cultural heritage/landscape can be not only *protected* and *safeguarded*, but revitalized and *creatively* regenerated.

We should conclude here that academic and research institutions should produce empirical evidence about multiple interdependences among these multidimensional impacts (through new knowledge production, data production, prospective analysis, dynamic impacts, etc.) for reinforcing the consensus towards the new urban paradigm. New indicators about cultural resilience, community heritage, social cohesion generated by heritage are required. All impacts related to intrinsic heritage value should be considered and assessed in a quantitative or qualitative scale.

The papers harvested in this issue of BDC are an example of the effort in the above direction, towards the improvement of urban productivity through landscape planning/management. The different papers explore multi-disciplinary approaches and methods employed to identify more sustainable and innovative systems of landscape valorisation, implementing new paradigms and approaches for managing change and linking landscape protection and sustainable local socio-economic development, by combining technological innovation, community engagement, and communication.

Nicola Flora explores the dynamics of the private space in Pompeii, relevant example of cultural landscape, where past and present live together, considering the perspective of a contemporary designer. In order to imagine the future of living, a contemporary designer cannot feel crushed by the past, by history. He must know how to use it as a seed thrown into the future: for planning. He must create a world, he must build an informed insight that, by the knowledge, lets him overwrite what came from the past to create the new, the future. The aspiration to the new is essential particularly to the domestic space's design. For the European architects, but in particular Italians, it is necessary to study once again the ruins of the atrium houses in Pompeii, in an attempt to read, through an original worldview, the threads that led our ancestors to set up the wise relationship artifice/nature device (with the invention of the landscape), which is the suburban villa. From this, we try to sketch out clarifying elements for contemporary interpretation that, planning the history, help us to plan the future by building the present.

Three papers study the cultural landscape of Torre Annunziata, in province of Naples (IT), part of a research, fielded by the Architectural Technology discipline with the Laboratory Reuse Recovery and Maintenance (LRR.M) from the University of Naples Federico II, for the project PRIN "Landscape protection between preservation and change. Economy and beauty for a sustainable development".

Donatella Diano analyses how today the international scientific community is more and more interested to the conservation, enhancement and development of historic cities. The aim is to combine the preservation of the urban heritage with the socio-economic development for a wise and sustainable employment of the natural and built resources. (UNESCO, 2011). Her paper focuses on the identification and systematization of unsettled

pressures of Torre Annunziata's ancient settlement, starting from the application of the resilience theory of social and urban systems. The main goal of this paper is the analysis of the environmental, social, economic and technological transition dynamics who affect the built landscape. This investigation is aimed at the definition of the current limits for the modifications of the structure of the city without change the urban landscape identity.

The paper of Teresa Napolitano introduces the relation between building system and water resource for the city of Torre Annunziata, considering that the availability of water resource has always guided settlement dynamics, influencing shape and liveability of human contexts. The sustainable use of water flows in the pre-industrial society was offset by a dissipative approach in the use and management of water resource. Examining a 19th century urban area in the town of Torre Annunziata, the analysis focuses on the integration of rainwater harvesting systems in buildings, with the aim to defining a knowledge framework about the systems, originally designed for using rainwater. Revealing the qualities that are hold into the memory of buildings, the technological characterization of plants is proposed as a founding moment to prefiguring scenarios for recovery and improvement of local landscape.

Maria Rita Pinto and Serena Viola explore the meaning of sedimented identities and new prosperity for Torre Annunziata productive urban landscape, declination for ancient settlements with a manufacturing vocation, of the concept of Historic Urban Landscape identified by UNESCO Recommendations (2011). Complex and adaptive system, it is the result over time, of procedures and methods of procurement for resources, their transformation, distribution of finished products, in which the technological opportunities are man-made connoting aspect.

Massimo Clemente, Alessandro Castagnaro, Stefania Oppido, and Gaia Daldanise describe the approach implemented for the Sansevero Chapel museum in the historic centre of Naples, Italy, where a cultural heritage and collaborative urban regeneration process has been activated. Cultural heritage has played a key role in urban regeneration processes although often with negative effects, such as the museification and gentrification of historic centres. The ancient centre of Naples is an emblematic case study because deeply degraded but strongly characterized by cultural identity. In the area, the Sansevero Chapel is a private museum very appreciated by tourists visiting Naples and famous for its historical heritage. Since the 90s, the museum is developing an innovative policy, playing an active role for the urban regeneration; on one hand, it increased its cultural activities, on the other hand, it promoted the valorisation of the urban area interacting with stakeholders and involving local community, especially supporting the initiative of "Corpo di Napoli" Committee. Starting from the case study, the paper aspires to offer useful insights for collaborative models of urban regeneration in historic centres.

According to the approach of collaborative planning, Massimo Clemente, Eleonora Giovane di Girasole, Daniele Cannatella, and Casimiro Martucci illustrate the case-study of the metropolitan waterfront of Naples taking into account the perspective of the cultural landscape by the sea as "commons". Indeed, cities by the sea are special "historic cultural landscapes", and maritime identity acquires new meanings for the touristic enhancement of urban coastal areas and it may represent a driver for socio-economic development. New strategies to stop deterioration in urban coastal areas should take place both through a conscious and evolved type of tourism both through innovative processes.

The paper analyzes some interventions of waterfront regeneration and tourism development in some seaside cities involving their maritime culture. New collaborative models of lateral participation took place as alternatives to the vertical models: “collaborative commons” might start its process for the touristic enhancement and regeneration of the metropolitan coast of Naples.

The city of Naples has been also analyzed by Gabriella Esposito De Vita, Stefania Ragozino and Maurizio Simeone to discuss partnership models and action protocols to be implemented in regeneration processes for enhancing the relationships slow tourism-cultural landscapes-urban regeneration. According to this, the paper focuses on a purposely-selected experience in Naples: the Marine Protected Area of La Gaiola.

In this distinguished example of waterfront area, a group of activists is developing an integrated system of initiatives for protecting cultural and environmental resources by promoting compatible uses for education and tourism purposes. The case study has been developed by interacting with the local stakeholders involved in social, environmental and economic activities to address the topic of developing effective partnerships for sustaining successful regeneration processes according to the needs of promoting cultural smart tourism.

Antonio Caperna, Guglielmo Minervino, and Stefano Serafini introduce the methodological approach implemented in the LEO project, result of a synergy action between the International Society of Biourbanistica and the City of Carpineto Romano (Rome, IT). Overall objective is to facilitate the socio-economic revival of the local community, enhancing technical and creative skills necessary to improve both the socio-economic and cultural field. The project consists of actions to start a mini-incubator of city and territorial development, able to convey technical, professional and managerial knowledge, and a promotion process of Carpineto Romano as tourist territory. Every action is structured in a systemic way, according to a *peer-to-peer model*, combining tradition and innovation, local and global.

Maria Cerreta and Maria Luigia Manzi identify a situated strategy for enhancement of the Valle Vitulanese, an inner marginal area of the province of Benevento, in the South of Italy, structuring an evaluative methodological approach that recognizes and interprets the valley as a multi-functional cultural landscape. The result is an enhancement strategy that leverages the specificity of the individual municipalities to enable local networks to activate dialogue between recovery and development of tangible and intangible resources. The first territorial action develops in the old town of Tocco Caudio, one of the eight municipalities of the valley, investing on the valorisation of local resources and triggering an incremental process of revitalization, able to strengthen the system of values and relationships, tangible and intangible, which characterize the context of a vast area whose Tocco Caudio is an integral part.

Rosanna Genovese proposes a reflection on abandoned minor cultural landscapes and historic centres, considering restoration, protection and enhancement of the medieval borough of San Severino di Centola, a little village in the South of Italy, within the National Park of Cilento, Vallo di Diano and Alburni. With its intense historic stratification, examined through the most significant territorial and architectural features (castle, tower, palaces, churches, dwellings, etc.), the ancient abandoned borough bears testimony to the passage of cultures and traditions, and is set in a highly evocative landscape. Here its restoration is proposed, through the examination of artefacts and assessment of their state of



deterioration so as to edit a project that may define intended uses with the purpose of integrating the cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, into social life in a perspective of “integrated conservation”. The consequent proposal for enhancement is based on an evaluation fully respectful of the social and cultural parameters of the borough, is part of interventions on local territory, and a financial feasibility hypothesis has been formulated for its management.

The paper of Antonio Acierno analyzes what means planning marginal landscapes, with specific attention to the inner areas of National Park of Cilento, Vallo di Diano and Alburni, in the South of Italy. The territory of the Cilento National Park is characterized by significant environmental and landscape assets, but also by physical and social weaknesses represented by geological risk and depopulation together with presence of aging people. The paper describes the “national strategy for the inner areas”, subsequent to the EU dedicated policy, which classified the Italian territory according to a polycentric criterion, highlighting the lack of basic services. This classification methodology is integrated with the results derived from the identification of Cultural Landscape Services (CLS), developed by the FARO research group of the University of Naples Federico II and Interdepartmental Research Centre Alberto Calza Bini, to define an innovative interpretation of the landscape. The proposed analysis could be useful to support the identification of priorities in choosing which projects are to be implemented in the studied area.

Ferdinando Di Martino and Salvatore Sessa propose an innovative approach to spatial analysis, implementing fuzzy logic in Geographical Information Systems (GIS) environment. In the context of the fuzzy logic they use a system of max-min fuzzy relation equations to solve a problem of spatial analysis in a GIS. The geographical area under study, the city of Naples, is divided in subzones to which they apply their methodological process to determine the outputs after that an expert sets the whole SFRE with the values of the coefficients impacting the input data. They find the best solutions by associating the results to each subzone and thematic maps are extracted from the GIS, and the thematic maps are useful to describe and analyse the resources of the local cultural landscape.

## References

- Australia ICOMOS International Council of Monuments and Sites (1999), *The Burra Charter*. Burra, Australia.
- Council of Europe (2000), *European Landscape Convention*. Florence, Italy.
- Fusco Girard L, Gravagnuolo A., Nocca F., Angrisano A., Bosone M. (2015), “Economic evaluation tools for historic urban landscape/heritage regeneration”. Paper presented at the International Scientific Workshop *Towards operationalizing UNESCO Recommendations on Historic Urban Landscape*. Naples, Italy, March 2-3, 2014.
- Fusco Girard L. (2012), “The urban future”. *BDC*, vol. 12, n. 1, pp. 19-34.
- Fusco Girard L. (2014), “Creative initiatives in small cities management: The landscape as an engine for local development”. *Built Environment*, vol. 40, n. 4, pp. 475-496.
- Hosagrahar J., Soule J., Fusco Girard L., Potts A. (2015), “Cultural heritage, the UN sustainable development goals and the New Urban Agenda”, ICOMOS Concept note for the United Nations Post-2015 Agenda and the Third United Nations Conference on *Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (HABITAT III)*. ICOMOS, Paris, France.
- ICOMOS (1994), *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Nara, Japan.

- ICOMOS (2011), *Guidance on heritage impact assessments for cultural world heritage properties*. ICOMOS, Paris, France.
- UNESCO (2011), *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL)*. Paris, France.



