BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

17

numero 2 anno 2017

BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

17

numero 2 anno 2017

Circular Models for Systemic Adaptive Reuse of Cultural Heritage and Landscape

BDC

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

Indice/Index

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

Anna Onesti, Martina Bosone

Abstract

UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (UNESCO, 2011) introduces a new and systemic approach for the conservation of the cultural heritage. For operationalizing this approach, where the interaction with social, cultural and economic processes and the empowerment of local communities are critical, new tools are needed, capable of addressing the critical issues of both bottom-up and top-down processes. Many communities are enhanced from acting on their physical context, which as cultural heritage in turn become social glue. Through the study of literature and the comparison between some good practices, the paper introduces a methodology for the recovery of built environment and investigates if the actions on the physical dimension of landscape really produce impacts on its immaterial dimension.

Keywords: sustainable development, community, circular economy

DAL TANGIBILE ALL' INTANGIBILE: STRUMENTI IBRIDI PER RENDERE OPERATIVO L'APPROCCIO DEL PAESAGGIO STORICO URBANO

Sommario

Le Raccomandazioni Unesco sul Paesaggio Storico Urbano (UNESCO, 2011) introducono un nuovo approccio sistemico al patrimonio culturale. Per rendere operativo questo approccio, in cui sono cruciali l'interazione con i valori sociali, culturali ed economici e il coinvolgimento responsabile delle comunità locali, sono necessari nuovi strumenti, capaci di superare le criticità dei processi bottom-up e top-down. Molte comunità appaiono rafforzate dall'azione sullo spazio fisico, che, riconosciuto come patrimonio culturale, agisce da collante sociale. Attraverso lo studio della letteratura scientifica e la comparazione tra alcune pratiche, il presente contributo indaga se le azioni sullo spazio fisico producono realmente impatti sulla sua dimensione immateriale.

Parole chiave: sviluppo sostenibile, comunità, economia circolare

1. Introduction

UNESCO Recommendations on Historic Urban Landscape (UNESCO, 2011) recognize the fundamental role of cultural heritage and landscape for sustainable local development and introduces a new approach landscape-based, called HUL approach (Pereira Roders and van Oers 2011; Angrisano *et al.*, 2016). Following the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000), Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) can be considered as a "living" heritage (Poulios, 2014) that includes both the physical territory (tangible heritage) and the perception, values and norms (intangible cultural heritage) of settled local communities.

Recently the European Union pointed out that cultural heritage/landscape is a strategic resource for sustainable development, recognized as a key of economic resource in the global competition (European Commission, 2015b). A landscape of high quality contributes to urban productivity, as it can produce (at certain conditions) new occupation, stimulating the location of creative activities, of ICT, and increasing the inclusion and social cohesion (CHCfE, 2016).

It is clear that landscape transformations can produce/re-produce values or contribute to landscape and societal fragmentation. The intrinsic value of cultural heritage can be exploited through the adoption of innovative culture-led business and governance models and evaluation tools.

In reverse, today people are strongly detached by the community and by the place where they live: they are projected entirely toward an autonomy and an inhospitable isolation, forgetting every relationship with other people and considering only the relations that are functional to pursuit their own objectives.

The management of landscape is extremely deleterious for the common good when is regulated exclusively by a capitalistic logic, as it benefits only individual and contingent affairs: it is unsustainable, because it degrades the environment and it weakens social cohesion. Social and economic dynamics are reflected in the landscape and in turn circularly fuel the degradation of it, that can be recognized as their main complex indicator (Fusco Girard *et al.*, 2014; Pinto and Viola, 2015). 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.

A "sick" landscape, with poor aesthetic values, is the expression of and in turn contributes to decrease the quality of life of people living in. It's unattractive and generally it produces dis-order, de-generation, dis-integration. In reverse, a "healthy" landscape, with great aesthetic values, is the expression of and in turn fosters a high quality of the life and has a remarkable ability of attraction.

The beauty of landscape increases the economic productivity and attractiveness, as it promotes relationships and exchanges, based on the common sense that it's good to take care of it. In turn, it depends on the density of circular loops and on symbioses and synergies that multiply the flow of benefits in a virtuous circuit. The challenge today is the "humanization" of our cities/society and it is strictly linked to the beauty of our landscape (Fusco Girard, 2016).

In recent years some practices show that through recognizing the values of the built environment, the sense of community grows up, and cultural heritage in turn becomes a social glue. These experiences express a reaction to the recent crisis, that is still the crisis of a cultural model rather than economic (Zecchi, 2016; Beck, 2012; Bauman and Bordoni,

2015). Today the necessity to take care of identitary places represents in reality the necessity to fill the cultural void that has progressively estranged the people from the places in which they live. This is the reason for which physical and social dimension are strictly connected.

The physical re-appropriation of a place through actions of "care" based on the collaboration and on the sharing has an ampler value: the physical action on the place expresses the wish to reconstruct the sense of identity and belonging which allow to a group of people to define itself as a "community" (Landry, 2009; Fairclough *et al.*, 2014).

In the physical dimension, social cohesion and sharing of values revive.

The recovery of built environment seems to be 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" (Gibson and Woolcock, 2005, p. 2; Alsop *et al.*, 2005, p.1). Into the light of the interaction between physical system and social system, today it is more and more necessary to recompose a balance among the ability to innovate and to build new values and the ability to preserve specific identities, according to an evolutionary continuity (Tagliagambe, 1998). At the basis there is the belief that civil values, rebuilt and shared in the community, are key elements for a sustainable and durable local development (Becchetti *et al.*, 2014). So, the paper aims to analyze if and under which conditions, through the recovery of the physical dimension of landscape, it is really possible to produce impacts on its immaterial dimension, and, beyond physical and environmental changes, generating social and cultural values. With this aim, the paper investigates some recent experiences recognized as good practices and, tries to compare their processes of development with the suggested methodology and to assess the results they produced.

2. From tangible to intangible and return. Theoretical framework

The idea of the society as a system of needs to be satisfied produces destructive results when it is accorded to an individualistic perspective, which has the only aim to maximize the profit. The perception of the necessity of a change of paradigm is very strong: a new humanistic and ecological paradigm has been proposed (UNFCCC, 2015), as it was already point out in the Agenda 2030 of the United Nations (United Nations, 2015). The paradigm of a "new economy" (United Nations, 2015; UNFCCC, 2015), characterized by a base both humanistic and ecological, is proposed as a reaction to the series of environmental, economic and social crisis of the last decades.

The acute perception of individualistic isolation has contributed to turn on a strong nostalgia of reciprocity, as confirmed by numerous empirical and experimental investigations (Sacco *et al.*, 2006). The proposal of a new "regenerative capitalism", or rather of a "co-capitalism" (sharing economy, collaborative economy, cooperative economy, etc.) is directed to reduce social inequalities and the impacts on climate change that derives from producing economic wealth. Beyond the strong entrenchment in the places/territories/city, in these different proposals the common element is the recognition of the human person (of his/her dignity, of his/her rights beginning from the health/comfort)

as an aim and not as a mean: the importance attributed to the intrinsic values and not only to instrumental ones, the relief assigned to the relationships that create complementarity/synergies/symbiosis and therefore new chains of creation of value.

Besides it appears necessary to imitate the circular trials of the nature, through the recovery, reuse, retraining, recycle, regeneration of the resources. In these coherent proposals of production of wealth with the new paradigm, more and more a perspective of middle/long term in comparison to that of brief term is needed. With this aim, the European Commission (European Commission, 2015a) has recently pointed out a new economic model, called Circular Economy, based on a systemic and circular approach inspired by natural systems, that aspires to build long-term prosperity into society.

As pointed out, the CE model is closely interdependent with the regeneration of landscape, which regenerates the value through actions of maintenance, recovery, reuse, restoration of landscape (Di Palma, 2017) 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 (Onesti and Biancamano, 2018).

The increasing interest of the citizens toward forms of participatory governance for the management of the so-called "common goods" has been recently implemented in experiences of active participation of the communities. The actions carried out by citizens, often organized in associations, testify a new necessary impulse to stimulate their pro-active role as actors in the decisional trials.

As such practices stimulate a sense of solidarity, they encourage the active citizenship, which is responsible and supportive in the participatory management of the common goods, feeding in the community a sense of affiliation to the place, a new conscience, a sort of sense of responsibility towards the urban common goods (Mattei, 2011; Ostrom, 1990).

These experiences have a common expression as a reaction to the crisis of cultural models rather the economic, as they express the necessity to fill the cultural void that has progressively estranged the people from the places in which they live. The physical re-appropriation of a place, through actions of "care" based on the collaboration and on the sharing, has a social value as it aims to rebuild the sense of identity and affiliation of a community, recreating the definition of (heritage) community (Council of Europe, 2005).

In this perspective, the relationship between urban regeneration and the quality of life in the city assumes a meaning specifically linked to the social order as the physical regeneration of urban spaces presents a new challenge: to recompose the 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 culture and cultural heritage in this process is critically recognized. Following the idea that any place 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, p. 690). In the cultural capital are integrated the composition of cultural characteristics and the belongings with the spatial entity of a place. The cultural capital is shaped by two types of capital. The material cultural capital comprises the works of art and historical monuments as well as all other objectified forms of culture in the locality, whereas the immaterial cultural capital comprises local attitudes, beliefs, values, traditions, oral folklore (Tubadji and Nijkamp, 2015).

Following Throsby (2001), the notion of cultural capital can be defined as the stock of tangible and intangible cultural expressions. The first one consists of all kinds of buildings, structures, sites and locations with cultural significance and of artworks and artefacts existing as private goods such as paintings, sculptures, and other objects. The second one, instead, comprises both artistic performances and celebrations as well as ideas, practices, beliefs, traditions, and values, together with the stock of artworks existing in the public domain as public goods, such as certain instances of literature and music (Bucci *et al.*, 2014).

Some authors (Tubadji and Nijkamp, 2015) recognize the existence of a temporal divide, which groups the material and immaterial living culture into "living culture" and "cultural heritage". The living culture is the currently (contemporaneously) created material and immaterial culture. The cultural heritage is the immaterial and material culture that was created in the locality in the past, e.g. more than 50 years ago.

Other authors give more emphasis to the continuity between past and present in cultural capital up to expanding the concept of cultural heritage 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 a community activator. In fact, the recovery of built environment deals with tools aimed to address both the development and the conservation of historical places, focusing on their social utility (Galliani, 1984; Caterina, 1989; Musso and Franco, 2006; Di Battista, 2006; Di Battista, 2012; Viola, 2012; Pinto, 2013). The strategies of recovery develop the theme of care, that protects identity factors, with the functional efficiency that the technological and spatial elements are still able to return (Pinto, 2004). So actions on landscape and cultural heritage can ensure sustainable development (UCLG, 2015).

UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) recognizes intangible cultural heritage as 'the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their Cultural Heritage' (UNESCO, 2003, art.2). UNESCO Convention points out the interdependence between intangible cultural heritage and tangible cultural and natural heritage, and acknowledges the role of intangible cultural heritage as a source of cultural diversity and a driver of sustainable development.

The profound relationship between tangible and intangible heritage has been widely recognized. Bouchenaki (Bouchenaki, 2003) pointed out that tangible and intangible heritage, although very different, 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. As landscape can be considered a "mixed heritage", that is often among the noblest cultural spaces and expressions produced by mankind, specific policies are needed for its identification, protection and enhancement.

The values involved in this processes don't concern only the immateriality of the goods to preserve, in terms of cultural value, historical value, symbolic value, but also and above all its materiality.

The physical dimension is connected to the social dimension, as in the physical dimension of the places, communities develop their convivial dimension and cohesion and shared values revive. In turn, material and constructive values, together with physical and aesthetic

values, are recognized by the communities as symbolic elements.

Therefore material and immaterial values go together and the need to be preserved concerns them both.

Built environment and community can be recognized as two systems interacting in the landscape: just as community relates to the built through its sedimented culture changing its internal structure, as the built environment contributes to shape the community as a social organization (Onesti, 2017).

The project of recovery is an interdisciplinary process of information/decision (Ciribini, 1984) that is capable to reactivate this circular process as it stimulates the creativity and strengthens the bonds between people and place (Onesti, 2017). The integration of skills, knowledges, 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, promoting the sharing of choices of permanence and change (Pinto, 2013) and activating a circular economy (Fusco Girard, 2016).

The participation to the process of recovery implicates a critical trial of knowledge and awareness, that brings to building and sharing values and objectives in the general interest. In this process, social capital grows up, as the recognition of common interests helps to overcoming particularisms and to consolidating social bonds in horizontal sense (among actors of the same "type") and in vertical sense (among actors that traditionally have different roles), increasing social cohesion (Council of Europe, 2014). It means both increasing social relations, that are at the heart of the human capital, and feeding the trust into the future and into institutions.

Just as the process of recovery, the forms of social/cooperative/collaborative economy, as those of philanthropic economy, are characterized by a circular trial (to give, to receive, to return), that makes them particularly suitable for the regeneration/exploitation and management of landscape. The active involvement of different stakeholders - people, third sector, public administration, economic entities, firms and university - can acts a catalyst able to relate different actors through research projects in the real context implementing a new development (Viola *et al.*, 2014; Pinto *et al.*, 2016). Social/inclusive enterprises can contribute to improve "urban productivity", as they are able to activate virtuous circuits of synergies/symbiosis/cooperations with the production of cultural, social and economic values.

The recovery of built environment, therefore, helps to create a creative milieu (Törnqvist, 1983; Bertacchini and Santagata, 2012), as it improves its three basic factors: the intense exchange of information between people, the accumulation of knowledge, skills and know-how in specific activities and, the creative capacity of individuals and organizations to use the two above capacities and resources. The creative milieu in turn produces a convivial atmosphere (Linnerooth-Bayer and Amendola, 2000) and safe, able to produce and disseminate projects regardless of their scope, both cultural, social, environmental and economic (Greffe, 2005).

The construction of the creative milieu is a prerequisite for economic development calibrated on human-scale, attentive to distributional issues and harmonious with nature. At the same time, the recovery of public space pursues community right to beauty, as "new community right that will give people more powers and incentives to shape, enhance and create beautiful places" (Harvey and Julian, 2015, p. 3).

Then, the project of recovery is a cultural project which can produce creative crossovers

(Sacco and Sciacchitano, 2015), interpreted as predictable social and cultural impacts of the project.

As it stores the intangible heritage of knowledge and adaptive capacity, the recovery of built environment becomes a valuable tool for building capability in managing the change of landscape. So, the actions on the physical dimension of landscape produce impacts on its immaterial dimension, rediscovering local identity and regenerating local material culture. These cultural impacts in turn pave the way for the regeneration of intangible cultural heritage.

In order to understand the crossover effects of the actions on cultural heritage, it is interesting to understand how cultural capital changes the behavior of both individuals and groups. In the field of art, Alan Brown (2006) attempted to illustrate an "architecture of value" for understanding the benefits of art experiences, from individual through interpersonal to community and overtime, from real time to surrounding up to cumulative benefits.

The framework is equally useful in describing vastly different arts activities, as these five modes of participation transcend discipline, genre, cultural context and skill level. As the recovery can be considered a creative activities (Santagata, 2009; Sacco, 2011), the model can be implemented in order to evaluating the benefits of cultural heritage and landscape. It proposes five clusters of benefits: imprint of art experience; personal development; human interaction; communal meaning; economic and macro social 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, reshape 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 *et al.*, 2015).

3. Methodology: recovery strategies and actions

The methodology proposes to consider the project of recovery as both a cultural project which can produce creative crossovers (Sacco and Sciacchitano, 2015), interpreted as predictable social and cultural impacts of the project, capable to contributing to a creative environment creation.

It introduces the project of recovery of built environment as a hybrid tool for operationalizing HUL approach, capable to overcoming the fragmentation of spontaneous initiatives and, similarly, a conception of recovery as mere physical embellishment.

It's very different from auto-recovery or similar spontaneous initiatives, as it actively includes each actor in the participative process but points out the responsibilities and commitments of each one. It's not a project of citizens, as it requires specific capabilities and technical and professional knowledge in each phases, but it's addressed by citizens' needs, it's shared step by step with them and, above all, it is based on their empowerment. This idea of recovery understands the recognition of heritage as a common good as both the prerequisite for its care and conservation and the means for improving the collective creativity of local communities. The recovery of built environment, although developed bottom-up, is projected and designed by professionals and cultural agitators which drive communities in a process of embedding and are supported by local association and institutions.

As it is place-based, this approach cannot be replaced exactly as it was but needs to be adapted step by step to the specific context whereas to be implemented through an experimental process "in vivo". This makes the place of implementation a "living lab", that from a place of exchange and interaction between local knowledge and expertise, becomes the place of recreation of the (heritage) community (Onesti, 2017).

Following these criteria, the methodology is based on these guidelines:

− embedding local community in the process of recovery also through recognizing local innovators, capable to drive other people;
− sharing knowledge between the different actors of the process, also by experimental and digital tools, accessible to everyone;
− recognizing local culture and intangible heritage as first step and promoting its regeneration through the creative contribution of art and cultural heritage;
− in the physical interventions on built, building high quality architectural solutions, integrating artworks and in the reuse preferring cultural and creative activities;
− connecting people and activities, promoting productive synergies and circular processes in each field, following the circular economy strategies;
− putting in relation the place of intervention with its external environment, promoting diversity and cultural exchange as a source of wealth and innovation;
− integrating the project of recovery into a mosaic of physical actions and intangible initiatives aimed at locally promoting a sustainable development;
− returning to the project of recovery a meaning that goes beyond the physical action that through the interaction between community and place can act as a source of innovation and social/cultural change;
− through the project of recovery following the main goal to make the place a creative environment, capable to improve social cohesion and to stimulate the creativity of local communities.

4. Case study

The research analyzes three different practices in which some criterions of the methodology previously exposed have been unconsciously applied. In all cases the initial action is a recovery action that determines impact in physical dimension. The aim of this analysis is to demonstrate that acting on the physical dimension following recovery and reuse criteria, it's possible to produce impacts on social, cultural and economic systems. In the paper each case study has been analyzed evaluating positive effects produced by recovery strategies and actions in physical, social, cultural and economic dimensions, even if each case presents more relevant effects into one dimension than into the others. The analysis demonstrates also that the initial physical action is able to produce positive return impacts in the same physical system, extending the effects on a wider area than the intervention one.

The first analyzed case is Cooperativa Coraggio in Italy (Tab. 1), in which the actors involved "recreated" an abandoned spaces and reused it as a common farm, thus returning the dimension of everyday life within urban political activism (Pink, 2012).

The second case is the illegal graffiti of Gezi Park (Tab. 2), in Istanbul Graffiti are performative gestures that express the protest in a tangible way through physical space.

Tab. 1 - Cooperativa Coraggio

Name of project	"Cooperativa Coraggio"
Location	Rome (Italy), 2011
Designer	Co.r.ag.gio (Roman Cooperative agriculture young people)
Actors	Agriculturists, agronomists, professional cooks, designer, architects, laborers and specialized laborers, anthropologists, communication experts, educators, sociologists.
Institutions	Lazio Region, Solidarity Rome Foundation
Goal	Coraggio transposed the concept of right to the land into four practical aims: − to census urban public agricultural land; − to elaborate public announcements in order to allocate the land to urban agriculture project carried out by young farmers; − to institute funds in order to facilitate bank cred-it; − to stop property speculations on the roman ter-ritory and to preserve biodiversity.
Recovery strategies and actions	The agriculture became a field where to test different competences and sensibilities to develop a productive strategy, social connections, interaction scales, inner structures of power and skills development.
Physical impacts	Recovery, reuse and management of rural land (about 800 hectares).
Social impacts	Birth of a cooperative: 15 activists involved. Voluntary and co-working activities. Social, civic and political participation. Partnership with institution and other associations. Civic and political participation. Voluntary activities. Partnership with institution and other associations.
Cultural impacts	"Anthropological" role in a circular conception of power. Use of social space (libraries, cultural associations, parks) for theoretical and practical laboratories on the horticulture and on the ecological best practices. From 2013 to 2017 the Cooperative has organized 4 educational seminars. Research intensity. Technological innovation in the production system
Economic impacts	Maturation of an agricultural project inspired to multi-functionality to reach the minimum level of economic sustainability. Development of a productive strategy. Birth of restoration services based on biological agri-food production. Disposition of public funds (Region) to allow the start of the project: € 150.000 as lost fund and 500.000 as guarantee leading.

Tab. 2 - Gezi Park graffiti

Name of project	"Gezi Park graffiti"
Location	Gezi Park (Turkey), 2013
Designer	Street artists (free)
Actors	Street artists
Institutions	Municipality
Goal	The illegal graffiti of Gezi Park expresses the idea that a political idea can became tangible by actuating it in and through physical space.
Recovery strategies and actions	The meaning of this artistic actions goes beyond the merely aesthetic value; through the interaction between community and place they stimulate social and cultural change, improving social cohesion.
Physical impacts	The "liminal socio-spatial sites" (rooftops, alleyways, car parks, tunnels, bridges, pavements and city walls) are transformed into «sites of action, communication, beauty» (Waclawek, 2011, pp. 112-115). Personalization signs. Public art. Art and culture in public space. Public space accessible to the community.
Social impacts	The "spatial contradictions" of graffiti represent the socio-political contradictions of society that, coming effectively into play in space (Lefebvre and Nicholson-Smith, 1991, p. 358 and p. 365).
Cultural impacts	The graffiti of the Gezi resistance represents a way to express the political idea and the social needs of a specific community stimulating cultural discussions.
Economic impacts	Social space in general and thus also the territories marked by graffiti reflect and mediate the contradiction between property and appropriation, and the contradiction between property and appropriation is nothing but the contradiction between exchange value and use value of space (Lefebvre and Nicholson-Smith, 1991, p. 356).

The third case regards the first example of regulation for "shared administration of common goods" (Tab. 3), promoted by the cultural association Labsus (Laboratory of subsidiarity) in the city of Bologna. This regulation produces impacts on the physical system as recovery and reuse interventions, which in turn produce impacts on other dimensions.

Tab. 3 - Labsus

Name of project	Regulation for "shared administration of common goods"
Location	Bologna (Italy), 2014
Designer	Labsus - Laboratory of subsidiarity
Actors	Jurists, sociologists, economists and political scientists, citizens
Institutions	Municipalities
Goal	The elaboration of governance and maintenance measures for the urban common goods, to assure and to improve their fruition and quality.
Recovery strategies and actions	The projects promoted by Labsus develops a "*collective conscience of the territory in which the productive, social and personal aspects mix with others type cultural, giving origin, around the common goods, also to others new, unpublished abilities, competences, connected activity*" (Rapporto Labsus, 2015). The practices on common goods activate local "circular economies", determining the activation of regenerative cycles of spaces but also of people with their competences and knowledges.
Physical impacts	Care of public space. Care of public space by citizens. Use of buildings. Public space accessible to the community.
Social impacts	Coworking activities. Social participation. Civic and political participation. Voluntary activities. Partnership with institution and other associations.
Cultural impacts	Development of a common conscience about local cultural heritage. Development of a sense of identity. Cultural changes. Empowerment of local communities. Cultural and creative industries production.
Economic impacts	Increase of the use value of common goods. Increase of the exchange value of common goods. Birth of local circular economy processes: regeneration of built environment, valorization of productive supply chain, increase of competitive benefits.

5. Discussion

The relationship between the recovery of physical space and the sustainability of local development is not always fruitful as it is extremely dependent by its implementation path. When developed top-down and only through the intervention of public bodies, the recovery is perceived as extraneous by local people and is a potential source of gentrification. Obviously, it is much more critical when it is aimed at improving only touristic attractiveness and to produce exclusively economic values.

The analyzed case studies are mainly developed bottom-up and can be classified into the numerous movements and initiatives, that are re-entering abandoned and unproductive parts of the urban context into the urban "cycle of life" through actions of "care" based on the collaboration and sharing.

The analysis of the case studies demonstrates the proposed thesis that the recovery project of public space, based on culture and shared with local community, contributes to find a "creative environment" that determines positive effects not only on physical dimension but also on cultural, social and economic ones. In this sense, reconstructing the relationships between people, communities and landscape, it is conceived as a prerequisite of development and has a social balancing attitude (Caterina, 2013).

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.

In the case of Coraggio Cooperative the synergies among different professional figures has encouraged the cultural changes and the creation of a community founded on common values and goals. In this sense this experience has represented an occasion of cultural progress not only for the members of cooperative but also for all people involved in formative initiatives. Therefore in this case the recovery of the physical space has also determined the recovery and the enrichment of the knowledge system tied up to the agricultural field. The numerous cultural initiatives promoted by cooperative for the knowledge dissemination have connected people and activities, encouraging a more and more interconnection between the place of intervention with its external environment. The contribution of different professionals to the realization of the project has promoted productive synergies and diversity and cultural exchange as a source of wealth and innovation.

In the case of illegal graffiti of Gezi Park the physical action has an aesthetic value that expresses social meaning. So in this case the artistic action has determined social effects more than cultural change or physical transformation. Indeed, the graffiti have represented a symbol more than a way to recovery public space. They can be considered as an expression of a political sentiment that already exists in community but they have also been the way to affirm and reinforce it. Therefore the artistic gesture became a common way to express shared values, improving cultural debate and social cohesion.

Finally, meaningful experiences of shared management of the public goods are those promoted by the cultural association Labsus - Laboratory of subsidiarity, founded in 2005 by a group of jurists, sociologists, economists and political scientists. These professionals take part in the association to develop the ideas to earn experience, standard and documents on the theme of the shared management of the common goods. Labsus association wants to ransom the condition of the citizens from "administered" to "allied", in the conviction to have to recognize "that when the citizens are activated they are not administered only, according to the traditional categories of the administrative Right, on the contrary they are responsible and solidal subjects that independently collaborate with the administration in the pursuit of the general interest" (Rapporto Labsus, 2015). In this case the physical actions are regulated by "pacts of collaboration" between institution and citizens: they are "the tool with which the Municipality and active citizens arrange all of this that is necessary to the realization of the interventions of care and regeneration of the common goods".

In substance, the pacts of collaboration are the technical-juridical junction on which is founded the alliance among citizens and administration and that gives life to the shared administration.

The activation of a multi-level network, in which multiple actors are involved in a process of acquisition and share of competence by doing together, accompanies the community in the acquisition of a shared civic conscience and of a sense of responsibility what decisive factor to guard, to manage and to develop the urban and human settlement in which they live. So the project of recovery became the way to stimulate a creative environment, capable to improve social cohesion and to stimulate the creativity of local communities.

In these experiences the recovery and reuse of built environment are used as a hybrid tool which integrates community based bottom-up approach with the institutional top-down approach and is capable to really activate new development processes with the empowerment of local communities (Onesti, 2017).

Although some critical questions can be highlighted.

When developed only bottom-up and not implemented into an institutional and coordinated framework, these practices rescue to be fragmented and to progressively burn out into 2-3 years. Nevertheless it is surely possible that, connecting the produced effects in a more comprehensive network, it's possible to activate virtuous trials with great effects both in the space and in the time.

The critical aspect of this study is that the analyzed practices were born from not too long and it's still had to show if the produced effects are in a long time perspective or are concentrated in a limited time.

Other times, the quality of the recovery is poor, as the interventions are carried by people without professional competence, although well-intentioned. These actions are often developed in illegal way, without authorizations and contributes to the decay of physical and social environment.

The recovery of built environment, that involves local communities in the whole process of recovery, from the knowledge phase up to the designing and building ones, is included into the first two categories. At the same time, the participation to the process of the actors involved, including institutional bodies, makes it suitable as an innovative regulatory system, pursued in consultation and dialogue with the parties concerned, ed it's implemented as financial tools, linked to innovative funding forms as crowdfunding (Angrisano *et al.*, 2016).

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.

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.

Referring to UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (UNESCO, 2011), the paper proposed to recognize the recovery of built environment as a tool for

operationalizing HUL approach. In the article 24, the Recommendation recognizes four categories of tools:
1. Civic engagement tools;
2. Knowledge and planning tools;
3. Regulatory systems;
4. Financial tools.

6. 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 (Council of Europe, 2005) 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 knowledges 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.
The paper aimed to analyze if and under which conditions through the regeneration of the physical dimension of landscape it is really possible to produce impacts on its immaterial dimension, and, beyond physical and environmental changes, generating social and cultural values. The literature review strongly supported our thesis, that seems to be in line with innovative research areas. The analysis of some recent experience tried to identify the processes of their development and which results they produced. The proposed thesis seems to be demonstrated, even if the research has deal with few available data and with their short life. A more significant test should be made in a few years, in order to check the results and monitor their process of implementation.
As future development of the research, we intend to implement the proposed approach to the recovery of built environment in a specific context and to monitoring its impacts step by step in each phase.

References

Alsop R., Bertelsen M., Holland J. (2005), *Empowerment in practice: From analysis to implementation*, www.openknowledge.worldbank.org

Angrisano M., Biancamano P., Bosone M., Carone P., Daldanise G., De Rosa F., Franciosa A., Gravagnuolo A., Iodice S., Nocca F., Onesti A., Panaro S., Ragozino S., Sannicandro V., Fusco Girard L. (2016), "Towards operationalizing UNESCO Recommendations on "Historic Urban Landscape". *Aestimum*, n. 69, pp. 165-210.

Becchetti L., Bruni L., Zamagni S. (2014), *Microeconomia. Un testo di economia civile*. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Bauman Z., Bordoni C. (2015), *Stato di crisi*. Einaudi, Torino.

Beck U. (2012), *La crisi dell'Europa*. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Bertacchini E., Santagata W. (2012), *Atmosfera creativa. Un modello di sviluppo sostenibile per il Piemonte fondato su cultura e creatività*. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Bertacchini E., Bravo G., Marrelli M., Santagata W. (2012), *Cultural Commons. A New Perspective on the Production and Evolution of Cultures*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.

Bouchenaki M. (2003), "The interdependency of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage", 14th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium, *Place, memory, meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites*, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe, October 27-31, 2003.

Brown A.S. (2006), "An Architecture of Value. Grantmakers". *Arts Reader*, vol, 17, n. 1, pp. 18-25.

Bucci A., Sacco P. L., Segre G. (2014), "Smart endogenous growth: cultural capital and the creative use of skills". *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 35, n.1-2, pp. 33-55.

Caterina G. (1989), *Tecnologia del recupero edilizio*. UTET, Torino.

Caterina G. (2013), "Conservazione, manutenzione e gestione degli spazi pubblici e dei beni architettonici", in Castagneto F., Fiore V. (eds), *Recupero Valorizzazione Manutenzione nei Centri Storici. Un tavolo di confronto interdisciplinare*. Lettera 22, Siracusa, pp. 14-17.

Ciribini G. (1984), *Tecnologia e progetto*. Celid, Milano.

Council of Europe (2000), *European Landscape Convention*, www.coe.int/en/web/landscape

Council of Europe (2005), *Framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society (Faro Convention)*, www.conventions.coe.int

Council of Europe (2014), *Intercultural city: governance and policies for diverse communities*, www.edoc.coe.int

Di Battista V. (2006), *Ambiente costruito*. Alinea Editrice, Firenze.

Di Battista V. (2012), "Il Laboratorio Osservatorio del Monferrato Casalese", in Osservatorio per il Paesaggio per il Monferrato Casalese (a cura di), *Sistema paesaggio. Un incontro tra metodi conoscitivi e decisionali di molte discipline*, Atti del workshop, Serralunga di Crea, 19-25 settembre 2011, pp. 331-340.

Di Palma M. (2017), "L'Economia Circolare: una sfida culturale per le città portuali creative". *BDC-Bollettino del Centro Calza Bini*, vol. 17, n. 1, pp. 99-124.

European Commission (2015a), *Closing the loop - An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*, www.eur-lex.europa.eu

European Commission (2015b), *Getting cultural heritage to work for Europe. Report of the Horizon 2020 expert group on cultural heritage*, www.publications.europa.eu

European Parliament (2015), *Report - Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe*, www.europarl.europa.eu

Fairclough G., Dragićević – Šešić M., Rogač – Mijatović L., Auclair E., Soini K. (2014), "The Faro Convention, A New Paradigm For Socially – And Culturally - Sustainable Heritage Action?". *Култура/Culture*, n. 8, pp. 9-19.

Fusco Girard L. (2016), "Verso una 'nuova economia': il contributo del patrimonio/paesaggio culturale". In Bobbio R. (ed.), *Bellezza ed economia dei paesaggi costieri*. Donzelli Editore, Roma.

Fusco Girard L., De Rosa F., Nocca F. (2014), "Verso il Piano Strategico di una città storica". *BDC-Bollettino del Centro Calza Bini*, vol. 14, n. 1, pp. 11-37.

Galliani G.V. (1984), "Il recupero: incontro, confronto, scontro di due culture". *Recuperare*, vol. 13, pp. 391-395.

Gibson C., M. Woolcock (2005), "Empowerment and Local Level Conflict Mediation in the Kecamatan Development Project in Indonesia: Concepts, Measures and Project Efficacy". Policy Research Working Paper 3292, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Greffe X. (2005), *Culture and Local Development*. OECD, Paris, France.

Harvey A., Julian C. (2015), *A Community Right to Beauty: Giving communities the power to shape, enhance and create beautiful places, developments and spaces*, www.respublica.org.uk

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?"*, www.habitat3.org

Landry C. (2009), *City making. L'arte di fare la città*. Codice, Torino.

Lefebvre H., Nicholson-Smith D. (1991), *The production of space*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK.

Linnerooth-Bayer J., Amendola A. (2000), "Global Change, Natural Disasters and Loss-sharing: Issues of Efficiency and Equity". *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance - Issues and Practice*, vol. 25, n. 2, pp. 203-219.

Mattei U. (2011), *Beni comuni. Un manifesto*. Bari, Laterza.

Musso S., Franco G. (2006), *Guida agli interventi di recupero dell'edilizia diffusa nel parco nazionale delle cinque terre*. Marsilio, Venezia.

Onesti A. (2017), "Built environment, creativity, social art. The recovery of public space as engine of human development". *REGION*, vol. 4, n. 3, pp. 87-118.

Onesti A., Biancamano P. F. (2018), "Synergies and symbiosis in HUL approach cultural heritage, landscape and productivity in the Cilento, Vallo di Diano and Alburni National Park", in Nijkamp P., Kourtit K., Kocornik-Mina A., *Towards an attractive countryside in the 'new urban world': sustainable villages and green landscapes*. Forthcoming

Ostrom E. (1990), *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Papa Francesco (2015), *Lettera Enciclica Laudato Sì del Santo Padre Francesco sulla Cura della Casa Comune*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Roma.

Pereira Roders A., van Oers R. (2011), "Bridging cultural heritage and sustainable development". *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, vol. 1, n. 1, pp. 5-14.

Pink S. (2012), *Situating everyday life. Practices and places*. Sage, London, UK.

Pinto M.R. (2004), *Il riuso edilizio. Procedure, metodi ed esperienze*. Libreria Utet, Torino.

Pinto M.R. (2013), "Recupero e Manutenzione". *TECHNE, Journal of Technology for Architecture and Environment*, n. 6, pp. 169-170.

Pinto M.R., Viola S. (2015), "Identità sedimentate e nuova prosperità per il paesaggio urbano produttivo". *BDC-Bollettino del Centro Calza Bini*, vol. 15, n. 1, pp. 71-91.

Pinto M.R., De Medici S., Cecere A.M. (2016), "Community and public cultural heritage: a chance to satisfy needs of protection, development and social cohesion", in C. Gambardella (ed.), *World heritage and Degradation. Smart Design, Planning and Technologies*. La Scuola di Pitagora, Napoli, pp. 1797-1805.

Poulios I. (2014), "Discussing strategy in heritage conservation: living heritage approach as an example of strategic innovation". *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, vol. 4, n. 1.

Rapporto Labsus (2015), *Amministrazione condivisa dei beni comuni*, www.labsus.org

Sacco P.L. (2011), "Culture 3.0. A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funds programming". EENC (European Expert Network on Culture) Paper.

Sacco P. L., Vanin P., Zamagni S. (2006), "The economics of human relationships", in S. Kolm, Ythier J. M. (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, Netherland.

Sacco P. L., Ferilli G., Tavano Blessi G. (2015), *Cultura e sviluppo locale. Verso il distretto culturale evoluto*. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Sacco P. L., Sciacchitano E. (2015), *Incroci creativi: due conferenze sulla cultura nel semestre di presidenza lettone dell'unione Europea*, www.ilgiornaledellefondazioni.com

Santagata W. (2009), *Libro Bianco sulla Creatività. Per un Modello Italiano di Sviluppo*. Università Bocconi Editore, Milano.

Tagliagambe S. (1998), *L'albero flessibile. La cultura della progettualità*. Dunod, Milano.

Throsby D. (2001), *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Törnqvist G. (1983), "Creativity and the renewal of regional life". *Creativity and context: A seminar report*, vol. 50, pp. 91-112.

Tubadji A., Nijkamp P. (2015), "Cultural impact on regional development: application of a PLS-PM model to Greece". *The Annals of Regional Science*, vol. 54, n. 3, pp. 687-720.

UCLG (2015), *Culture 21: Actions. Commitments on the role of culture in sustainable cities*, www.agenda21culture.net

UNESCO (2003), C*onvention for the safeguarding of the intangible Cultural Heritage*, www.unesco.org

UNESCO (2011), *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.* UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Resolution 36C/23, Annex, www.unesco.org

UNFCCC (2015), *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twenty-first session*. www.unesco.org

United Nations (2015), *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. www.sustainabledevelopment.un.org

Viola S. (2012), *Nuove sfide per le città antiche*. Liguori Editore, Napoli.

Viola S., Pinto M.R., Cecere A.M. (2014), "Recovering ancient settlements: approaches to negotiation for collective spaces", Proceedings of 40th IAHS World Congress on

Housing, *Sustainable Housing Construction*. Funchal, Portugal, December 16-19, pp. 1-14.

Waclawek A. (2011), *Graffiti and Street Art*. Thames and Hudson, London, UK.

Zecchi S. (2016), *Paradiso Occidente. La nostra decadenza e la seduzione della notte*. Mondadori, Milano.

Anna Onesti
Dipartimento di Architettura, Università di Napoli Federico II
Via Toledo, 402 - Napoli (Italia)
Tel.: +39-3476580499; email: annaoneb@gmail.com

Martina Bosone
Dipartimento di Architettura, Università di Napoli Federico II
Via Toledo, 402 - Napoli (Italia)
Tel.: +39-3687675982; email: martina.bosone@unina.it