architettura
urbanistica
paesaggio
beni culturali

LA CITTÀ CREATIVA

CNAPPC
CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE
DEGLI ARCHITETTI
PIANIFICATORI
PAESAGGISTI
E CONSERVATORI

La città creativa

Spazi pubblici e luoghi della quotidianità

CNAPPC
CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE
DEGLI ARCHITETTI
PIANIFICATORI
PAESAGGISTI
E CONSERVATORI

La Città Creativa

www.cittacreative.eu

Call for Papers - Biennale Spazio Pubblico 2017 - Roma

prodotto da
CNAPPC
Consiglio Nazionale Architetti Pianificatori Paesaggisti e Conservatori

Componenti del Consiglio
Giuseppe Cappochin - Presidente
Marco Aimetti
Walter Baricchi
Ilaria Becco
Lilia Cannarella
Massimo Crusi
Alessandra Ferrari
Franco Frison
Rino La Mendola
Paolo Malara
Alessandro Marata
Luisa Mutti
Fabrizio Pistolesi
Arturo Livio Sacchi
Diego Zoppi

A cura di
Rossana Galdini I Dipartimento di Scienze Sociali ed Economiche - Sapienza Università di Roma
Alessandro Marata I Dipartimento Ambiente Energia e Sostenibilità - CNAPPC

Mediapartner
L'Architetto
Point Z.E.R.O.

Grafica e impaginazione Marta Badiali, copertine Anna Branzanti e Flavia Vacchero.

E' vietata la riproduzione, anche parziale, effettuata con qualsiasi mezzo, compresa la fotocopia, anche ad uso interno o didattico. Per la legge italiana la fotocopia è lecita solo per uso personale purché non danneggi l'autore. Quindi ogni fotocopia che eviti l'acquisto di un libro è illecita e minaccia la sopravvivenza di un modo di trasmettere la conoscenza. Chi fotocopia un libro, chi mette a disposizione i mezzi per fotocopiare, chi comunque favorisce questa pratica commette un furto e opera ai danni della cultura.

Nel caso in cui fosse stato commesso qualche errore o omissione riguardo ai copyright delle illustrazioni saremo lieti di correggerli nella prossima ristampa.

ISBN 978-88-941296-2-5

Prima edizione settembre 2017

© CNAPPC - www.awn.it

L A C I T T

A C R E A T

I V A / 1 7

C N A P P C

L A C I T T

A C R E A T

I V A / 1 7

C N A P P C

INDICE

Il progetto della città contemporanea 11
Giuseppe Cappochin

La Città Creativa 13
Rossana Galdini, Alessandro Marata

Città, creatività e innovazione - Il caso di Essen, European Green Capital 2017 15
Rossana Galdini

City Surfing 27
Alessandro Marata

ARCHITETTURA

Creatività partecipata: processo di riappropriazione dello spazio pubblico della Vucciria 41
Giovanna Acampa, Salvatore Maraventano

Lo spazio pubblico tra (re)invenzione del quotidiano e dinamica dell'evento: poesia e crisi delle pratiche spaziali creative 51
Mariateresa Aprile

Imparare dai Playground 59
Andrea Matteo Azzolini

Riappropriarsi dei luoghi dell'abbandono: la comunità creativa come epicentro della rigenerazione urbana sostenibile 69
Nadia Bertolino

Il cantiere creativo - Il caso dell'ex cantiere navale di Refshaleøen a Copenhagen come esempio di riqualificazione di aree industriale dismesse tramite l'introduzione di attività creative 79
Lucrezia Biasutti

Barcellona e Rotterdam creative cities - I casi del Pla Buits e della Child Friendly City 89
Gianluca Burgio, Maurizio Francesco Errigo

Generare identità - La città creativa come strumento di riappropriazione e identificazione nelle trasformazioni urbane 99
Francesco Camilli, Andrea De Sanctis

Luoghi dell'abbandono tra arte architettura e paesaggio
Come il concetto di spazio impreciso può rilanciare la creatività della città contemporanea 109
Eride Caramia

Agrigento Smart - Integration and sustainability in the regeneration of an urban public space. A case study. 117
Teresa Cilona

Creatività e arte nei progetti di sviluppo urbano 127
Massimo Cosenza

Attorno al cohousing: l'abitare collaborativo 133
Jacopo Gresleri

La costruzione condivisa dello spazio pubblico - Architettura e programmi sociali per Zingonia 141
Serena Indaco

Creatività e pratiche di riuso degli spazi urbani 151
Aleda Kosova

A morphological and sustainable approach to open space design - The case study of Viterbo historical centre 157
Marco Maretto, Barbara Gherri, Anthea Chiovitti, Nicolò Boggio, Cherrie Cabrera, Federico Catalano, Greta Pitanti, Francesco Scattino, Chiara Vincenti

Gender mainstreaming: mobilità urbana, risorse energetiche e impatti 167
Lucia Martincigh, Marina Di Guida

Scarti e rifiuti urbani come nuova sostanza dello spazio pubblico contemporaneo: esperienze a confronto tra architettura, arte e attivismo civico 177
Gaetano De Francesco, Saverio Massaro

Dalla Do It Yourself (DIY) alla Do It Together (DIT) Strategy: la campagna di crowdfunding "I Make Rotterdam" per la realizzazione del ponte Luchtsingel a Rotterdam in Olanda 187
Laura Pavia

Quale Habitat per la città creativa 197
Leonardo Pugin

Spazi urbani d'apprendimento 205
Massimo Faiferri, Samanta Bartocci, Fabrizio Pusceddu

Resisting boundaries. Il caso dell'ex Caserma Rossani a Bari 215
Vito Quadrato, Giuseppe Tupputi

Innesti creativi in spazi industriali 225
Silvia Nigro

Le nuove stanze urbane o urban rooms nella città contemporanea 235
Nilda Valentin

URBANISTICA

The creativity of *micro-use* in public space 245
Elisa Avellini

Green density. The public space role for the creative city. 255
Giovanni Bello

I bambini inventano la città: partecipare per progettare 263
Fabio Corbisiero, Antonella Berritto

Il processo divergente all'origine della città creativa 271
Valeria Brigliadori

Gli spazi della creatività 277
Letizia Carrera

Programma Millefiori - Da un giardino intessuto a orti e giardini urbani 285
Marinella Carrieri, Marco Cei, Gabriele Paolinelli, Camilla Tredici

La creatività come pratica di resilienza territoriale 295
Carlo Colloca, Roberto Giuliano Corbìa e Roberta Pastore

Il recupero del centro storico di Salerno tra slancio progettuale e rispetto della memoria storica
The recovery of the old town of Salerno between project dynamism and respect of historical memory 305
Rossella Del Regno, Pasquale Cucco

BoOM! - Proposta per un processo di rigenerazione urbana dell'Ex Ospedale Militare di Bologna 313
Davide De Cecco

The notion of the creative city and its implementation in Shanghai, China: Spatial practices and further implication for design actions 323
Ioanni Delsante

Gli spazi urbani della mobilità non motorizzata 333
Raffaele Di Marcello

Il luogo si chiama Babilonia: il disegno della città e della casa 341
Andrea Donelli

TRAN/CIT(Y) 351
Jari Franceschetto

Dalla rigenerazione locale alla rivitalizzazione integrale
I Plan de revitalización del centro tradicional y patrimonial di Bogotá e Managua 355
Daniele Frediani, Maria Cristina Petralla

Designing the Unexpected - How to Foster Creative use of Public Space 365
Francesco Garofalo

The production of pluralistic spatialities:The persistence of counter-space territories in the streets of Hanoi - Vietnam 373
Manfredo Manfredini, Anh-Dung Ta

V.I.R.U.S.: un approccio per una città creativa
Valorizzazione (degli spazi), Integrazione, Rigenerazione Urbana Sostenibile attraverso la creazione di microspazi urbani per il Verde, per l'Ispirazione, per il Riciclo, Utili e per il Sapere 383
Gaetano Giovanni Daniele Manuele

Creatività temporale: dinamismo della città in funzione delle necessità del presente 393
Antonio Pisani

The cultural resources and the re-design of places: the importance of public space in successful creative regeneration 403
Marichela Sepe

Città ri-creative 413
Matteo Verazzi

PAESAGGIO

Rifondare luoghi comuni 425
Fabrizia Berlingieri

9 Eyes di Jon Rafman: Google Street View nella voragine del reale 435
Paolo Berti

La Citta': Creatura Creativa 445
Maria Sara Cambiaghi

Fabbrica Verde
Progetto per lo spazio pubblico dei Cantieri Culturali della Zisa a Palermo 455
Manfredi Leone, Luciana Carapezza

2030+2°C. Un nuovo approccio creativo per la sensibilizzazione sui cambiamenti climatici e il riscaldamento globale 463
Claudia Cosentino, Eleonora Giannini, Dario Felice, Lorenzo Nofroni, Gisella Pisana, Antonio Rizzo, Marco Viggiano

Cartoline dal futuro 471
Rocco Converti

Città creativa come valorizzazione del contesto 479
Alberto Coppo

Un mercato creativo per una città creativa 487
Roberto D'Ambrogio

L'Aquila – Spazi urbani come "link" sociali 493
Dunamis architettura: Stefano Balassone, Lorenzo Cantalini, Giovanna Marchei

LANDesign®: storicamente-naturalmente-creativamente 503
Sabina Martusciello, Maria Dolores Morelli

Creativity-driven change in Public Space- good practices from UNESCO Creative Cities of Literature 511
Milica Matovic

Riusi creativi e sezioni complesse: spazi infrastrutturali per il riempimento di relazione 521
Pasquale Mei, Filippo Orsini, Michele Roda, Luca Salmieri

La città necessaria. Quando occorre ripartire dall'ordinario 531
Chiara Maggi, Rossana Misuraca

Oltre al giardino mi gioco la città! Architetture relazionali e rigenerazioni urbane 539
Letizia Montalbano

Co-Citying - Riattivare i confini infraurbani per la conservazione delle diversità 553
Olivia Longo

Basta un muro. Rinascite urbane tra arte e colore 563
Francesca Sarno

Titolo: Urbs in fabula 575
Chiara Sonzogni

Creatività come necessità.
Il delta del Po come modello per una nuova urbanità. 583
Stefano Tornieri

Città creativa, città biofilica. Integrare la natura nel progetto urbano 591
Simona Totaforti

Urban Space 3.0 - dar forma allo spazio comune 599
Matteo Emil Valente, Carlotta Valentino

BENI CULTURALI

Città minori e Identità creativa 611
Enrico Bascherini

Arte ambientale: creatività urbana e processi di democratizzazione 617
Massimo Bignardi

The representation of socials in maps: map of a great event in Monza Park 627
Cecilia Bolognesi, Andrea Galli

La Città Creativa: L'arte di Rigenerare 637
Serena Borrello

L'arte come processo di rigenerazione urbana - Il Piano di Manutenzione come Strategia di Gestione per le stazioni dell'arte di Napoli - 647
Renè Bozzella

Il patrimonio culturale della città di La Plata in Argentina: analisi e valorizzazione 655
Fabiana Carbonari, Emanuela Chiavoni

Cultura a servizio della politica: aspetti critici nella pratica di Istanbul città creativa 667
Irene Chini

Il paradiso può attendere.
La *street art* come forma di rigenerazione urbana 675
Marina Ciampi

Fare città. Arte pubblica e laboratorio 685
Giovanna Costanza Meli

Follia intravista *vs* creatività consapevole
Gli ex ospedali psichiatrici, spazi (non) pubblici della quotidianità 697
Angela D'Agostino, Giovangiuseppe Vannelli

La città creativa 707
Vincenza Cinzia Farina

Cremona: per una sostenibilità creativa dello spazio pubblico 717
Enrico Maria Ferrari

Il diritto creativo delle città 727
Fabio Giglioni

"La Città creativa sperimentale" 737
Michele Gortan

Quale agency per le politiche culturali e creative? Il caso delle Film Commission 745
Silvia Lucciarini

La Fortezza Vecchia di Livorno, simbolo di una riscoperta e rinascita dell'identità storico-culturale portuale 753
Francesca Morucci, Francesca Pichi

La partecipazione nell'ottica di genere, le componenti e le attività del Laboratorio 763
Elena Mortola

Recupero e riuso del patrimonio pubblico dismesso 771
Paola Rosati

Cantieri di arte contemporanea nei centri minori calabresi 781
Sante Foresta

I percorsi dell'accoglienza: religioso, culturale, politico, shopping 791
Gruppo di lavoro: Renata Bizzotto, Antonella Candelori, Luisa Chiumenti, Fiorenza Irace, Pia Petrucci, Rossella Poce, Raffaella Seghetti, Rosamaria Sorge

Arnaldo Pomodoro: interventi scultoreo-architettonici nello spazio urbano 801
Maria Martina Soricaro

L A C I T T

A C R E A T

I V A / 1 7

C N A P P C

L A C I T T

A C R E A T

I V A / 1 7

C N A P P C

The creativity of *micro-use* in public space

Elisa Avellini *

Keywords: public space; use; micro-use; immaterial; design process

The study of public space, as all architecture and urban design processes in general, usually leads to an analysis that requires precise categorizations. In order to be able to proceed towards a proposal for a change, designers need to produce clear and synthetic representations of the existing condition of a site. Carmona (2010) addresses six *dimensions* that urban designers should look at, to approach the study of the built environment: the morphological; the social; the visual; the functional; the temporal. However, he clarifies that they are deeply interconnected and that they cannot be seen as singular aspects of urban design. On the contrary, they define all together the field for urban design to work on (ibid.).

Such *dimensions*, through which public space can be *unravelled*, tend to put material (and therefore visible) aspects of space first, leaving to consider immaterial aspects as not as relevant as the first ones. Architecture and urban design require tools to physically act in the city: the immaterial, the cultural side is left to social science. This paper will not argue a need for a radical multi-disciplinary approach from architects' and urban designers' point of view, but rather the necessity of acknowledging how the material and the immaterial are intertwined. Design processes should generate flexibility when looking at the effects and mutual relations between these two aspects, which if separated or categorized, might produce an understatement of public space complexity.

Trying to understand how such a complexity can be included into design processes without over-simplifying and reducing it, this paper will focus on the concept of use in architecture and urban design. Through a micro/local scale point of view towards the study of space, the creative processes originating from users' experience will be pointed out. In fact, it will be underlined that the ways space is used unveils how the effects of immateriality are made material, visible, and vice versa.

Can the creative city centre its attention on the micro-dynamics of usage of space, bringing to light the creative process that lay underneath? In order to do so, the concept of use in architecture and urban design will be briefly explored, to open a discussion on how disciplines regarding the built environment can include immateriality in their discourse.

Focusing on a case study, the Tiber riverbanks in the central part of the city of Rome, the possibility of an immaterial use of space will be discussed, as a further category to consider when looking at how people use space. Can the study of use be related to observable activities (Gehl 2011) only? The paper explores how use can refer not only to materiality through anthropologist Setha Low's concept of *embodied space* (Low 2011, 2014, 2017). Regardless of location, using ideas,

experiences and memories to take part in the way people act in urban space, *embodied space* shapes our actions. Linking immaterial use to embodiment, it could be questioned the necessity of bodily presence to acknowledge the happening of some use, as in the case of the Tiber.

The way a space is used reflects the effects of immateriality on the visible, the material. Relationships, memories, ideas of a multiplicity of spaces, being experienced in first person or even just through media, make a difference in how people approach, and creatively use, space.

Use

The analysis of space in use is one of those tasks any architect or urban designer has to undertake when looking at public space. Apart from studying the physical features of a space and the functions of the surrounding spaces and buildings, methods would generally include a minimum of onsite observation to look at how people behave in public space. Do they sit in specific spots? Do they tend to stand? And where? Are there preferred routes within the space? This would help recognize existing patterns of use to be taken in consideration by designers.

This approach can be linked to the work of Danish architect Jan Gehl. Denying any sort of functionalistic approach, Gehl started thinking about cities from a completely different point of view: looking first at how people use urban space rather than focusing only on the architectural object (Gehl 2011). His intention has always been to invert the direction of mainstream design processes: First life, then space and only at the end buildings (Gehl 2013), therefore focusing on the use of public space. In his book *Life between buildings*, he writes «the physical framework itself can be designed so that the desired contact forms are impeded or even made impossible. Architecture literally can stand in the way of desired activity patterns» (Gehl 2011: 54).

He goes on by categorizing outdoor activities in relation to their degree of *necessity* and to how they are affected by the presence of other people and by the physical features of the built environment. In particular, he identifies three main categories: *necessary activities*, *optional activities*, and *social activities* (ibid.). Such activities are related to observable uses of public space, like for example walking, standing, sitting, talking, watching.

Also Whyte (2001) addressed this study from a similar perspective. Through a methodology mainly based on observation, he identified five key elements to consider when aiming for a better use of public space: type of sitting space, nearness to the street, sun, presence of water, green/ trees, food (ibid.). Moreover, he underlined the importance of a further factor: triangulation or the characteristic of a space to gather people together (ibid.). Gehl describes this phenomenon making this example: «the interrelationship between street performers and audience. Spectators A and B exchange smiles or begin to talk while enjoying the skills and talents of the street entertainer, C. A triangle is formed, and a tiny but very enjoyable process has begun to develop» (Gehl 2011: 169).

How to define use though? Jonathan Hill writes «within the term *use* I include the full range of ways in which buildings and cities are experienced, such as habit, distraction and appropriation» (2003: 2). Hill goes on debating the concept of use questioning the existence of an *immaterial* side together with a *material* one, (Hill 2006) stating that «the user decides whether architecture is immaterial. But the architect [...] creates material conditions in which that decision can be made»

(ibid.: 3). Hill challenges the reader to rethink what are the possible ways people can experience cities. Can this be left only to a range of *activities* (Gehl 2011) recognisable through visual observation? Or does using a space include a much wider range of actions that are not necessarily related to either doing an *activity* in that space or even physically being there at a specific time?

In other words, can the concept of *action*, closely interrelated with *use*, suggest an action in space that does not produce a physical outcome (like walking or talking)?

Drawing from Kevin Lynch (1962) and Jane Jacobs (1961) among others, Tonkiss (2013) moves towards a study of public space that does not examine the materiality of space alone. She underlines the importance of integration and diversity in urban form, so to aim at «heterogeneity in terms of users and uses» (ibid.: 54). According to the author, diversity can be interpreted through Lefebvre's (2003) idea of the *encounter*: this diversity is not given exclusively by a variety of uses and therefore activity, but is intended also as social and cultural diversity (Tonkiss 2013).

Yet, these theories might lead to an excessively uniform of what *users* do in space, sometimes looking at ways to predict their actions and, consequently, underestimating the individuality of their experience, as Forty (2000) underlines. A deeper understanding of what users actually do and the meanings behind their material actions can then be a starting point to better value how the forms of the immaterial become visible in public space. Within these forms, a different modality of conceiving creativity could be found; one that pays attention at how the immaterial is re-elaborated and can become visible in public space.

micro-use

Both Gehl (2011, 2013) and Carmona (2010) underline the importance of *life* in space, as the array of possibilities for interaction in space. Studying space in use links primarily to the act of observing and locating *activities*, aiming to a categorisation. This can be argued to be a *material use* of space, that alone might tend to a hierarchical observation of life: Carmona adds «getting the shape and structure of urban morphology right in the first place is thus crucial if the spaces created are to be robust and adaptable, and able to cope with both movement and activity» (2010: 110).

The methodology Gehl has developed during almost 50 years of research and practice is a mixture between a quantitative and qualitative one, starting from defining three different types of activities people do in relations to the quality of the urban space: «necessary, optional and social activities» (Gehl 2011: 11). If the necessary activities (like going to work, for example) are not very much influenced by urban space features, both optional and, even more, social activities are linked to the physicality of urban space and to the possible interaction with other people (Gehl 2011), that the author also links to the concept of *triangulation* from Whilliam H. Whyte's (1980) work. Given this first definition, Gehl moves on trying to explore possible design inputs able to guarantee a better condition for social activities to happen.

How to add an additional layer of use to this framework? Is it possible to consider the concept of *embodied space* (Low 2011, 2014, 2017) as part of an *immaterial use*?

The concept of *embodied space* (Low 2011, 2014) is described as «the location where human experience and consciousness take on material and spatial form» (Low 2011: 467). This

creates a shift, changing the object of research from space itself to *embodied space*: «the actor as a mobile spatial field, a spatio-temporal unit, with feelings, thoughts, preferences, and intentions as well as out-of-awareness cultural beliefs and practices, creates space as a potentiality for social relations, giving it meaning and form, and ultimately through the patterning of everyday movements, produces place and landscape*»* (ibid.: 468).

Thus, local and global scales interrelate and intertwine, just as the idea of *place attachment* (Altman and Low 1992), where physical space is not necessarily considered the final aim of *attachment*, but rather a mean that incorporates our experiences, with no distinctions between the individual and the group (ibid.).

It can then be argued that *use* does not exclusively refer to *materiality*, and that, on the contrary, it could also refer to *other* ways of using space. Low explains that «the body (bodies), conceptualized as embodied space(s), incorporates metaphors, ideology, and language, as well as behaviors, habits, skills, and spatial orientation derived from global discourses and faraway places [...] and yet is grounded at any one moment in an urban location*»* (Low 2011: 464). The way in which this concept is aimed to be used here, is to question the necessity of bodily presence to acknowledge the happening of some use. *Immaterial use* has then to do with *embodiment*, that shapes use at different times and in different spaces, determining multiple modalities of use itself. A last clarification has to be made in terms of this duality: this does not have to be intended as an attempt to categorise a difference, on the contrary it aims to suggest an implied conjunction between *immaterial* and *material use*.

The concept of *embodied space* allows to search for the creative side through which the immaterial is at work in shaping our experience of space. Shifting the attention on the micro-scale of events, it would be possible to understand those invisible processes that could be essential to comprehend the visible dynamics of space. It would be possible to analyse the reasons behind a certain material outcome regarding both visible and invisible matters; as «in order to conceive the immaterial, one must always try to understand it in material terms» (Buchli 2010: 185). The creativity is then recognizable in the continuous elaboration of the material and the immaterial in space. The creative city would then be about a re-evaluation of a much more detailed scale of observation that has to synchronically work with the broader scale of the city. The study of space in use cannot then limit itself to a *macro* observation of space: a study of *micro-use* could help understand the interrelations between materiality and immateriality instead.

With the aid of a case study, the paper will try to clear this idea, in order to then draw some conclusions about the relevance of the concept of micro-use and its creative side.

Case study

21st April 2016. The opening of the artwork *Triumphs and Laments* by contemporary artist William Kentridge is approaching. The event is part of a wider project, led by Rome based non-profit organization Tevereterno, whose aim is to *reactivate*[1] the Tiber, the river of Rome. Also, the mural (situated on the flood-protection walls between Ponte Sisto and Ponte Mazzini) signs the birth of a new square at the level of the river: Piazza Tevere.

1. The banks of the Tiber between Ponte Mazzini and Ponte Sisto (in the background). On the right, a part of the artwork by William Kentridge, inaugurated a year ago. Photo taken by the author, August 2016.

Since the construction of its 10 metres high flood-protection walls along the river section running through the city centre, a physical and practical distance between the city and the river started to develop (D'Onofrio 1970, Ravaglioli 1982). The inauguration of Kentridge's artwork aimed to mark a transition for this part of the river, leading to a formalized state of *public space* for the whole city. The initiative wants to provide the river with new uses, as a need to reactivate and fill a *void* as far as *activities* are concerned: a claim for a *material use* of the river. A year has now passed since the opening of this ephemeral piece, which has already started to slowly disappear from the walls, creating a peculiar setting for initiatives to take place[2].

The immaterial is one of the cores of Kentridge's work and its link to the materiality of place is clear as well. The immateriality of this action is bonded with the aim of gaining a more regular material use of the river, and in particular of the new square. However, the scale of this project is somehow directed towards a macro-scale, both in terms of immateriality and materiality. The immaterial action is, in this case, well visible too and it directly engages with the aim of the organization to reactivate the river. Creativity has of course a major role in this operation: however, it is a creativity intended in a more conventional way, having to do with artistic expression.

Immateriality, though, can also be investigated at the city micro-scales, so to aim at a deeper awareness of space, also in terms of its material functioning. Micro-use could be analysed as a further way to understand the dynamics between space materiality and immateriality, inseparable aspects of the urban environment.

A space so profoundly characterised by material elements, like the riverbanks and the consequent 10 metres high flood-protection wall, can be explored by looking at the nature of its intertwined relations with the immaterial. By doing so, creativity is conceived as a product of this interrelation, getting to new and ever-changing meanings of the material, that change as a function of the immaterial. Going back to the concept of use, its creative side cannot then be reduced to its material outcomes, but rather it has to be investigated in much smaller and invisible matters.

Thus, the river becomes a space for an even wider range of interactions: using that space opens up to *actions* like remembering instead of only walking, or sensory experiencing space instead of only watching. Materiality, within the very concept of use, could then become only one of the variables, rather than a necessary characteristic, gaining a different meaning if centred on micro-uses of space and its creative modalities of expressions. As for the latter, it will then be possible, for instance, to recognize the creative act of memory in relation to space material and immaterial conditions.

In order to identify such aspects, new conceptual and analytical tools need to be taken into consideration by architecture and urban design. As previously analysed, the idea of *embodied space* (Low 2011, 2014, 2017) can be a starting point to look at an immaterial side together with a material one. This would allow to better study the experience of space, and its immateriality, together with the material forms of space, considering people who *use* space not only in terms of their observable behaviour, but also in terms of their creative contributions to shape the materiality and immateriality of space with their experiences.

Conclusions

What this paper has tried to discuss is only a starting point for a different approach towards public space and its design processes. The importance of the immaterial in the creativity that can derive from public space and its use has been underlined through a review of the literature. The concept of use as conceived in architecture and urban design has been explored, stressing the focus of these studies on material and observable aspects of space. The paper then has carried on discussing possible ways of expanding the concept of use, in relation to the immateriality of space and the creativity that can derive at a micro-scale from the re-evaluation of both the material and the immaterial together. *Embodied space*, decentring the object of research away from the material alone, can allow a deeper understanding of how people creatively use space.

There has not been the intention to propose or identify a proper operational tool for architects and urban design to employ. How could architecture and urban design deal with such complex and intertwined relationships regarding use without the risk of creating too limiting categories? In fact, it is argued that trying to design a tool to investigate material together with immaterial aspects of space could fall once again in too tight categorisations or hierarchies. The exploration of the material and the immaterial in public space does not need to be linked to a particular *dimension*, nor a pre-organised set of analysis to perform onsite. It is the looseness of boundaries within these explorations that allows to bring to the surface such a micro-level of interrelations. Therefore, the essay rises the need for a less categorizing way of tackling *actions* in the built environment, as they might not be recognisable from a mere observational study.

The immaterial needs to be valued by designers just as much as the material. To know the dynamics of a space, to be aware of how a certain space *works*, designers need to expand on their objects of analysis. Moreover, to be able to find where the creativity lays within public space, it is necessary to acknowledge not only the relevance of the immaterial, but also its creativity side when comprehended at a micro-scale. By doing so, immateriality, disclosing its tangible aspects, could be employed into a design process. Only then it will be able to produce a similar effect to the one materiality has on design disciplines, positively limiting and framing the boundaries of a project. By exploring the multiple modes through which immateriality is related to the use of space, the creative city can bring to the surface the *micro-uses* incorporated in the everyday, micro/local and apparently invisible scale of the built environment. This creative side can be conceived as a tangible and fundamental variable to consider by architecture and urban design.

Note

[1] from Tevereterno website: www.tevereterno.it.

[2] Tevereterno has been organizing several events to animate Piazza Tevere and to communicate the meaning of Kentridge's artwork.

References

Altman, I. and Low, S. (1992). *Place Attachment*. Boston, MA: Springer US.

Apollonj Ghetti, F.M. (1980). *TuttoTevere*. Roma: Arti Grafiche Pedanesi.

Buchli, V. (2010). Presencing the Im-Material. In: Bille, M., Hastrup, F. and Sorensen, T. F. (eds.). *An Anthropology of Absence. Materializations of Transcendence and Loss*. New York: Springer. pp. 185-203.

Buchli, V. (2013). *An anthropology of architecture*. London: Bloomsbury.

Carmona, M. (2010). *Public places, urban spaces. The dimensions of urban design*. Oxford, UK: Architectural Press.

Cuthbert, A. (2007). Urban design: requiem for an era – review and critique of the last 50 years. *Urban Design International*, 12(4), pp.177-223.

Cuthbert, A. (2011). *Understanding cities*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

D'Onofrio, C. (1970). *Il Tevere e Roma*. Roma: Ugo Bozzi Editore.

Forty, A. (2000). *Words and Buildings. A vocabulary of Modern Architecture*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Gehl, J. (2011). *Life between buildings*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Gehl, J. and Svarre, B. (2013). *How to study public life*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Hill, J. (2003). *Actions of architecture*. London: Routledge.

Hill, J. (2006). *Immaterial architecture*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. (2003) *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Low, S. (2011). Spatializing culture: embodied space in the city. In: G. Bridge and S. Watson, ed., *The new Blackwell companion to the city*, London: Blackwell Publishing, pp.463-475.

Low, S. (2014). Placemaking and embodied space. In: A. Sen and L. Silverman, ed., *Making place*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.19-43.

Low, S. (2017). *Spatializing Culture. The Ethnography of Space and Place*. New York: Routledge.

Lynch, K. (1960), *The image of the city*, Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge.

Ravaglioli, A. (1982). *Le rive del Tevere. Come erano e come sono*. Roma: Edizioni di Roma Centro Storico.

Segarra Lagunes, M. M. (2004). *Il Tevere e Roma. Storia di una simbiosi*. Roma: Gangemi.

Tonkiss, F. (2013). *Cities by Design. The Social Life of Urban Form.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Whyte, W. (2001). *The social life of small urban spaces*. New York: Project for Public Spaces.

* Architect, graduated from the Faculty of Architecture, Sapienza University of Rome, and PhD student in Urban Planning (DICEA - Department of Civil, Constructional and Environmental Engineering; Sapienza University of Rome). Currently doing a Master of Research at the Bartlett School of Planning, University College London.