

ON CHANGING THE VALUE OF BUILT HERITAGE AFTER MAJOR INTERVENTIONS

Nadja Kurtović Folić¹
Nataša Živaljević Luxor²
Hartmut Pasternak³

UDK: 725/728

DOI: 10.14415/konferencijaGFS2019.005

Summary: *In recent decades, heritage conservation has been extended to a very diverse field of construction, including industrial heritage, numerous forms of housing (not just representative!) and other diverse types of buildings. There is an obvious tendency to protect the significant legacy of global civilization development. As "younger" examples of heritage, such goods are more suitable and susceptible to large interventions and modernization. In this way, preserved and renovated buildings enrich the city's cultural image and lifestyle. Observed in this way, the preservation of heritage is one of the essential parts of the modernization and identification of social identity. The community identifies itself with preserved heritage and supports various ideas on how to present it and use it. The feeling that their protection also implies significant constraints in the manifestation of forms and features is something worth to discuss internationally. Such an approach is, however, becoming more and more flexible, especially since the beginning of the 21st century.*

The question arises as to what happens to the originally established values of the cultural property that has been altered by large interventions? Is it compulsory to re-evaluate and determine the newly created value? Should we wait to create a certain historical distance in order to re-establish the value, or how long it should take to determine whether the interventions have created a new value of a whole that makes a cultural good and interventions in it and with it? The number of questions is great, and the experience of the need for re-evaluation is still very modest.

That is a process that is constantly refreshed with new ideas, techniques, technologies, and following the civilization development of the society in which the events unfold. Many ways to encourage further research on this topic are just opening up.

Keywords: *Built heritage, Large-scale interventions, Re-evaluation, New technologies*

¹ Nadja Kurtović Folić, PhD, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Trg D. Obradovica 6, Serbia, tel: +381 63 565345, e – mail: nfolic@uns.ac.rs

² Nataša Živaljević Luxor, PhD, National Heritage Foundation, Štipska 7, Belgrade, Serbia, nluxor@gmail.com

³ Hartmut Pasternak, Dr, Brandenburgische Technische Universität, Konrad Wachsmann-Alle 2, Cottbus, Germany, H.Pasternak@web.de

1. INTRODUCTION

Principles of evaluation, conservation and presentation of cultural heritage are constantly evolving and adapted to the current attitude towards the heritage in global by a certain society.

Nevertheless, one principle still remains that new does not exclude the old, but needs to include it and modernize it. Thus the spirit of the old one survives. The past is not erased, but remains in constant dialogue with the new one [1]. The old and new tissue co-exist, enabling residents to choose their lifestyle and diversity of interests.

In recent decades, heritage conservation has been extended to a very diverse field of construction, including industrial heritage, numerous forms of housing (not just representative!) And other diverse building types. Obvious is the tendency to protect the significant legacy of "global" civilization development. As "younger" examples of heritage, such immovable goods are more suitable and susceptible to adaptation and modernization.

During the interventions, the type of functions that the architectural heritage is gaining is significantly expanding. The traditional selection of new functions such as museums, galleries, cultural centers, souvenir shops is also overcome and the number and type of new purpose of old structures is very wide. Today, it is no longer surprising that churches are converted into comfortable living quarters or industrial halls in shopping malls, town houses in gym.

In this way, preserved and renovated historic buildings enrich the city's cultural image and lifestyle. It turned out that such a transformed heritage is not only attractive for residents but also for tourists.

Observed in this way, the preservation of heritage is one of the essential parts of the modernization and identification of social identity. The community identifies itself with preserved heritage and supports various ideas on how to present it and use it. Protected wholes of some areas are among the most restrictive parts of spatial, or urban or rural planning policies. The feeling that they protection also implies significant limitations in manifest forms and features of cultural monuments. Such an approach, which stands out as an attitude in numerous international and national documents, is, however, becoming more and more flexible, especially from the beginning of the 21st century [2].

2. THE MODERN NEED OF MAJOR INTERVENTIONS AND EXTENSIONS WITHIN THE BUILT HERITAGE

If the monuments on the World Heritage List are excluded and are not considered, the number of listed buildings in certain areas is rising and more and more all over the world. Listed cultural monuments can most often be functionally converted, but only if this does not compromise the characteristics that are valued and of particular interest, significance or appearance of a building. Changes in buildings, which allow them to gain a new purpose or use, often represent the only way to ensure survival and a sustainable future. Getting the right balance between development requirements for conversion, construction regulations and special needs of cultural monuments is a very demanding task that is solved with the help of numerous specialized expert teams, as well as negotiations between different stakeholders in the venture.

In order to balance the architectural and historical values of cultural monuments, including where internal tissue and devices are needed, with the necessary regulatory requirements, it is necessary to understand the way in which the cultural monument is expressed as the general value of the society. In the last decades, there is considerable flexibility in accepting the standard of new functions, but there are still a number of important problems that can make the relationship between protection and new interventions uncertain and unreliable. In addition to the fact that certain buildings are listed as cultural monuments due to their many valuable properties, their duration depends on their economic value by which they participate in social income, that is, they must "earn their hold" in an environment that evolves and changes. Assessing the ability of a building to "earn" for its retention, at the place where it is built, is most often focused on the short-term return of invested capital. The costs of maintaining cultural monuments throughout his entire life cycle to the moment when deciding on his future, a new purpose, are rarely considered [3].

One of the basic differences between new buildings and the conversion of existing cultural monuments is the choice of materials, construction solutions and techniques, which are limited in the case of heritage, while for new buildings this choice is very wide and, most often, limited only by investment costs. When it comes to major changes in the tissue of the cultural monument, often accompanied by volume extensions, each project is unique and applicable only to a particular building, and can not be applied directly to another cultural monument. The decision-making space can be narrowed in relation to the new construction, because the ability to select materials and construction methods is limited to those that are well aligned with the existing tissue. Much of the success or failure of such ventures can be attributed to the initial decision to intervene significantly on the cultural monument, but at each stage of the process, it is necessary to reconsider the effects that these changes on the protected building will have on its already established value, but also on the future financial and cultural values.

Preservation of individual cultural monuments, spatial wholes and ambiances created in the past by gaining a new purpose is necessary for their physical protection and the creation of conditions to play an active role in contemporary social, cultural and economic development and humanization of the environment. One of the reasons is also the provision of hygienic and health conditions for life in a cultural monument, spatial historical wholes or ambiances and their use in accordance with contemporary standards, norms and needs of the life of the inhabitants who use those monuments.

When a decision is made to undertake large-scale interventions on a cultural property, often to provide greater space for an existing or changed function, this involves major changes in the interior of the building, horizontal extensions in some or all directions, and upgrades. All that is being done is done, undoubtedly, cautiously in order to respect the main conservation principles [4]. However, the application of new materials, techniques and technologies significantly changes the characteristics that represented the value due to which something was proclaimed as immovable cultural goods [5].

3. WHAT IS THE MAIN PROBLEM OF BUILT HERITAGE AFTER MAJOR MODERN INTERVENTIONS?

The main problem, undoubtedly, is the new value that the cultural monument thus changed represents. The question arises as to what happens to the originally established values of a cultural goods that has been altered by large interventions? Is it compulsory to re-evaluate and determine the newly created value? Should one wait to create a certain historical distance in order to re-establish the value, or how long it should take to determine whether the interventions have created a new value of a whole that makes a cultural good and interventions in and along with it? The number of questions is great, and the experience of the need for revaluation is very modest [6] (Figure 1. a and b).



Figure 1. a Museum de Fundatio with egg-shaped extension as an excess in space by B. Henket architect, Zwolle 2013.

(<https://www.google.com/search?q=museum+de+fundatie+ zwolle+the+netherlands&oq>)
 b Cultural Memory (Kulturspeicher) with neutral extension by Brueckner and Brueckner, Würzburg 2002. (<https://www.baunetz-architekten.de/brueckner-und-brueckner/31411/projekt/171349>)

It seems that there are still no international agreements and decisions on how to treat cultural monuments that have undergone major changes, and others, most often, without their internal structure, and in some cases with an added or reworked exterior. One of the attitudes might be that a partial answer can be found in the way that significant changes have occurred in buildings built through history [7] [8]. Consciousness conservation has undoubtedly evolved over time and today, to a large extent, principles, methods of research, evaluation and conservation, ways of presentation, management and use are established and internationally recognized. Mobility, multiculturalism, globalization are present, in a certain way, throughout the history of people's lives and construction for their needs. They were interpreted, of course, in a different way and they developed

much slower than phenomena in time, but they were interconnected [9]. Today, we live in cities, villages, settlements that are the result of a gradual replacement of old buildings with new ones, and the number of interventions on existing buildings, even those declared today as cultural goods, is enormous. These changes in buildings that have been going on for a long time do not seem to work so radically today because they took place when they needed

them, although it is obvious that some changes were made exclusively to keep up with the current stylistic directions and functions. The need for an increase in living space is inherent in people and is completely understandable. There is a different way of doing this, so, therefore, it is not possible to document whether and what criteria were for intervention in buildings and in whole areas.

In recent history, examples are more and more numerous. During the 19th and 20th centuries, the expansion of the interior space, most often with the upgrade, was carried out for several reasons, and the notion of modernization was significantly expanded. Existing structures must continue to function within the city or part of it, but adapted to new spatial relationships.

If one considers very carefully the way in which the buildings were evaluated in those periods, the fact is that most public and residential buildings were proclaimed as worth more in terms of the appearance and impression of their outer shells than the spatial structure or construction. Intervention by upgrading the building means that it works in terms of changing the look and purpose of the elements of the outer surfaces, which together with the volumes and forms of architecture make up one value entity. And theoretically, and practically, it will no longer be the entire organism that was at its time and its long-standing existence, but these new buildings will be breathed new into life, it will be revitalized. In them, therefore, the authentic life of the past no longer takes place, but the new life is evolving and developing in the will and planning of the current society. The new life of existing buildings, however, is largely determined by the value of the past [10].

Investments in maintenance, reconstruction and modernization of cultural goods from year to year are growing and are equally treated with investments in new facilities. The sustainable development policy in cities, mainly oriented towards the construction of new buildings, by expanding the city territory, has changed a lot and is again focused on exploring the possibilities of using the already existing, built areas. This has opened up new possibilities for extensive upgrading and upgrading of existing buildings, and inevitably, there is a lack of agreement in the treatment of the external surfaces of new and older parts of buildings where they intervened, which does not automatically mean that degradation of heritage will really occur. Examples of such complex interventions on protected entities can be found all over the world [11].

4. RE-EVALUATION AFTER RENOVATION AND EXTENSION OF PUBLIC SPACES AND URBAN WHOLE

Urban planning is, undoubtedly, an important reason for changing the volume of buildings. In certain historical periods of town development, the builders' aspiration to achieve vertical regulation of street fronts was particularly pronounced. The ideal cities of the Renaissance are largely conceived as very tidy units, with objects of the same

heights, even formally very similarly processed. In practice, this meant that individual, already constructed buildings, mostly medieval, along the streets should be overshadowed to connect with the same height with those built according to the new urban rules. As a rule, such oversized buildings were only given a new envelope with Renaissance features, and their internal spatial organization was kept in the lower floors. Starting from the Renaissance, urban plans have emphasized the correct and uniform horizontal and vertical regulation as one of its main characteristics. All existing buildings, however, could not be removed, so bringing objects to the same height, connecting roof cornice, and often other horizontal divisions, were the backbone of a landscaped city. In such a situation, it was logical that many of the buildings that had been found before implementing such plans experienced an upgrade of one, even more floors, a change in the slope of the roof and a number of other modifications, mainly related to surface decoration and decorating according to the style that was actual at the moment of reaching [12]. Mass upgrades are numerous, especially in cities where there were no drastic urban developments, the demolition of entire neighborhoods, but the plans were gradually implemented

There are only two commentaries here, both from Berlin. The first refers to reconstruction, by the definition of the author of the project, the largest courtyard complex in Germany that has the status of a cultural asset. The Hackesche Höfe complex consists of residential and commercial buildings around eight connected yards, and was built around 1906/1907 predominantly in the Jugend style (and partly in the Historicism). The aim of architects Weiss and Partner was to maintain the overall architecture of the complex, in accordance with the applicable technical regulations and requirements. Around the courtyards, as of blocks, new buildings have been erected or existing ones upgraded so that the vertical regulation is in line. Around the courtyards, some new buildings have been inserted or existing ones upgraded so that vertical regulation remain in line. They also have outward appearance similar to old ones, but in new materials. The rebuilt continent, in which works were completed in 1996, now includes theaters, cinemas, restaurants, offices, workshops, ateliers, shops and 80 apartments, along the underground garage. The complex of the courtyard, which represents a cultural and architectural attraction for tourists and inhabitants of Berlin, has remained on the list of protected cultural goods after these extensive interventions in which there is little left from spatial organization, original material and construction (Figure.2. a and b).

As part of the intensive renovation and construction of Berlin, a huge complex of former livestock markets and remisers was also protected as a cultural good. The three market halls where the cattle were once guarded and sold (built between 1895 and 1902) went under remodeling and were rearranged to create a modern industrial park. The renovated halls now have 20 rooms (offices) for renting and are equipped with modern equipment and communication technology. Depending on their location, they can be used for various purposes, for offices, workshops or sales. Within the modernization of this complex, on the area that was being issued, a very modern building, with completely different architecture and special climatic conditions was built. It contains an archive of Heinrich Boell Foundation. The "Green Memory", bearing the name associated with new ecological streams in architecture, has walls through which a special ventilation system and cooling pass. The designers of this building were E24 Architekten from Zürich. During remodeling, and prior to major interventions on existing buildings of stockyard

and extensions by raising new buildings, measures were prescribed for the preservation of certain value characteristics that architect Bernhard Leisering had to take into account (Figure. 3. a and b). And this complex has remained a listed cultural good and, as far as it is known, it has not been subject to re-valuation.

Similar examples of large urban areas with buildings whose purposes are no longer suitable for urban centers could be found in all countries. Within such protected areas, the buildings have a different architectural value. Therefore, it is necessary to do a whole series of research, analysis and offer a series of scenarios, so that interventions and extensions on buildings and reorganisation of urban spaces will be harmonized and added, by not erasing the value of the existing one.




Figure 2a and b. The layout of the interconnected courtyards of Hackesche Höfe in Berlin and street facades with new wing (photo Manfred Bruckels -www.berlinstadtservice.de/)

Fig. 3 a and b. Model of the redeloping plan of the stockyard and Green memory archive building of Heinrich Boell Foundation /with old buildings on left/ in Berlin

(<http://www.gtb-berlin.de/en/projects/listed-buildings/heinrich-boell/>)

(<https://en.kusch.com/references/auditorium/heinrich-boell-stiftung-e-v-berlin-germany>)

5. ARE CREATIVE EXTENSIONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE VALUE OF THE BUILT HERITAGE?

The re-evaluation of individual cultural monuments is not legally regulated in most states, even those with a very long history of legal protection. By reviewing and analyzing the registers of listed architectural goods of several European countries, it was concluded that the status of cultural goods did not change after extensive, sometimes exaggerated interventions and reconstruction [13] [14] [15]. It might even be noted that the topic of re-evaluation has less theoretical debate than the critical analysis of successful or unsuccessful realizations.

The development of structures in space can not be frozen in time, in spite of the very often unperturbed conservation approach, but continual development must be permitted [16]. There is no room here for presenting and commenting on numerous other examples of individual buildings in which the means of accessing large-scale interventions range from a wide range of replicas, imitations, associations, restrained creative activities to extreme excesses in space. In residential buildings, space for a more comfortable life is required in upgrades for modern needs (elevators, balconies, fire stairs, etc.). Medieval churches turn into luxurious housing, libraries, hospitals. In hospitals built in the first half of the 20th century, the conventional treatment of patients is now changing and this requires certain interior renovations, and in some cases new extensions with very specific and noble intentions are added. One of the important example is the project "Kinderstad" in Amsterdam. The goal of "Kinderstad" is to extract the sick child, its family and friends from the unpleasant surrounding of a hospital and to enable an encounter in a much better atmosphere. This new specialised type of health care for sick children gives the visitors the chance to forget for a moment that the child is sick and to facilitate the normal development of the young patients (between 4 and 18 years old) despite the treatments; it has a positive influence on the patients' recovery. "Kinderstad" is attached to the children's ward on the 9th floor in the old eastern wing of the Medical Centre of Amsterdam Free University (VU Amsterdam). (Figure 4. a and b)




Figure 4. a. and b. Kinderstad in Amsterdam – roof extension and interior of the new floor for sick children

(<https://www.google.com/search?q=kinderstad+vu+amsterdam&source>)

In industrial complexes, most often, cultural activities are being stored. In the United States, the phenomenon of revamped industrial buildings began some decades ago, when the new middle-class became tired of suburban life and started to move back to the city centres. Looking for attractive residential areas whole factories, warehouses, old electric power stations, gas stations, water towers, are intensively transformed into luxury apartments. In most cases, it is necessary to replace certain façade walls with large glass surfaces, add certain parts that are necessary for full comfort, such as terraces with swimming pools and greenery, private panoramic elevators, etc ... 'Loft living' became the new lifestyle and a successful real-estate product. Today, this is happening all around the world (Figure 5. a and b).



Figure 5. a and b. Clere Street Penthouse by Tonkin Liu, over warehouse building in London, 2008, fron and rear facades (<http://www.contemporist.com/clere-street-penthouse-by-tonkin-liu/>)




Figure 6. a and b "Støperiet" housing blocks over the listed Iron Foundry building in Bergen.

(<https://linkarkitektur.com/en/Projects/Stoperiet-The-iron-Foundry>)

The extension to the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), now named the Michael Lee-Chin Crystal in Toronto by D. Libeskind, 2007. (<https://libeskind.com/work/royal-ontario-museum/>)

The objective is clear: to emphasize the imposing historical building by adding a new layer to the landmark, a fashion statement in the form of a complex building overlooking the city. More and more designers and conservators together decide that old-new combined structure does not try to blend in or to hide its modern extension appearance. They threatened this approach as a fitting apotheosis for what was, until recently, a heap of crumbling structure (Figure 6. A and b).

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Great interventions on the architectural heritage are criticized by many interested, but this can also be interpreted as a certain fear of challenges, as there is a dilemma about the inevitable decision-making of the present generation for future generations of what should be valued as important. This is an almost impossible task, because it is impossible to know whether the generations in the future will even consider the heritage as important.

In order to open a discussion on the subject of reevaluation of cultural goods, where extensive interventions and extensions were carried out, examples were drawn from which it can be concluded that such large undertakings entered consciously and with the obvious consent of the institutions that decide on the values of the architectural heritage. Experiences are different, somewhere large changes are accepted immediately and with approval, somewhere they are accepted after a certain time, but nowhere in the public that has more or less violently reacted did not raise the issue of legalized reevaluation. Criticism and praise seemed to have not been officially re-evaluated in the institutions that were responsible for the newly created combined structures. When these cases are analyzed in depth, there is, however, one link that connects them. It can be painful for many conservatories, but the fact is that in such bold actions, there were exceptionally talented architects who are not conservators by definition, who put their creativity on trial and exposed the court to the public. Undoubtedly, they followed the basic conditions and principles of conservation, but, like their predecessors from history, they treated architecture as a process that is constantly refreshed with new ideas, techniques, technologies, and following the civilization development of the society in which the events unfold. Many ways to encourage further research on this topic are just opening up.

Acknowledgement

The paper is the contribution to the scientific project T36042 „Optimization of urban and architectural planning and designing in the function of sustainable development of Serbia“ supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kurtovic Folic, N. Zivaljevic-Luxor, N.: “The Dialogue of Built Heritage with Itself

- An Ongoing Process”, Proceedings of *International Conference ‘Contemporary Achievements in Civil Engineering’*, (Besevic, M, ed.), 24 April 2015, Subotica, Faculty of Civil Engineering, pp. 859-858.
- [2] Holforf, C.: Averting loss aversion in cultural heritage, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 21, 2015/4, Issue 4: Heritage Erasure, pp. 405-421.
- [3] Mickaityte, A. Zavadskas, E., Kaklauskas, A, Tupenaite, L.: The concept model of sustainable buildings refurbishment, *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 12:1, 2008, pp.53-68.
- [4] Giove, S, Rovato, P, Beil, M. An Application of Multicriteria Decision Making to Built Heritage: The redevelopment of Venice Arsenal, *Journal of Multicriteria Decision Analysis*, vol. 17-3, 2011, pp. 85-99.
- [5] Torraca, G. *Lectures on Materials Science for Architectural Conservation*, Los Angeles, The Getty Conservation Institute, 2009.
- [6] Yücer, H.: *An Evaluation of Interventions in Architectural Conservation: New exterior additions to Historic Buildings*, Graduate School of Engineering and Sciences of Izmir Institute of Technology, 2005 (doctoral dissertation)
- [7] Bribio, E. *The Duomo: Art-Faith-History of the Cathedral of Milan*, Fabrica del Duomo di Milano, 2003.
- [8] Ackerman, J.C. *The Architecture of Michelangelo*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition, 1986. pp.175-197
- [9] Déom, C, Thiffault, M-A.: Thoughts Towards a New Definition of Heritage, *The Historic Environment*, Vol.4, No 1, April 2013, Leeds, Maney Publishing, pp. 62-74.
- [10] *New Uses for Heritage Places, Guidelines for the Adaptation of Historic Buildings and Sites*, Heritage Council of New South Wales, Australia, 2008.
- [11] Buriatis, E.: Urban-Spatial Development and Built Heritage, The Case study of Greece. *Proceedings of 48th ISOCARP Congress „Fast Forward: Planning in a dynamic urban context“*, September 10-13, Perm, 2012, CD pp.1-8.
- [12] Kurtović Folić, N, Zaštita postojećeg graditeljskog fonda dogradnjom, *Tematski zbornik Unapređenje i razvoj stanovanja* (M.Ralević i N.Folić, ur.), Arhitektonika 10, Beograd, Arhitektonski fakultet, 1996, str.175-186. (in Serbian)
- [13] Denmark: https://issuu.com/realdania.dk/docs/the_value_of_the_built_heritage (download October 2018)
- [14] Swiss: Inventar https://web.archive.org/web/20090501142322/http://www.bevoelkerungsschutz.admin.ch/internet/bs/de/home/themen/kgs/kgs_inventar.html (download October 2018)
- [15] Great Britain: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/heritage-and-design/listed-buildings/Pages/> (download October 2018)
- [16] Jokilehto, J. *A History of Architectural Conservation*, Butterworth-Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology, 1999. (2nd edition Routledge, 2017)

O PROMENI VREDNOSTI GRADITELJSKOG NASLEĐA NAKON VELIKIH INTERVENCIJA

Rezime: Poslednjih decenija, očuvanje baštine prošireno je na veoma raznovrsne oblasti izgradnje, uključujući industrijsko nasleđe, brojne oblike stanovanja (ne samo reprezentativne!) i druge različite vrste zgrada. Postoji očigledna tendencija da se zaštiti značajno nasleđe razvoja globalne civilizacije. Kao "mlađi" primeri nasleđa, takvi objekti su pogodniji i podložniji velikim intervencijama i modernizaciji. Na taj način očuvane i obnovljene zgrade obogaćuju kulturnu sliku i način života grada. Posmatrano na ovaj način, očuvanje naslijeđa je jedan od bitnih delova modernizacije i identifikacije društvenog identiteta. Zajednica se identifikuje sa očuvanom baštinom i podržava različite ideje o tome kako je predstaviti i iskoristiti. Osećaj da njihova zaštita implicira i značajna ograničenja u manifestaciji oblika i osobina je nešto o čemu se raspravlja na međunarodnom planu. Takav pristup, međutim, postaje sve fleksibilniji, posebno od početka 21. veka.

Postavlja se pitanje šta se dešava sa prvobitno utvrđenim vrijednostima kulturnih dobara koje su izmenjene velikim intervencijama? Da li je obavezno ponovo proceniti i odrediti novostvorenu vrednost? Da li treba da se sačeka da se stvori određena istorijska distanca kako bi se ponovo uspostavila vrednost, ili koliko dugo treba da se utvrdi da li su intervencije stvorile novu vrednost celine koja čini kulturno dobro i intervencije u njemu i sa njom? Broj pitanja je veliki, a iskustvo potrebe za ponovnom procenom je još uvek vrlo skromno.

To je proces koji se stalno osvežava novim idejama, tehnikama, tehnologijama i prati civilizacijski razvoj društva u kojem se događaji odvijaju. Mnogo načina da se podstakne dalje istraživanje o ovoj temi tek se otvara.

Ključne reči: graditeljsko nasleđe, velike intervencije, ponovna procena, nove tehnologije