

THE INTEGRATION BETWEEN PROTECTION, ENHANCEMENT OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND TOWN PLANNING IN THE HISTORICAL CITY: ELEMENTS FOR REFLECTION

Anna Maria Colavitti-Nicola Usai/ Italy

The Italian cultural heritage is still considered a residual sector, in spite of its significance and variety, and even if it contributes to the national economic development process by attracting impressive amount of the international tourist flows.

Judging from the poor allocation of public funds assigned to its conservation and valorization, cultural heritage has been considered as an “heritage in misery” (Cederna, 1989). Recent changes in market economy, such as the rising of new production processes of intangible goods and the competition between local and global dimensions, made possible the reconsideration of the strategic role of the cultural heritage. It is now considered as fundamental resource in the processes of promotion of local development and in the regeneration of lagging-behind regions. New political attention has been drawn on cultural heritage both at local scale and at international one (Choay 1979).

In the most important *art cities*, two main conditions indicate the complexity of the management of cultural sites. The first one refers to the co-existence of *stratified culture places* (in other words the historical-artistic goods) and those hosting the city main activity (for instance, the political and administrative one hosted in the historical building). As a consequence, there's need to make possible the circulation of persons and material goods. The second one refers to the necessity to have available huge innovative forms of financial and human resources to assign to the conservation and protection of the historical-artistic heritage.

Due to these considerations, in Italy it is still difficult to define a strategic planning of intervention for the valorization of spread historical and cultural heritage.

The paper aims at proposing some methodological disciplinary considerations that could address the study approach of sustainable planning of spread cultural heritage in historical cities. Some case study refer to ongoing experiences that could be useful to propose policies and strategies of intervention for the assessment and evaluation of cultural goods, and for the definition of shared scenarios of land use planning and for sustainable models of local development.

Normative aspects: general framework

The Italian constitutional reform, introduced with constitutional law n. 3/2001, sets the distribution and the differentiation between the powers of the State and those of the Regions. The State reserves the exclusive right to protect and safeguard the environment, the eco-system and cultural heritage. The Regions are delegated to hold the functions of land and territory governance and management, valorization of cultural and environmental heritage, promotion and management of cultural heritage and activities (Italian Constitution, article 117). These modifications have been acknowledged in the legislative decree n. 42/2004, known also as the Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape or Code Urbani¹, which specifies the different power competences for the State and for the Regions in the field of protection and valorization and sets the co-operation forms.

It is worth it to sort out what is to be meant for protection and for valorization. Protection consists in the exercise of the duties and in the discipline of the activities addressed, on the basis of an adequate knowledge, to identify the goods constituting cultural heritage and to guarantee preservation and conservation to public enjoyment². Valorization consists in the exercise of the duties and in the discipline of the activities addressed to promote the cultural heritage knowledge and to ensure the best conditions for exploitation and public enjoyment, included promotion and conservation. Valorization action is owed to Regions together with promotion and management of cultural activities. This competence subdivision has generated a series of problems hard to be solved. First of all, the dichotomy between

¹ Since four years before the new Code, was in force a consolidation act. But the constitutional reform, the European Community rules and international agreements forced to adapt the act, to improve effectiveness of cultural heritage interventions, to update cultural heritage protection and conservation instruments. Urbani, Giuliano is the name of the former Culture Minister.

² The reference is to article n. 3 of legislative decree n. 42/2004. It is still not clear where stops the protection operated by the State and where starts the valorization operated by the Regions. Obviously this generates competence conflicts and problems.

protection and valorization seems to be contradictory and produces competence conflicts still not cleared up. Secondly, the lack of certainty about financial resources assigned has the consequence that it is impossible to make long-term effective plans. The Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities 2004 budget has reached the total amount of 2,289,000,000 € (Euros), that represents 0,34% of Italian State budget and 0,17% of Italian GDP. It is evident that these figures are inadequate and insufficient compared to the quantity and quality of national cultural heritage. More complex is the valorization problem that is structured in two main actions: on one hand, an offer that take into account the physical and cultural access to cultural heritage; on the other hand, the access demand to cultural heritage coming from the communities.

The unclear subdivision of powers between State and Regions in the matter of cultural heritage valorization has produced a lot of discretionary power for the interpretation of the right value to be assigned to local cultural systems and bad outcomes in regional planning processes and in the valorization policies of historical cities³. A recent outlook on cultural activities of local governments⁴ published in the *Giornale dell'Arte* magazine highlights a worrying disparity between regions on cultural policies and valorization issues. This is due to single strategies implemented with different budget, involving local investors at different degree of participation and to political choices being not enough aware of the priorities of cultural heritage management.

The historical city and its evolution

The historical city is a cultural good. Since the Fifties of last century in Italy and Europe historical city has been considered as a complex object. For its management it was then necessary to draw action strategies able to include the fast society evolving. The large range of parameters useful to historical city reading has during the time partly *frozen* its interpretation, fostering instead the idea of total conservation as the only one able to guarantee its survival. Some of the new forms of master plans (both at regional or urban scale) do not consider only the intrinsic value of the cultural good but suggest also economic valorization strategies, focused on the added value produced by a new awareness: to feel bound to preserve the cultural identity typical of a place and of a community. The study of such kind of master plans allows to

³ Cfr. A. Clementi, *Vent'anni dopo Memorabilia*, in *Territorio* n. 32, 2005, pp.12

⁴ Cfr. *Rapporto sistematico annuale 2005 sulle Attività culturali delle Amministrazioni pubbliche*, published as supplement of the magazine *Giornale dell'Arte*, anno XXIII, n. 243, May 2005, Torino, Umberto Allemandi & C.

track down a model of urban planning oriented to strategic re-use practices for the historical city that highlights some innovative elements compared to traditional and authoritative planning model: the plans that make strategic and participatory the historical memory, stressing the relationship between plan-form and context⁵, meant here as a wide texture of contents and situations directed linked to local experiences. The cultural good meant as one of the elements on which it is possible to build a rational and shared planning form keeps an old history: according to Astengo's thought, cultural good is represented by an object and its context⁶. For the first time it is realized that knowledge, conservation and programming could not be elements in conflict of interests. The value of this sentence is a consequence of a long process started in Europe with the debate on historical centers of the cities and culminated with ICOMOS codification that extends and defines the environmental and historical goods classification.

The current set of rules for historical settlements reveals a meaningful caesura between urban planning and conservation needs, as originally thought by the 1939 *Bottai Laws*⁷. Their aim was to join landscape and monuments safeguard and urban activity, in an organic cultural vision. The safeguard of single monumental building should have coupled to landscape protection, not only for high-quality naturalistic realms but also for historical settlements. But the real consequence was to enhance the dichotomy between landscape and historical settlement, even if it has been useful to face in an acceptable way the post-war reconstruction process. Besides that, in the Seventies of last century has been settled a complete separation between urban planning matters and protection of historical centers. The State lost in favour of the Regions the power to intervene in the approval of urban planning instruments (master plans, detail plans) and could not more evaluate them in terms of conservation. With Law n. 431/1985 (known as *Galasso Law*) the State delegated to *Sovrintendenze* the control power in the matter

⁵ Cfr. the introduction of G.L. Nigro (editor), *Piani regolatori generali di ultima generazione. Argomenti di riflessione e letture di piani locali*, Roma, Gangemi, 1999, pp. 13

⁶ Between 1958 and 1966 Giovanni Astengo elaborates the master plan and the detail plan (*piano particolareggiato*) of Gubbio. In the same period have been written two important documents, the Gubbio Charter and the Urban planning Code in collaboration with Giuseppe Samonà. In parallel it was built a dense disciplinary support on the debate about the regeneration of urban historical heritage that leads to advanced reflections, from storicism to the positions of Gustavo Giovannoni.

⁷ The so called *Bottai Laws* were: Law n.1089 about the protection of the things of artistic and historical interest and Law n. 1497 about the conservation of natural beauties. Both passed in 1939.

of territory protection, partly gaining again the power previously allowed to Regions. Even if it has been written a lot about the philosophy of landscape protection of Galasso Law, it seems actually to exist a loss of connection between protection, territory governance and urban planning that leads to reflection paths still not experienced⁸. On the cultural side, there's an as frequent as fruitful debate on the definition of cultural good and how it can be a planning engine⁹. Cultural good is not all the same: it is a good that diversifies its content and its meaning linked to a present memory that allows to pass problematic messages, showing a variety of situations, functions, ways of use, symbolologies not always coherent with that message. The perception¹⁰ of the message can be always different. However exist ways of scientific acquisition of the different messages (for instance the analytical methodologies of study of the forming processes of the territorial structure¹¹) that are able, if implemented in the right way, to supply a complete knowledge framework useful to activate the cultural resources programming in the instruments of planning. The knowledge building process, meant as just said, is a quality process giving an added value to last generation urban planning plans, in which it is evident the effort to implement the contents and practices of these thoughts also to the planning set of rules.

This is the most vexed issue aspect and also what mostly brakes the plans of strategic kind, since in the major part of the cases it is the constraint to still guide the system of the shared rules. In other cases the past attention to the historical-cultural good is limited to a declaration of intents, in others to urbanistic forecasts, or to the plan rules and prescriptions. These are typological rules related to historical settlement structure, such those used for the construction of the famous detail abaci, still valid instrument and method to check the legitimacy of design choices. In the literature of the urban and regional plans the consideration of the cultural good happens through three prevailing typologies:

- *Declaration of intents*. It represents the simplest case to

find in the plans of older conception. A simply declared interest towards the cultural good that doesn't go over the simple verification of its existence.

- *Extension of the constraint*. It deals with the application of the protection set of rules settled by Law n.1089.
- Creation of typological abaci that lead to the preservation of the historical built heritage. Once ascertained the existence of the good and protected according to the effective laws, it is planned an attempt to preserve its integrity through some reuse and renewal tools.

The historical-cultural heritage has acquired a special dimension in the discipline of the landscape and vice versa the landscape has become a cultural historical good to all the effects, for its nature of non-reproducible resource. The cultural resources become cultural heritage that remains through the time with the help of creative design capability that not necessarily has to interest all the goods. Or better all the goods must be protected, but not all can be involved in the strategic plan choices.

One of the themes mostly debated in these last years is the relationship among historical heritage and contemporary architecture, motivated by the loss of relationship between ancient context or setting and new city. The recent World Heritage Committee meeting in Vienna has approved a memorandum aiming at regulating both the future approach to the protection of the cities just members of UNESCO lists and the process of registration of new urban centers. The Vienna memorandum talks about integrated approach that puts in correlation the contemporary architecture, the urban development and the integrity of the landscape. It describes also the present situation and solutions are being proposed. Some of them lead to a wider conception of historical center and underline as the contemporary architecture contributes, together with the historical buildings and texture as such with their context, to increase the value of a city determining its peculiar character. It is also underlined the necessity to contemplate high-quality projects sensible to the historical context. Besides that it is wondered a greater cooperation among politicians, planners, persons and institutions in charge of historical-artistic heritage protection, investors and local communities to preserve the urban historical heritage, taking into account the processes of modernization and the society development according to culturally and historically suitable ways, to strengthen the identity and the social cohesion.

The relationship between urban planning and cultural heritage planning. A case study

⁸ Cfr. L. Bermejo Latre, *La pianificazione del paesaggio. I piani paesistici e la nuova tutela delle risorse naturali*, Milano, Maggioli, 2002, p.11

⁹ Cfr. M.A. Vittorini, *Luogo, segni e memorie nella costruzione del piano urbanistico*, in G.L. Nigro (editor), *ibidem*, pp. 29-40

¹⁰ See the world of perception of Kevin Lynch.

¹¹ The quoted methods are those of *Forma Italiae*, Città antica in Italia, *Forma Maris Antiqui*, *Tabula Imperii Romani*. Codified methods that allow to guarantee the comparison and the juxtaposition of datas, being actually what is most representative and innovative in the field of archaeological science in relationship with urban and territorial analysis for ancient times and Middle age.

The Code of cultural heritage has therefore assigned and imposed to Italian Regions the power to design and prepare the Regional Landscape Plan, superordinate planning instrument of the regional territory and ruling over the local or municipal master plans. One of the main problem that many local and national governments ought to face and to solve is to agree or not if regional and landscape planning could be the superordinate standard form of the territorial development programming, inside which all other sector plans (for instance tourism plan, transportation plan, industrial plans, commerce plans, etc.) must be included. In Italy it is still not clear if the Regions have the right or the obligation to prepare Regional Landscape Plan and if it could be the general coordinating plan or carry on with sectorial planning, risking to overlap and to rule the territory use in contradictory way. In the hypothesis that the landscape plan was univocally defined as superordinate coordinating plan, it would provide the development general objectives of an area and all territory resources would concur to reach them. It is inside this framework that cultural goods, meant as resource and as founding value for the territory, would find the right placing for the most proper valorization strategies. For instance, starting from the planning of tourist systems able to involve different professions to protect, preserve and manage the cultural good. Thus the cultural good would find its own identity and at least partly the reason for income production and economic development inside a defined system.

An emblematic case study comes from the realization of the Regional Landscape Plan (*Piano paesaggistico regionale*) of Autonomous Region of Sardinia. Sardinia is one of the first Italian regions that is endowing with the Landscape Plan according to what settles legislative decree n. 42/2004 and to Sardinian regional law n. 8/2004¹². Within the strategic development guidelines of regional local systems and within the Landscape Plan project has been started, as preliminary study, a research on local cultural systems that aims to identify areas of common cultural identity and to evaluate relationship systems to found cultural-dimension-oriented development strategies. The objective is to understand and to evaluate if territorial cultural heritage is able to interact with the whole service system and with the productive chains that could spin off. Besides that there's need to evaluate the capability to activate local projects, to start network policies, to identify local systems or districts, making explicit the *active* element of the cultural heritage valorization. The cornerstone of the proposed strategy resides in a strong integration between all the components of the cultural sector at territorial scale

¹² Sardinia regional law n. 8/2004 has forbidden any building within a belt of two kilometers from the sea coast line.

(archaeological and architectural heritage, historical centers, enjoyment services, activity of preservation and recovery, etc.) and those of the connected sectors: the tourism, the museum communication, the marketing, the scientific research, the specialist school and the university education, the professional training, the specialized production or the craftsmanship.

Such sectors should be involved concretely through forms of territorial cooperation that could produce positive outcomes. The forms of cooperation can concern both public subjects and private subjects.

Cultural Heritage Master Plan

We would like also to propose here the idea of a new management instrument for cultural goods existing in a particular territory: *the cultural heritage master plan* (CHMP). In the hypothesis that is always the territorial landscape plan the superordinate form of regional planning, the new master plan of the cultural goods would be a tool that supplies the fundamental information about the presence, the typology, the forms of protection and preservation of the cultural goods existing in an area. Specific task of the cultural heritage master plan would be to stimulate the more suitable forms of intervention to make the cultural goods linked to defined projects of valorization, both on the side of the preservation, and on that of the enjoyment, creating synergies between the cultural good and local economy.

Conclusions

The predisposition of valorization strategies for cultural goods in the historical cities, as in other less anthropized territories will have to move towards a general vision of projects on the territory, that should take into account the succession of historical and cultural stratifications but also the economic resources that contribute to characterize and to identify an area. Cultural good valorization cannot be separated by the other economy sectors directly involved with it. The tourism and the induced economy derivated from the valorization of the cultural heritage represent the industry of the third millennium, in which a wise use of the territory must be calibrated on the respect for the environment, its preservation for the future generations and the achievement of sustainable forms of development. This will be even more important and strategic for the developing countries which, moving from still fluid economic status and less structured in comparison to the countries of longer industrial tradition of the western world, can be more flexible in the planning of the protection and preservation of their own cultural goods and heritage.

Strategy must be that of *integration* among economic and cultural structures, because otherwise the risk is that even if it was brought to bear a preservation intervention for a cultural good without making it enjoyable, without showing it off, without including it in tourist circuits, without the possibility to identify it as tourist destination and to carry flows of visitors, without being in one word economically productive, the reasons for investment and for just met expenses for protection and preservation could only fail.

Abstract

Falmouth, located on Jamaica's north coast near Montego Bay, is noted for being one of the Caribbean's best-preserved Georgian Period historic towns. It was declared a National Monument by the Jamaican Government in 1996 and is listed as one of the 100 Most Endangered Sites by the World Monument Fund.

References

1. AA.VV., *Politiche, strategie e strumenti per la cultura*. Secondo Rapporto annuale Federculture 2004 (a cura di R. Grossi), Milano, Allemandi & C., 2004
2. AA.VV., *Il Codice dei Beni Culturali e del paesaggio*. Commento a cura di M. Cammelli, Milano, Il Mulino 2004
3. AA.VV., *Urbanistica e prassi della conservazione*. L'esperienza di Genova (a cura di M. D'Onofrio Caviglione), Milano, Franco Angeli 2004
4. Cederna 1979: Antonio Cederna, *Mussolini urbanista*, Bari, Laterza, 1979
5. Choay 1988: Françoise Choay, *L'allegoria del patrimonio*, Officina, Roma 1988
6. Cavenago D., *Città e piano strategico*. Percorsi di governance del territorio, esperienze italiane e internazionali, Milano, Il Sole 24 Ore, 2004
7. Cicerchia A., *Il bellissimo vecchio*. Analisi per una geografia del patrimonio culturale, Milano, Franco Angeli 2002
8. Forte F., Mantovani M., *Manuale di economia e politica dei Beni culturali*, Soveria Mannelli, Rubbettino, 2004
9. Morazzoni M., *Turismo, territorio e cultura*, Milano, De Agostini, 2003
10. Trentini A., *Codice dei Beni culturali e del paesaggio*, Commentario ragionato del D.Lgs 22 gennaio 2004, n. 42 (Prefazione di F. Paolucci), Milano, Maggioli Editore, 2004