

TEMPoraryUSes as start-up actions to enhance port (in)tangible heritage

D3.2.1 - TEMPLATE FOR CHN MAPPING

European Regional Development Fund

www.italy-croatia.eu/TEMPUS



Document control

| Deliverable | D3.2.1 – Template for CHN mapping |
|-----------------|---|
| Due month | M3 |
| Delivery date | 18.10.2019 |
| Document status | Final |
| Authors | L. Laghi (CertiMaC), M. Morganti (CertiMaC), M. Santandrea (CertiMaC) |
| Reviewers | A. Vulic (Solin), L. Strašek (PPMHP) |

Revision history

| Version | Date | Author(s) | Comments |
|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| | 03.10.2019 | L. Laghi, M. Morganti, M. Santandrea | First Draft |
| V1.0 | 10.10.2019 | A. Vulic | General Review |
| | 10.10.2019 | L. Strašek | General Review |
| 14.10.2019 | | M. Santandrea | General Review |
| | | | |



INTRODUCTION

The present Report defines the Templates that shall be used for the mapping of the Cultural and Natural Heritage in the TEMPUS cities (Ravenna, Rijeka and Solin/Split).

The report is composed of two different Templates:

- Template for Cultural Heritage (CH) mapping;
- Template for Natural Heritage (NH) mapping.

The templates consisted of simple and shared criteria that allow to accumulate descriptive information and to acknowledge hidden or neglected Cultural Heritage worthy to be valorized. Through these criteria it is also possible to understand to what extent a building/area could be used for temporary activities, as well as the degree of possible mutual relations among each other. The results of the mapping activities will be Deliverables D.3.2.2 and D.3.2.3.

RATIONALE

From an operative point of view, the two Templates illustrated in this document shall be used "in situ" for the mapping of the Cultural Heritage and Natural elements. The aim of the mapping is to evaluate the convenience to regenerate/reactivate a Site through Temporary Uses (TUs). At this extent, some of the criteria employed in the template for CH mapping includes a score (reported in brackets), assigned on the basis of the answer selected. Therefore, for each CH elements is possible to determine a final weighed score (obtained from the sum of the different criteria analyzed) that is developed to determine, at the end of the mapping campaign, a ranking to identify the most promising sites in which to implement TUs. To the other side, the Template for NH mapping is aimed to collect for each Natural element a general description of the site, of its actual accessibility together with an evaluation of its valorization level and opportunities to be exploited, in order to understand the Valorization processes that can be activated. After the "in situ" mapping of the Cultural and Natural Heritage, the information shall be reported in the Excel Template (sent to all PPs involved), that reports the same criteria illustrated in the present document. Following this procedure, it is possible to obtain a unified database that collect all the mapping information related to the TEMPUS cities (Ravenna, Rijeka and Solin/Split).



TEMPLATE FOR CH MAPPING

| (XX: State, YY: City Ref., NN: Progressive N° of the CH element) Example: IT_RA_01 = Italy, Ravenna, n° 01 of the CH element 1. Name/Title of the CH element: > 2. Date of the mapping: > 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest? [] YES [] NO > 4. Location/Address of the building: > 5. Property Typology: > [] Public [] Private 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | 0. Associated Code: | XX_YY_NN |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Example: IT_RA_01 = Italy, Ravenna, n° 01 of the CH element: 1. Name/Title of the CH element: > 2. Date of the mapping: > 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest? []YES []NO > 4. Location/Address of the building: > 5. Property Typology: []Public []Private []Private 6. State of Occupancy: []Abandoned []Party Occupied []Party Occupied | | (XX: State, YY: City Ref., NN: Progressive N° of the CH |
| 1. Name/Title of the CH element: <> 2. Date of the mapping: <> 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest? []YES []NO []NO 4. Location/Address of the building: <> 5. Property Typology: []Public []Private []Private 6. State of Occupancy: []Abandoned []Partly Occupied []Occupied | | element) |
| 2. Date of the mapping: 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest? 4. Location/Address of the building: 5. Property Typology: 6. State of Occupancy: () Public () Private () Partly Occupied () Occupied | | Example: IT_RA_01 = Italy, Ravenna, n° 01 of the CH element |
| 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest?[]YES []NO4. Location/Address of the building:<>5. Property Typology:[]Public []Private6. State of Occupancy:[]Abandoned []Partly Occupied []Occupied | 1. Name/Title of the CH element: | <> |
| 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic interest?[]YES []NO4. Location/Address of the building:<>5. Property Typology:[]Public []Private6. State of Occupancy:[]Abandoned []Partly Occupied []Occupied | | |
| interest? i I YES i NO 4. Location/Address of the building: 5. Property Typology: i I Public i I Private 6. State of Occupancy: i I Abandoned i I Partly Occupied i I Occupied | 2. Date of the mapping: | <> |
| interest? i I YES i NO 4. Location/Address of the building: 5. Property Typology: i I Public i I Private 6. State of Occupancy: i I Abandoned i I Partly Occupied i I Occupied | | |
| interest? i I YES i NO 4. Location/Address of the building: 5. Property Typology: i I Public i I Private 6. State of Occupancy: i I Abandoned i I Partly Occupied i I Occupied | | |
| I J YES [] NO 4. Location/Address of the building: 5. Property Typology: [] Public [] Private 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | 3. Is it an Area with Archeologic | |
| 4. Location/Address of the building: <> 5. Property Typology: [] Public [] Private [] Private 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | interest? | [] YES |
| 5. Property Typology: []] Public []] Private []] Private 6. State of Occupancy: []] Abandoned []] Partly Occupied []] Portly Occupied []] Occupied []] Occupied | | [] NO |
| 5. Property Typology: []] Public []] Private []] Private 6. State of Occupancy: []] Abandoned []] Partly Occupied []] Portly Occupied []] Occupied []] Occupied | | |
| [] Public [] Private 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | 4. Location/Address of the building: | <> |
| [] Public [] Private 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | | |
| 6. State of Occupancy: [] Abandoned [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | 5. Property Typology: | |
| 6. State of Occupancy: []] Abandoned []] Partly Occupied []] Occupied | | [] Public |
| [] Partly Occupied [] Occupied | | [] Private |
| [] Occupied | 6. State of Occupancy: | [] Abandoned |
| | | [] Partly Occupied |
| 7. State of preservation: | | [] Occupied |
| • | 7. State of preservation: | |



| | [] Ruin – (Score = 0) |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | [] Mostly rickety/unsafe – (Score = 0) |
| | [] Need of interventions on structural framework – |
| | (Score = 1) |
| | [] Need of minor interventions on non-structural elements (interior finishes) – (Score = 2) |
| | [] Well preserved (no need of interventions) – (Score = 3) |
| | |
| 8. Level of Practicability: | [] None – (Score = 0) |
| | [] Partial – (Score = 0.5) |
| | [] Total – (Score = 1) |
| | |
| | Is there a "surrounding Area" in safe conditions to be used as TU? |
| | [] Yes – (Score = 1) |
| | [] No – (Score = 0) |
| | Please, describe the possibility to organise public events in |
| | part of the building/archeologic site, in the whole building/archeologic site or in the surrounding area in safe |
| | conditions |
| | (max 500 char.) |
| | <> |
| 9. Construction Era: | Please, consider more than one Era if the Infrastructure/Building/Archaeological Site presents |
| | elements of interests belonging to the different era. |



| | Note: Different scores will be assigned according to the number of eras selected. A score equal to 0 will be assigned if only one era is selected. 0.5 points will be assigned for each additional era selected (e.g. only Roman Era = 0, Roman Era + Late Antique = 0.5, Roman Era + Late Antique + Modern Era = 1). |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | [] Roman Era (III b.C III a.C.) [] Late Antique Era (IV - VII a.C.) [] Medieval Era (VIII - XIV a.C.) [] Modern Era (XV - XVIII a.C.) [] Contemporary Era (XIX a.C Today) |
| 10. Buried Archaeological Remains: | Which is the probability to have buried Archaeological Remains in the area surrounding the Infrastructure/Building/Archaeological site, based on the scientific archaeological studies performed on the site? [] Absence of buried Archaeological remains or absence of Archaeological information about the site – (Score = 0); [] Low probability (based on the available Archaeological information) – (Score = 1); |



| TEMPUS EUROPEAN UNION | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | [] High probability (based on the available Archaeological |
| | information) – (Score = 2); |
| | [] Certain presence of buried Archaeological remains – |
| | (Score = 3); |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 11. Value of the site: | Please, describe the role and value/significance of the |
| | Infrastructure/Building/Archaeological Site in the Port |
| | framework and its evolution along the time. Please, specify |
| | the archaeological potential of the site. |
| | |
| | (max 1.000 char.) |
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 12. Main Cultural/Touristic point of | Please, describe the main Cultural/Touristic point of Interest |
| Interest in the surrounding Area: | in the surrounding Area of the Infrastructure/Building/ |
| | Archaeological Site. |
| | (max 500 char.) |
| | |



| | ī I |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| | Please, specify the distance (D) of the main |
| | |
| | Cultural/Touristic point of Interest from the |
| | Infrastructure/Building/Archaeological Site: |
| | |
| | |
| | []D < 1 km |
| | |
| | []1 km < D < 2 km |
| | |
| | [] 2 km < D < 3 km |
| | |
| | |
| 13. Connection with Natural Heritage | Does the Infrastructure/Building/Archaeological site belong |
| (NH): | to an area considered part of the NH? |
| | |
| | |
| | []] Vac (Capro 1) |
| | [] Yes – (Score = 1) |
| | [] No – (Score = 0) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | If Yes, please report the code employed to identify the |
| | |
| | natural element/site in the NH mapping. |
| | natural element/site in the NH mapping. |
| | natural element/site in the NH mapping. |
| 14 Organisation of Internal Spaces | natural element/site in the NH mapping. Please, describe the rationale of the Layouts according to |
| | Please, describe the rationale of the Layouts according to |
| related to the last/current "final | Please, describe the rationale of the Layouts according to the last/current final Intended use and how much/how have |
| | Please, describe the rationale of the Layouts according to the last/current final Intended use and how much/how have been altered along the time. Add, if available, plants, |
| related to the last/current "final | Please, describe the rationale of the Layouts according to the last/current final Intended use and how much/how have |



| <i>Note</i> : <i>if the information is not available, do not fill this field</i> | [] None (only external envelope, no internal layout/distribution) |
|--|--|
| | [] Commercial |
| | [] Residential |
| | [] Logistic |
| | [] Handcraft/Industrial |
| | |
| | (max 1.000 char.) |
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| 15. Structure and Material | |
| Characteristics: | [] Bearing Masonry |
| | [] Reinforced Concrete frame structure |
| | [] Wood structure |
| | [] Steel Structure |
| | [] Other |
| | |



| EUROPEAN UNION | |
|--|---|
| | Please, describe the state-of-the-structure as it is during the mapping stage. Add photo and imagines collected at this |
| | regard |
| | (max 1.000 char.) |
| | |
| | |
| | <> |
| | |
| 16. Technical Systems, Services and | ELECTRICAL SYSTEM |
| sub-services available into the | [] Total lack of systems in the |
| Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site and in the Surrounding Area: | Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of |
| Site and in the Surrounding Area. | connections to the public network and absence of a |
| | public network in the surrounding area $-$ (Score $=$ 0) |
| Note: if the information is not available, | [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, |
| do not fill this field | total lack of systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of |
| | connections to the public network – (Score = 1) |
| | [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, |
| | presence of connections to the public network, total lack |
| | systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site |
| | - (Score = 2) |
| | [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, |
| | presence of connections to the public network, |
| | presence of systems in the |
| | Infrastructure/Building/Archeologic Site – (Score = 3) |
| | SANITARY INSTALLATION |
| | [] Total lack of systems in the |
| | Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of |



connections to the public network and absence of a public network in the surrounding area - (Score = 0)

- [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, total lack of systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of connections to the public network – (Score = 1)
- Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, presence of connections to the public network, total lack systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site
 – (Score = 2)
- [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area,presence of connections to the public network,presence of systems in theInfrastructure/Building/Archeologic Site (Score = 3)

GASWORKS

- [] Total lack of systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of connections to the public network and absence of a public network in the surrounding area – (Score = 0)
- [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area,
 total lack of systems in the
 Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, total lack of
 connections to the public network (Score = 1)
- Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area, presence of connections to the public network, total lack systems in the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site
 – (Score = 2)



| | [] Presence of a public network in the Surrounding Area,presence of connections to the public network,presence of systems in theInfrastructure/Building/Archeologic Site – (Score = 3) |
|--|---|
| 17. Accessibility with reference to existing infrastructures in the Surrounding area for private mobility (car, bicycles, etc.): | [] Total lack of roads and parkings that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site – (Score = 0) [] Presence of a dirt road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, absence of a paved road and of a parking – (Score = 1) [] Presence of a paved road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, absence of a parking – (Score = 2) [] Presence of a paved road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site and of a parking in the surrounding area – (Score = 3) [] ADDITIONAL: Presence of a bicycle lane – (Score = 1) |
| 18. Accessibility with reference to existing infrastructures for public means of transport - MoT (collective transport: bus, train, etc.) | [] Unattainable with public MoT (>3km) – (Score = 0) [] Difficult to attain public MoT (>1 and <3 km) – (Score = 1) |



| | [] Easy to attain with public MoT (>500 and <1km) – (Score = 2) [] close to public MoT (<500 m) – (Score = 3) |
|--|---|
| 19. Is the infrastructure/building/Archeological Site considered as "Bounded Heritage"? | [] YES [] NO |
| 20. Which is the level of complexity of the administrative procedures to be adopted to manage it (see question n° 19) in terms of renovation/retrofit or Temporary Uses activation? | [] Facilitated – (Score = 2) [] Ordinary – (Score = 1) [] Complicated – (Score = 0) |
| | Please, describe the level of complexity to be managed according to the local/national Regulatory framework. (max 1.000 char.) <> |
| Annexes | Drawings Plants Pictures |



TEMPLATE FOR NH MAPPING

| 0. Associated Code: | XXX |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | Please, indicate the code employed in Nature 2000 |
| | classification |
| 1. Name/Title of the NH element: | <> |
| | Please, indicate the name/title of the NH element employed |
| | in Nature 2000 classification |
| | |
| 2. Date of the protection act: | XX/XX/XXXX |
| | |
| | Please, indicate when the area was legally protected. |
| | |
| | Note: If the protection act of the area is recent, it is needed |
| | to pay more attention and care in the protection activities |
| | related to the area. Indeed, the protection act is usually |
| | applied to an area where the general conditions of the |
| | natural site are getting worse and the protection activities can contribute to avoid harmful activities for the site. |
| | |
| | |
| 3. Motivation of the protection: | Please, describe the motivation of the protection and summarize by points the motivations that led to the |
| | protection of the area. This information can be obtained |
| | through the official web-sites. Using this approach, the |
| | actions that will be designed for the area in order to valorize |
| | it (through the TEMPUS project), will be coherent with the |
| | protection act. |



| | (max 1.000 char.) |
|--|---|
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 4. Level of identification of the area | Please, describe the level of identification of the area as |
| as heritage by the community: | heritage by the community. This information can be kept |
| | only on the basis of the direct experience, by synthesizing |
| | the general sentiment that the site inspires to the citizens. |
| | (max 1.000 char.) |
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 5. Level of integrity of the | For each value identified, please select the level of integrity |
| connotative values of the site | and give a brief description in order to motivate the choice: |
| (referring to the values that have | |
| been identified in the motivation of | |
| the protection and by the | Historical value |
| community) | |
| | [] Preserved |
| | |
| | [] In transformation |
| | |



| NUNION | | |
|--------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | [] Lost | |
| | | |
| | Motivation of the choice: <> | |
| | | (max 750 char.) |
| | • Cultural value | |
| | | |
| | [] Preserved | |
| | [] In transformation | |
| | [] Lost | |
| | | |
| | Motivation of the choice: <> | |
| | | (max 750 char.) |
| | | |
| | Natural value | |
| | | |
| | [] Preserved | |
| | [] In transformation | |
| | [] Lost | |
| | | |
| | Motivation of the choice: <> | |
| | | (max 750 char.) |
| | | |



| ECROPEAN ONION | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | Morphological value |
| | |
| | [] Preserved |
| | [] In trasformation |
| | [] Lost |
| | |
| | Motivation of the choice: <> |
| | (max 750 char.) |
| | |
| | Aesthetic value |
| | |
| | [] Preserved |
| | [] In trasformation |
| | [] Lost |
| | |
| | Motivation of the choice: <> |
| | (max 750 char.) |
| 6. Institution/Body in charge of the | |
| management of the site: | <> |
| | |
| | Please, indicate the Institution/Body in charge of the |
| | management of the site and, if possible, indicate the name and the contacts of a responsible |
| | |



| 7. Main Cultural/Touristic points of | Please, describe the main Cultural/Touristic points of |
|---|---|
| interest within the site: | interest within the site and indicate them in the map |
| | attached to the present form (see Annexes) |
| | (max 1.000 char.) |
| | <> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 8. Is it a site with elements identified, | |
| within the TEMPUS project, as CH | [] Yes |
| (Cultural Heritage)? | |
| | [] No |
| | |
| | If Yes, please indicate the names of the CH and highlight |
| | them in the map (see Annexes) using a color. |
| | |
| | |
| 9. Is it possible to visit the site? | |
| | [] Yes |
| | [] No |
| | |
| | |
| | If Yes, please indicate in the map (see Annexes) the access |
| | points to the site and identify with a color the portion of the |
| | site that can be visited (it is possible to find an area with a |
| | portion accessible for visitors and a portion not accessible |
| | for visitors) |
| 10. Accessibility with reference to | |
| existing infrastructures in the | |



| TEMPUS EUROPEAN UNION | |
|--|---|
| Surrounding area for private mobility | [] Total lack of roads and parkings that lead to the |
| Surrounding area for private mobility (car, bicycles, etc.): | [] Total lack of roads and parkings that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site [] Presence of a dirt road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, absence of a paved road and of a parking [] Presence of a paved road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, absence of a parking [] Presence of a paved road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site, absence of a parking [] Presence of a paved road that lead to the Infrastructure/Building/Archeological Site and of a parking [] ADDITIONAL: Presence of a bicycle lane Please, indicate in the map (see Annexes) the existing infrastructures and the access points to the area from the existing infrastructures. |
| 11. Accessibility with reference to existing infrastructures for public means of transport - MoT (collective transport: bus, train, etc.) | [] Unattainable with public MoT (>3km) [] Difficult to attain public MoT (>1 and <3 km) [] Easy to attain with public MoT (>500 and <1km) [] close to public MoT (<500 m) |



| 12. Date of the survey | XX/XX/XXXX |
|------------------------|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Annexes | |
| | • Site Map, with the indication of the elements |
| | requested at points 7, 8, 9 and 10. |
| | |
| | Pictures of the site |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |