

Interdisciplinary dialogue ensures a place for *Baukultur* in monument preservation

Waltraud Kofler Engl

“Your head and my hands ...”

Interdisciplinarity has become a motto and almost a self-evidence in discourses on the theory, research, teaching, and practice of monument preservation and restoration. However, it is easier said than introduced and actually put into practice, especially since interdisciplinarity is not just the juxtaposition of several specialist areas, ways of thinking, techniques, methods and solutions; rather, it entails their merging and networking into a common discourse and a shared way of thinking and working. In many cases, built cultural heritage is of outstanding value in terms of *Baukultur*. Historic buildings, cityscapes, and townscapes, as well as ensembles, are primarily defined as worthy of protection through their value in terms of *Baukultur*; along with other characteristics. *Baukultur*, regional identities, and diverse living spaces are paired in this discussion, as summarised in the 2018 Davos Declaration, amongst other statements.

Legal regulations, theoretical concepts, charters, declarations, and guidelines claim and manage the values of *Baukultur* in order to preserve and restore them for the future, but do not ensure their actual retention in practice. Rather, thinking and working methods determined by planning, technique, restoration, craftsmanship, organization, and social discourse are required that would have this goal in mind when viewed together and through dialogue.

It is essential that a process of mutual agreement and a common naming of problems and solutions

are found; this, however, can only arise under certain conditions. As in all areas of interdisciplinary agreement and activity, one of the essential conditions is to recognise that all specialist areas are equal, even though the legally responsible monument preservation authority will seek to claim supremacy owing to its legal embeddedness and responsibility over technical or functional requirements. Trust can only be created on a basis of equal rights, enabling a shared identification with the property and its qualities, as well as the integration of the arguments of all partners. Ultimately, as the result of a dialogue of equals, synergies for action emerge whereby all specialised disciplines bring the property to the fore.

In addition to knowledge and goodwill, interdisciplinary discourses are a question of time (which is needed for information and discussion), social skills and experience. The increase in knowledge for all those involved, sensitisation to construction issues, and mutual trust and understanding are characteristics that positively affect the result and safeguarding of *Baukultur*; both as regards preservation activities and contemporary interventions, additions, and expansions.

Public and private knowledge spaces for *Baukultur* – a practical report

The above-mentioned approach can be explained through the example of the new use and restoration of Bruneck Castle. The castle complex, which towers over the small town of Bruneck, was built in the middle of the thirteenth century by a

Prince-Bishop of Brixen: Bruno von Kirchberg. Prince-bishops used it as a temporary residence, as the administrative seat of the episcopal estates and, finally, as a summer residence, changing and expanding it until the early twentieth century. Over seventy years, it was only used for a school and a caretaker's apartment until the Südtiroler Sparkasse Stiftung (a foundation) acquired the castle in 2004 from the diocese of Bozen/Brixen and made it available to the municipality of Bruneck free of charge. The latter only required the state rooms for formal reception purposes and handed over the main part of the castle to the extreme mountaineer Reinhold Messner, so that it could be used as a museum of mountain peoples, the Messner Mountain Museum Ripa, which opened in 2010. User requirements, combined with the idea of strengthening the identification of residents with the castle that had given their town its name and defined its townscape, were widely discussed at the preliminary planning stage and during the planning stage. An extensive study of the building was conducted, including a room inventory; this, in addition to close coordination between the architects in charge of planning (EM2), monument preservation experts, and the users, led to an increase in knowledge and enhanced sensitivity to the property and its restoration requirements amongst all decision-makers. The well-known user Reinhold Messner went along with this approach and was ready to adjust his ideas and exhibition scheme — which was not easy to integrate into the premises — to the property and its

furnishings. A shared result of the joint work on the building and its new use was the implementation of barrier-free access to the lifts, along with an underground extension beneath the north-facing bailey, which had not originally been planned, in order to gain needed exhibition space and not overload rooms featuring decorative paintings and panelling in the historicist style with museum items. The architectonic quality of the new interventions, the dialogue between contemporary interventions and the existing structure, and the coordination of materials and forms are also based on an increased understanding of the building and its historical, architectural, artistic and material dimensions (see Fig. 1)

The positive experience gained through interdisciplinary work on an equal footing continued during the implementation phase and bolstered communication with technicians and craftspeople. The learning effect and increased competence became a valuable prerequisite for further work on listed properties; this was equally valid for clients, planners, technicians and craftspeople, as well as for experts from the monument preservation department. Interdisciplinary exchange made it possible to gain knowledge of the history of the construction and furnishings, so much so that this needs to be rewritten.

The study and restoration of Tyrol Castle in the years 2000–2003 and its new use as a museum of cultural and regional history elicited similar experiences. The restoration of the castle that gave the County of Tyrol its name was accompanied by extensive building research and, in close coordination, a museum scheme was developed that places the castle centre stage as the most important exhibit. In particular, the new self-supporting steel structure for a flight of stairs and platforms hosting the exhibition on the regional history of South Tyrol in the great tower, which was rebuilt around 1900, is not only a high-quality architectural intervention; it is also the outcome of many discussions about the significance of the existing

structure, its typology, and the need and justification for continued building within such a prominent, symbolic museum property, that were conducted by the planning A5 architects Walter Angonese and Markus Scherer, the working group on the exhibition scheme, and the monument preservation department.

I am convinced that the interdisciplinary approach at Tyrol Castle has shaped and enhanced the planning work of both architects for subsequent projects. With the restoration planning and additional buildings of the Franzensfeste – a Habsburg fortress in the Eisack Valley inaugurated in 1838 – the architect Markus Scherer has once again created a high-quality example of existing structure preservation and added construction in contemporary style. The lift structures and connecting bridges in the north-east wing of the lower fortress, the connecting stairs from the lower to the middle fortress, and the integrated administration wing and Brenner Base Tunnel information points are engaged in a both powerful and sensitive dialogue with the existing structure; this also developed out of negotiation processes (see Figs. 2 & 3).

Architecture prizes, publications and exhibitions showcase predominantly high-ranking, unique properties and thus present an incomplete picture of both historical and contemporary *Baukultur*. Less outstanding residential buildings, such as farms and townhouses, that have often been maintained, renovated or extended with much personal effort and emotion, are perceived as a lesser resource in terms of *Baukultur*. Yet they make up a greater share of the designed environment and are no less important constants of *Baukultur*. Experience shows that work on publicly financed buildings is usually handled through competitions; it is thus easier to maintain and characterise *Baukultur* for that sector than for private constructions.

In the case of private residential buildings, in the vast majority of cases planning architects do not play

a decisive role; rather, the building owner comes to the fore as the party that will pay for and use the building. Renovations are often carried out on a self-build basis with much enthusiasm and in collaboration between property-owner and craftsmen, with advice by planners and monument preservation experts playing a lesser role. Despite the risk that the consistency of the interventions in terms of conservation and style may be lost, the results are not necessarily any worse. Rather, they often fulfil everyday requirements stemming from use, limited financial resources, and the knowledge and skills of those directly involved. It does not do justice to these achievements to evaluate and appreciate their quality according to criteria that are appropriate for public museums or buildings used for official purposes. Rather, they open up other spaces for experience and education as regards *Baukultur*-related knowledge, skills and learning. Evaluation criteria are also interdisciplinary in nature and should only be considered in relation to the property involved and its users.

An example from Bolzano, where the arcade of Goldenstern, a small city hotel, was converted, neatly sums up the close cooperation involved. The bricklayer, who had been working on the conversion for years, said to his unconventional, largely in-house planning client: “It was your head and my hands that made this.” The statement, which clearly exudes pride in the end result, points to the skills of comprehensive collaboration and mutual trust, as well as to the quiet, often unspoken but decisive working methods and elements of a shared *Baukultur* (see Fig. 4). Regardless of the specific case, this statement may be applied to the merging of theoretical and practice-oriented knowledge and planning with restoration, craftsmanship, technical execution, and future-oriented cultural and economic use; it also refers to everyday *Baukultur* achievements beyond unique listed properties, which absolutely ought to be recorded and publicised.

Le dialogue interdisciplinaire sécurise la culture du bâti au sein de la sauvegarde du patrimoine

Waltraud Kofler Engl

« Ta tête et mes mains... »

Malgré la nécessité d'ancrer les efforts en faveur de la restauration, de l'utilisation et de l'évolution des bâtiments historiques dans les réglementations, les chartes, les déclarations et l'élaboration de directives, ces derniers doivent également être protégés au niveau de la planification et de la réalisation par une approche, une réflexion et une mise en œuvre interdisciplinaire.

L'égalité de la mise sur pied de tous les partenaires et de tous les domaines, ainsi que le dialogue horizontal engendrent des synergies au niveau de l'approche et des solutions, une identification avec l'objet, une croissance des compétences, des connaissances et de l'expérience dans l'approche de la culture du bâti historique, ainsi que des compétences et des processus de négociation. La convergence des

connaissances et des planifications tant théoriques que pratiques, du savoir-faire technique et artisanal, de même que l'enseignement réciproque et des exploitations culturelles et économiques novatrices ouvrent des espaces d'apprentissage et d'expérience au profit de la culture du bâti.

Dans le cadre du processus de restauration et de présentation muséale du château Bruneck et du château Tirol, il fut possible, au sein de la mise en réseau des compétences des utilisateurs, planificateurs, spécialistes, conservateurs, curateurs, techniciens et artisans, de sauvegarder des valeurs culturelles historiques et de les développer, tout en les intégrant de manière contemporaine.

La culture du bâti ne se limite pas uniquement à des objets et des restaurations isolés de haut niveau,

mais englobe l'architecture résidentielle urbaine et rurale ordinaire, qui constitue la plus grande partie de notre environnement bâti, ainsi qu'une constante et des ressources importantes. Il est vrai que les maîtres de l'ouvrage jouent dans ce cas un rôle plus décisif que dans les bâtiments publics, tout en incluant beaucoup d'apport personnel et d'enthousiasme. La prise en compte des besoins quotidiens, la collaboration étroite avec les artisans engendrant la confiance régénèrent des valeurs culturelles dans le domaine bâti qu'il est indispensable d'analyser et d'étudier. Sans engagement des propriétaires dans la production privée, de la société dans les bâtiments publics, ainsi que de la participation interdisciplinaire de tous les participants, la culture du bâti ne peut guère être assurée et développée.