

**52 /
53**

Coronavirus, city, architecture. Prospects of the architectural and urban design

edited by**Carlo Quintelli, Marco Maretto, Enrico Prandi, Carlo Gandolfi****articles by**

Massimo Zammerini | Giorgio Gasco/Giuseppe Resta | Ottavio Amaro
Grazia Maria Nicolosi | Alberto Bologna/Marco Trisciuoglio | Antonino
Margagliotta/Paolo De Marco | Marianna Charitonidou | Edoardo
Marchese/Noemi Ciarniello | Roberta Gironi | Giovanni Comi | Claudia
Sansò/Roberta Esposito | Paola Scala/Grazia Pota | Antonello Russo
| René Soleti | Pascal Federico Cassaro/Flavia Magliacani | Giuseppe
Verterame | Li Bao/Die Hu | Ken Fallas/Ekaterina Kochetkova | Nicola
Marzot | Riccarda Cappeller | Fabrizia Berlingieri/Manuela Triggianese
| Luca Reale | Anna Veronese | Elisabetta Canepa/Valeria Guerrisi |
Alessandro Oltremarini | Sara Protasoni | Silvana Segapeli | Laura
Anna Pezzetti/Helen Khanamiryan | Ann Legeby/Daniel Koch | Enrico
Bascherini | Costantino Patestos

reviews by

Martina Landsberger | Marina Tornatora | Rossella Ferorelli | Riccardo
Petrella



FAMagazine. Research and projects on architecture and the city

Publisher: Festival Architettura Edizioni, Parma, Italia

ISSN: 2039-0491

Segreteria di redazione

c/o Università di Parma
Campus Scienze e Tecnologie
Via G. P. Usberti, 181/a
43124 - Parma (Italy)

Email: redazione@famagazine.it
www.famagazine.it

Editorial Team

Direction

Enrico Prandi, (Director) Università di Parma
Lamberto Amistadi, (Vice-director) Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna

Editorial board

Tommaso Brighenti, (Chief Editor) Politecnico di Milano, Italia
Ildebrando Clemente, Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna, Italia
Gentucca Canella, Politecnico di Torino, Italia
Renato Capozzi, Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”, Italia
Carlo Gandolfi, Università di Parma, Italia
Maria João Matos, Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias, Portogallo
Elvio Manganaro, Politecnico di Milano, Italia
Mauro Marzo, Università IUAV di Venezia, Italia
Claudia Pirina, Università degli Studi di Udine, Italia
Giuseppina Scavuzzo, Università degli Studi di Trieste, Italia

Correspondents

Miriam Bodino, Politecnico di Torino, Italia
Marco Bovati, Politecnico di Milano, Italia
Francesco Costanzo, Università della Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, Italia
Francesco Defilippis, Politecnico di Bari, Italia
Massimo Faiferri, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Italia
Esther Giani, Università IUAV di Venezia, Italia
Martina Landsberger, Politecnico di Milano, Italia
Marco Lecis, Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italia
Luciana Macaluso, Università degli Studi di Palermo, Italia
Dina Nencini, Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia
Luca Reale, Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia
Ludovico Romagni, Università di Camerino, Italia
Ugo Rossi, Università IUAV di Venezia, Italia
Marina Tornatora, Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria, Italia
Luís Urbano, FAUP, Universidade do Porto, Portogallo
Federica Visconti, Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”, Italia



Scientific Committee

Eduard Bru

Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Barcelona, Spagna

Orazio Carpenzano

Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia

Alberto Ferlenga

Università IUAV di Venezia, Italia

Manuel Navarro Gausa

IAAC, Barcellona / Università degli Studi di Genova, Italia, Spagna

Gino Malacarne

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna, Italia

Paolo Mellano

Politecnico di Torino, Italia

Carlo Quintelli

Università di Parma, Italia

Maurizio Sabini

Hammons School of Architecture, Drury University, Stati Uniti d'America

Alberto Ustarroz

Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de San Sebastian, Spagna

Ilaria Valente

Politecnico di Milano, Italia

Editorial

Carlo Quintelli
Marco Maretto
Enrico Prandi
Carlo Gandolfi

Enrico Prandi

Questioning about the architectural and urban design during the pandemic

10

Old and new themes of architectural and urban design

17

Articles

Massimo Zammerini

The home as a resource. From privacy to relations, between rooms and open spaces.

25

Giorgio Gasco
Giuseppe Resta

From the Elizabethan long gallery to the Turkish sofa: rethinking the art of inhabitation

32

Ottavio Amaro

Which measure for the invisible

40

Grazia Maria Nicolosi

Constrained inhabited space. Real or virtual?

46

Alberto Bologna
Marco Trisciuoglio

Tectonics for an architectural pedagogy. The One Person House project and new theoretical paradigms

50

Antonino Margagliona
Paolo De Marco

#Stayhome, New forms of domestic living

57

Marianna Charitonidou

Takis Zenetos's City and House of the Future: Resynchronising Quotidian Life

63

Edoardo Marchese
Noemi Ciarniello

Abitare produrre riprodurre. Progetti politici per la residenza

69

Roberta Gironi

Flipped space: The inverse relationship between home and work

75

Giovanni Comi

Designing the uninhabitable. Reflections on the space of relationships

81

Claudia Sansò
Roberta Esposito

Pandemos: 'in' space, 'between' space and 'net' space

87

Paola Scala
Grazia Pota

Elastic places and intermediate design.

92

Antonello Russo

Densify / Scale Down. The archipelago as a response

98

René Soleti

Designing with void. The structuring role of the wide open space

103

Pascal Federico Cassaro
Flavia Magliacani

The European block as a renewed spatial entity among collective living, functional autonomy and sustainability

108

Giuseppe Verterame

The city in quarantine. Perspectives of urban regeneration through the experimental model of the macro-block

113

Li Bao Die Hu	Reflections on the Design of Urban Community and Residential Buildings in China in the Post-epidemic Era	120
Ken Fallas Ekaterina Kochetkova	From Parasite to Pandemic. How Korean Cities Can Lead the Way to a Global Post-COVID Urbanism	127
Nicola Marzot	The Reclaimed City. Islands of resilience in the urban archipelago. "Temporary Use" and transformation in emergency conditions	133
Riccarda Cappeller	Cooperative Architecture. Urban Space as Medium and Tool to share Narratives	142
Fabrizia Berlingieri Manuela Triggianese	Post-pandemic and urban morphology Preliminary research perspectives about spatial impacts on public realm	148
Luca Reale	Bodies and spaces in the public city. Towards a new proxemics?	155
Anna Veronese	Architecture post Covid-19. Using proxemics in spatial design	162
Elisabetta Canepa Valeria Guerrisi	The Pandemic Storm and the Design Culture's Rafts: A Review of the Main Italian Architecture Magazines during the 20th and 21st Century's Major Health Threats	167
Alessandro Oltremarini	Care and measure. While everyone around makes noise	174
Sara Protasoni	The green element and housing in the quarantined city	178
Silvana Segapeli	Pandemic versus collective space? Towards a topology of care	184
Laura Anna Pezzetti Helen Khanamiryam	Accelerating Innovations, Wellbeing and Requalification of School Buildings after the Pandemic. Towards a "New Extraordinary"	189
Ann Legeby Daniel Koch	The changing of urban habits during the Corona pandemic in Sweden	198
Enrico Bascherini	Repopulating abandoned villages, new housing strategies for the pandemic	204
Costantino Patestos	From the diffused city to dispersion into the abandoned villages, or: the new solitude of the compact city	209

Reviews

Rossella Ferorelli	The theory on the balcony. Among the postpandemic landscapes of Lockdown Architecture	217
Martina Landsberger	Ignazio Gardella: architecture as an experience of oneness	219
Riccardo Petrella	The eye of the architect. Journey through the gaze of thirty-three architects at the time of Covid-19	223
Marina Tornatora	Journey around my room in Te.CAltrove Digital migration of the micro-gallery Te.CA_TemporaryCompactArt	225

Riccarda Lea Cappeller
Cooperative Architecture.
Urban Space as Medium and Tool to share Narratives

Abstract

Understanding the already existing space as socio-cultural dimension, cultural capacity and atmosphere that can be approached in many different ways, is connected to the idea of using space as a medium that opens up discussions, fosters social connections and is able to reveal socio-political contexts, cooperative processes of planning, production and change, questions of everyday life, the design and use of space throughout the past and visions towards the future of our cities. Changing the perspective on space and using it as a medium and tool for knowledge creation is addressed through the concept of cooperative architecture. This concept rethinks and reactivates the architectural and urban design discipline as social, creative and common practice as well as it defines new roles within the discipline and at the intersection with other disciplines.

Keywords

Reuse — Cultural capacity — Inventive methods — Design modes

Raising questions in a new context

Thinking about how space in an urban environment is able to react to the users requirements and how we have to shape it in future to be able to permit enough room, flexibility, distance and possibilities for encounters, have been part of the big questions of architects and urban designers for centuries: How can many people live and work together and how should living, working and space for leisure be organized spatially? How can the wish for autonomy and privacy within an urban context, of having an own little island, be brought together with the necessary exchange in public space that prevents us from isolation and a high segregation of the society. How do we have to imagine the very basic concept of coming together, the “agora” of the Greeks – a common place for cultural production, political organization and social togetherness in the current Everyday life of our spaces?

All these questions have a new topicality and have received a rising and much more outreaching, also public attention across the world. The Corona Pandemic is forcing us to rethink the way in which we live together as well as how we as architects and urban designers act and create space – «addressing the intertwining of the systemic and the personal» (Roberts 2020, p. 10) anew. It asks for spatial ideas to distance people from each other, closing or sharply restricting many unsecure localities and events, especially the working places, but also others, that allowed unexpected encounters to happen (smaller cultural institutions, café's, sport clubs, workshops etc.). Employees are forced to work from home and to organize life in a different way, which rapidly has shown social differences through spatial division and distribution; a dissimilar access



Fig. 1

Filmic parts – atmospheres of the three spaces. Photo by Riccarda Cappeller.

to open spaces, mobility, and private refuges, just naming some of the constraints leading to a more and more segregated society. So, looking at the current challenges on a long term view, how do we have to design urban space and which kind of urban action is needed?

To answer, at first we have to reveal the very basic understanding of urban space as a place of physical encounter that especially in the digitalized network society of today, which Manuel Castells describes (2005) has become indispensable. Topics like the complexity and multiplicity of social and spatial relations (Boeri 2004), shown in the mix of heterogeneous aspects, programs and user groups (Cappeller in Schröder and Diesch 2020), as well as a spontaneous encounter of people in the Everyday, have to be highlighted more than ever as positive. They provide a huge variety of social, economic and cultural resources for their citizens, the “homo urbanus”, as the Filmmakers Ila beka and Louise Lemoine name the species. Working with these parameters to foster new connections, allows our spaces to adapt to changing requirements and grow and learn together with us – continuously transforming. It is connected to the aim of creating a space that reveals a philosophical idea of a democracy, which looks for political equality, allowing the same conditions – in living, working, education and access to public institutions – for everybody (Allen 2020).

Unforeseeable use in existing urban Spaces

As Jane Jacobs states «old materials are needed to reinvent the cultural life of innercity environments and seen to resist high speed capitalisation.» (1963) The existing spaces in our cities, the leftovers from a historic past and often former industrial sites within the city centre are important places to test out programmes and ideas and create new linkages, working on multiple scales and topics in relation to their neighbourhoods, fostering possibilities for unexpected events and allowing a creative engagement and inhabitation of space to take place, change and further develop the spaces through the people involved. Their material substance works as integrating element, as it brings together memories and stories keeping it alive and creating new kinds of communities for the Future that go beyond the material. They are *Lived Spaces*, socially influenced

and subjectively perceived spaces that gain their significance through practice and use in the everyday (Lefebvre 1974), were re-cycled, re-used and interpret in new ways that don't represent but enact the dependency of the social and the material. In this point I completely agree to and still find very relevant the statement of André Corboz in his article *Old Buildings and Modern Functions*, published in 1978. He states:

«If the work of a building [here understood as spatial situation] is considered from the start as a product in constant development created as part of a programme with an aim in mind, and provided with a cause of adaptability, the reanimator [architect or urban designer] is then dealing with objects open to modernisation». (1978, p.77).

Scaling this up, the idea of objects open to modernization becomes urban space that changes and further develops, which is not realized in a before and after but in a process which has to be read in its different facets and modes of production. It is a social, political and spatial process, an atmosphere and cultural capacity allowing and producing interrelations in-between the live and space matters always under construction as time goes on (Massey 2005).

Proposing this increasing attention to already existing spatial situations, their context and the to it bound communities, I follow the general idea of contextualism from the 1970s and relational theories that lead to a situated knowledge, a strongly contextually routed notion of space that reads and interprets the layers of palimpsest-spaces (Corboz 1983) before designing or realizing space. There are many spaces where one can see this kind of process, many spaces where different user groups merge and produce different kinds of happenings and many spaces where old buildings are re-used to produce something new. Nevertheless I would argue that there are very few spatial situations where all these aspects come together and are bound not only to a changed attitude of architects and urban designers, really engaging in situ and working with what they found in the place, but also to the actions happening in place, the spatial practice and active engagement of people living, working and being there, based on alternative models of ownership and organization that relate to a broader and cultural dimension of space connected to the will of its inhabitants to transform and change it.

Introducing "Cooperative Architecture" as concept

Cooperative Architecture as conceptual idea brings together these multiple topics of the city and through the analysis of selected projects shows a different attitude in the social and spatial design and production as well as an understanding of space as ongoing process and sequence of situations that allow spatial differentiations. Derived from the latin "*cooperor, cooperaris*", wheras "*co-*" means *together* and "*opperari*" to be occupied by or work on something, it points out the active doing of architecture as an act of collaboration and co-creation. Another in the word inherent meaning is "*opus*", understood as a musical, artistic, literary or scientific work, a labour or composition – an abstract, conceptual but at the same time interpretative and intuitive compilation of knowledge. It refers to a work of art or product of labour, with a connection to the artistic that can re-view the practice of designing. Architecture is defined as the art and science of designing and making buildings or the style of a building itself. "*Opus est*", means it is necessary, so the act of co-creation in thinking and projecting space becomes compulsory.

Referring to this reinforces the mutual dependency of the social and the material, its visual experience and sensory perception as well as its “*Po-esis*”, the mentally reflected theory and “*Praxis*”, the through action expressed concept or spatial and material realization, Aristoteles defined. Both have to be re-defined and re-integrated into the architects and designers education, which can be done, and this also lies in the nature of the wording, through artistic and interdisciplinary approaches provoking a change of perspective and a re-discovering and new invention of creative solutions and situation-bound ideas. So what is needed now is a shift of architectural and urban design (Nilsson 2013) towards an attitude connecting analysis and design, theory and practice more deeply and reflexively, highlighting a performative understanding of space. A shift that tries out new tools and modes of designing to propose innovative, promising, maybe even utopic ideas – turning the existing upside down. It is a new appropriation of space that allows improvisation (Dell 2019) and experimentation (Marguin 2019), the merging of bottom-up and top down strategies, temporary and enduring spatial interventions and the realization of frameworks allowing flexible and at the same time sustainable spaces in constant development.

Through looking at three exemplary spaces; the *Exrotaprint* in Berlin (Germany), *Granby four streets* in Liverpool (United Kingdom) and *Can Batlló* in Barcelona (Spain), my ongoing research on cooperative architecture reflects on spaces of multiplicity forming a spatial translation of a contemporary understanding of democracy and the changing role of architects and urban designers, addressing the complexity of thinking, projecting and realizing such composite urban situations. It opens up to the academic and the practice but also to people beyond the discipline, a broader public, that will take part in an active creation, production and discussion, stressing the how and why of spatial agency – the designerly action, public engagement as connection to plurality and the openness and freedom, referring to Hannah Arendt, that doesn't predefine everything in advance but allows to evolve in process.

The projects were approached through an inventive exploration – a material-based examination, using the fieldsite as device (Candea 2013). The Inventiveness of methods according to Lury and Wakeford, who collected a whole range of examples that investigate, engage with and try to «contribute to the framing of change» (Lury and Wakeford 2012, p. 6) is «the relation between two moments: the addressing of a method [...] to a specific problem, and the capacity of what emerges in the use of that method to change the problem» (Ibid., p. 7). So the challenge is to find a visual and narrative expression for the cultural aspects inherent in spaces, evaluating and transmitting the findings while reflecting both the practice and the theory, leading to a critical spatial practice (Marguin 2019).

The “As Found”, introduced as interdisciplinary movement by the Smithsons also increased attention on the existing, opening a field in between art and science, based on observation and reflection of the world as experienced. It departs from a spontaneous, unconscious, practical approach to space as inspiration and elaborates a theoretical background through its aesthetic reflection. Art in this sense doesn't mean the actual production of an artwork, but aims at an art of thinking and doing, which reaches much further than the basics of design (Bürkele 2012), often un-

derstood as aesthetical interpretation but also being a creative and active doing.

Working with «open-ended and socially engaged approaches» (Dodd 2019 p.11) and sensory methods like experimental film to visualize the tangible and intangible through an experimental approach creates textual interpretations of the space's capacities, the subjectively perceived and qualitative values as transformability, cultural capacity or atmosphere. This is important to “see” the potential of sharing a living environment where diverse knowledge is collected (Julien 2016), and shared as fundamental education – which is the opposite of the idea of social distancing.

Bibliography

ALLEN, D. (2020) – *Politische Gleichheit*. Suhrkamp: Berlin

BOERI, S. (2004) – *Multiplicities*, in: Koolhaas, R, et alii, *Mutations*, ActarBirkhäuser

CANDEA, M. (2013) – ‘The Fieldsite as Device’. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 6 (3): 241-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2012.754366>.

CASTELLS, M. and CARDOSO, G. eds., (2005) – *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy*. Johns Hopkins Center for Transatlantic Relations: Washington, DC

CORBOZ, A. (1978) – ‘Old Buildings and Modern Functions’. *Lotus International* 13 (December): 69–79.

CORBOZ, A. (1983) – “The Land as Palimpsest”. *Diogenes* 31 (121):12-34

DELL, C. (2019) – *Towards the improvisation of space*, Berlin: Jovis

DODD, M. (2019) – “Space is always political”, in: DODD, M. (ed.) *Spatial Practices: Modes of Action and Engagement with the City*. Routledge: London, pp. 7-20

DODD M. (2019) – *Spatial Practices: Modes of Action and Engagement with the City*. Routledge: London

FRANK, U.; LINDENMAYER, V.; LOEWENBERG, P.; ROCNEANU (Hg.) (2017) – *Hiatus. Architekturen für die gebrauchte Stadt*. Birkhäuser: Basel.

JACOBS, J. (1963) *Death and Life of great american cities*

JULIEN, Francois (2016) – *Es gibt keine kulturelle Identität*. Suhrkamp: Berlin

LURY, C., and N. WAKEFORD (2012) – ‘Introduction: A Perpetual Inventory’, in C. LURY and N. WAKEFORD (eds) *Inventive Methods: The Happening of the Social*, Routledge, London, pp. 1-24

MARGUIN S., RABE H., SCHÄFFNER W. und SCHMIDGALL F. eds. (2019) – *Experimentieren. Eine Bestandsaufnahme experimenteller Praktiken in Wissenschaft und Gestaltung*, Transcript Verlag Bielefeld, Reihe Sciences Studies

MASSEY, D. (2005) – *for space*. Sage: London

NILSSON, F. (2013) – “Knowledge in the Making. On Production and Communication of Knowledge in the Material Practices of Architecture”. *FormAkademisk - forskningstidsskrift for design og designdidaktikk* 6 (2). <https://doi.org/10.7577/formakademisk.569>.

ROBERTS, B. (2020) – “Expanding Modes of Practice”. *Log* 48: 9-14

SCHRÖDER, J. and DIESCH, A. eds. (2020) – *Climate Commons. Regionales Bauen und Siedlungsplanung*, Leibniz Universität Hannover: Hannover

SMITHSON, A., P. SMITHSON, and ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION LONDON, eds. (2005) – *Architecture Is Not Made with the Brain: The Labour of Alison and Peter Smithson* ; [Based on a Symposium Held at the Architectural Association in November 2003]. *Architecture Landscape Urbanism* 9. s.l.: Architectural Association.

WARD, C. (1996) [2002] – *Talking to Architects: Ten Lectures by Colin Ward*. Freedom Press: Sheffield

Riccarda Cappeller M. Sc. M.A. is a lecturer, researcher and PhD candidate at the Institute of Urban Design and Planning, Leibniz Universität Hannover (Prof. Jörg Schröder) with a research interest in interdisciplinary design modes and narratives for mixed urban spaces. 2019 AULET Research funding of Leibniz University Hannover. Since 2015 Architectural Journalist at bau-netz, Politik&Kultur. MA of Visual Sociology, Goldsmiths University London, MA of Science in Architecture, Bauhaus Universität Weimar 2015, Universidad de Buenos Aires 2014, ETSAM, Politecnica Madrid 2012. Recognition Daniel Gössler Preis, Bauhaus-Graduation funding. Recognition Daniel Gössler Preis. Since 2013 several Collaborations with Exyzt/Constructlab.

Fabrizia Berlingieri, Manuela Triggianese
Post-pandemic and urban morphology Preliminary research perspectives about spatial impacts on public realm

Abstract

As Covid-19 evidence, urban density[*] proved to be a health risk factor, reclaiming the rethinking for higher sustainability. The investigation on post pandemic strategies in the metropolitan cities of Milan and Rotterdam shows emergent modes of spatial re-appropriation towards better risk adaptiveness.

[*] «Density is really an enemy in a situation like this, with large population centers, where people are interacting with more people all the time, that's where it's going to spread the fastest.» (Dr. Steven Goodman, epidemiologist at Stanford University). Citation in: Brian M. Rosenthal (March, 23, 2020) "Density Is New York City's Big 'Enemy' in the Coronavirus Fight" on <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/nyregion/coronavirus-nyc-crowds-density.html> (accessed 08. 05.2020, 11:00 a.m.).

Keywords

Covid-19 — Urban Morphology — Public Spaces — Social Distancing — Spatial Proximity

Adaptive, resilient, reversible

In the post-pandemic phase, the central question 'how does the infrastructure of public space and mobility need to adapt to a 1.5mt rule of social distancing' has been tackled by socio-economic metropolitan agendas. New York City is an exemplary case to describe the ongoing challenge in decentralizing public spaces (Hu, Haag 2020). The city closed more than 60 miles of its road network to allow the decongestion of main parks and squares, within an extremely compact urban structure characterized by fragmentation and lack of non-privatized open spaces.

Grounded on the experience of the *Superilles* project in Barcelona¹, new pop up and temporary bike lanes appeared in Berlin, Bogotá and Milan, while New Zealand has become the first country to experiment tactical urbanism as official governmental policy during the pandemic (Reid 2020). Temporary and *tactical urbanism* configure a common strategic approach to roll out effective techniques to cope with health emergency, that drive towards adaptiveness and resilience to risks. In the European context, the cities of Milan and Rotterdam are two interesting cases to look at regarding design strategies and tools for the post-pandemic phase, as they also differ in urban morphology.

Tactic urbanism and public realm. A comparative analysis on Milan and Rotterdam

The "comeback to a new ordinary" is the leading motto of the Milan municipality (2020) in the adopted *Urban adaptation Strategy*. The strategy invests in public realm in a preponderant way, focusing on two main aspects: the reorganization of the road network and the reuse and implemen-

