

1. INTRODUCTION

In Poland, similarly to Central Europe, the first processes of revitalisation were undertaken at the beginning of the nineties. They were significantly delayed in comparison to the first American projects of the fifties and sixties. Revitalisation frequently results in the excellent implementation of projects, which contributes to the multifaceted revival of degenerated public spaces. However, the final outcome, despite significant financial contribution, does not always result in achieving the effects intended during the planning phase. Mistakes made in each phase of the process, as well as during the usage phase may be the reasons for such failures. Since the activities are undertaken on historical tissue¹, an assessment of potential risks as well as finding solutions to limit such risks seems particularly significant for the preservation of cultural heritage. All the more, the evaluation of the revitalisation conducted by professionals may differ from the evaluation made by societies, a local government or an entity settling assistance measures (Fig. 1, 2). It is difficult to consider grading the process as objective if society only sees a narration which consists of successful propaganda proclaimed by the beneficiary of funds.

This paper is focused on selected aspects of the revitalisation process. Among them, special attention is given to the pre-project and usage phases. The need for introducing a uniform evaluation may be supported by the lack of protection of historical buildings which are not registered in the Register of Historical Monuments. Thanks to such a tool particularly the assessment of EU projects could go beyond the utilitarian evaluating. Proposals and comments included in this article, together with other ones advocated in



Fig. 1. Gentrification of Canary Wharf in London. The post-industrial areas revitalization transformed into the business district, resulted in neighbouring, poor area properties rental rates increase. It was followed by the residents move out and traditional services fade away, 2015

dr inż. arch. Piotr Opałka, University of Applied Sciences in Nysa, e-mail: opalka1@O2.pl

¹ In Poland, the term "revitalisation" is more and more often mistakenly broadened to modernisation, renovation, construction of new buildings, etc.



Fig. 2. The retail space commercial success purified from the historical internal tissue (numerous demolitions only with facades remained) and the original development plan. Manufacture in Łódź (source: photo by author, 2015)

the conservation community, could serve to create a matrix for the entire evaluation process.

2. INVESTMENT PROCESS

2.1. Preparatory phase

The preparatory tasks for an investment comprises the planning of the investment process, starting from the idea, the vision of achievement of the goal, including the specification of the financing path and definition of its participants and beneficiaries, up to its final realisation. The decisions made during this phase

have a fundamental influence on the success or failure of the entire enterprise.

In case of financing the project from EU funds, the justification or the attempt of justification of the aptness of an idea is a *feasibility study*. This analytical document is drawn up in order to verify if a given project has good grounds for realisation and if it fulfils the needs of future beneficiaries². Theoretical study should be subordinated to assumptions of the architectural concept or building and working design. In practice, it may be created even during the phase of realisation of the building design. Its content, consistent with a particular Operational Programme, has a fundamental impact on project decisions.

Lack of awareness of final outcomes in this phase may cause a failure of the entire investment processes, including the revitalisation ones. Undertaking an idea, not having had thoroughly examined the financial potential, as well as the needs and possibilities, may doom the entire process to failure. Lack of long term planning is especially characteristic of local governments marginalising public consultations as well as participation of experts who deal with spatial design and conservational matters. A favourable political configuration may present the most powerful argument for prompt realisation of an idea, especially if the initiation of an investment process is a perspective of receiving financial support and not factual needs and potential of a local government. Data recorded in a feasibility study ordered by a local government may justify the need for the most nonsensical investment and a prospect of receiving financial support might override other arguments, most of all the financial and economical ones. Unrealistic aims enclosed in the study imposed by the ordering party may make it worthless or very risky.

² "Feasibility study" means the evaluation and analysis of the potential of a project, which aims at supporting the process of decision-making by objectively and rationally uncovering its strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats, as well as identifying the resources required to carry it through and ultimately its prospects for success (definition of COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 651/2014 of 17 June 2014 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty).

Revitalisation realised in such a manner may constitute a particular threat mostly to historical monuments and complexes, yet the problem concerns also newly constructed buildings. Already nowadays, numerous investments in Poland such as water parks, swimming pools, sports halls or convention centres plunge the budgets of many local governments. Similarly, planning a new function for historical monuments, usually without participation of experts knowing specifications of a matter, may be the seedbed for its rapid deterioration.

During the preparatory phase, the basis for further design works is a functional specification program together with architectural and urban concept. Working out a programme must be proceeded with, among other things, a detailed property condition survey, comprehensive historical and conservational research from architectural and urban angles and appropriate technical trials (geological examination, testing of technical condition), concluded with conservational evaluation and guidelines³. The scope of works may differ in each case. The programme should take into consideration characteristics of a historical tissue, including:

- parameters of an area, capacity and zoning rules, which have to “handle” a new function of the building without damaging it;
- variability of function – as a rule, a planned function is not the last one, hence the scope of interference must not change the authenticity of a monument (the rule of reversibility of conservational actions);
- variability of function with no need of re-interference.

As far as possible, and especially in the case of large monuments, it is necessary to take into consideration the possibility of a multi-option usage programme, including independent media supply. Lacking flexibility in such a function may influence e.g. the decreased rental potential of the offered area. During the preparatory phase, solutions decreasing maintenance costs of the entire building life cycle should be taken into consideration. Focusing merely on the aim which is the adaptation or construction of a building, may override the proportions of construction costs and the building maintenance. In practice, maintenance costs may be several times higher than the costs of construction. Making the final decisions concerning the commencement of the entire process should be proceeded with an analysis of good and bad experiences concerning similar investments.

2.2. Design and execution phase

Revitalisation processes in Poland are regulated by law set forth especially in the act from the 9th of October 2015 on *revitalisation*, as well as in the act from the 7th of July 1994 *Building Law* and in executory orders, the act from the 23rd of July 2003 on *the protection and care of historical monuments* and in the act from the 29th of January 2004 *Public Procurement Law*. It is worth noting that none of the aforementioned enactments, apart from the *Old Monuments Law*, restrict the scope of revitalisation only to historical monuments.

³ J. Tajchman, 2014. Standardy w zakresie projektowania, realizacji i nadzorów prac konserwatorskich dotyczących zabytków architektury i budownictwa (*Standards for the design, implementation and supervision of restoration works on monuments of architecture and construction*). Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa Toruń-Warszawa.

Revitalisation resolution passed in 2015 “specifies the rules and course of preparation, conduct and evaluation of revitalisation” (art. 1). However, it does not define any specific enterprises which have to be undertaken within the confines of revitalisation of a degraded area. It merely defines the general legislative framework concerning its conduct, in which the participants of the process, thanks to their competences and abilities may realise specific goals in an engaged and coordinated manner⁴.

In the conservatory community, the issue of inconsistency and superficiality of legislation, starting with the designing phase to realisation and supervision of conservation works, has been discussed for a long time. Professor Jan Tajchman [7] presented this matter in the form of a nearly ready enactment.

Nowadays, it is very convenient for orders to follow the formula “design-and-build” which is being used more and more in the investment process. Here, working through the documentation as well as all negotiations are imposed on the contractor. The investor, usually a local government unit, reduces the costs of preparing the documentation in favour of half-measures of a functional-utility programme together with architectural-urban conceptions. A specific investment project should be realised on the basis of these two documents within the lump price. In practice, such practices during the execution of works may lead to numerous complications. Some unexpected circumstances, which should be considered nearly as a certainty in case of historical monuments, may pose an additional financial burden. Problems appear most frequently in the case of conducting the investments “taking a shortcut”, in situations when:

- the phase of pre-design conservator’s and archaeological examination is omitted, which may lead to suspending the works in progress;
- factual circumstances of the construction site do not correspond to the construction and working design;
- working design was not prepared or when its scope do not explain new circumstances discovered on the construction site;
- the basis of working out the Bill of Quantities is the construction plan or the functional-utility programme and not the working design;
- the Bill of Quantities is made unreliably, for example does not consider the specifications of a historical monument;
- the participation of experts dealing with conservation matters is limited;
- it is necessary to pay the contractor additional sums for unexpected construction works; investments subsidised from the EU funds do not provide for a possibility of additional financial support;
- the works possible to be calculated were not foreseen (act [11] allows a possibility of increasing the scope and value of the order only up to 20%); it might be problematic to find additional financial means.

Negligence may lead to suspending the construction works in a given field till the clarification of the uncertainty by the designer or to the necessity of conducting additional design works. Suspending the investment always entails a change of the scope and schedule of the works and additional costs, and

⁴ Revitalisation resolution Practical commentary, 2016. Ministry of Infrastructure and Construction, Department of Spatial Policy Warsaw, p. 5.

usually yields failure to meet the deadline of finishing the works. In extreme cases, investments funded from external sources may be threatened with the necessity to give back the subsidy⁵.

Apart from the aforementioned legal acts, in the case of benefiting from an EU subsidy, it is necessary to take into consideration the legislation of the European Parliament and the European Council, concerning realisation of specific Operational Programmes, including especially the one concerning the evaluation. However, the EU regulations do not discuss the matter of evaluation and methodology of the examination of the architectural and urban areas, including historical ones, e.g. concerning aesthetics or ethics. In *Guidelines concerning the evaluation of cohesion policy for 2014-2020*⁶ issued by the Minister of Infrastructure and Development, evaluation performs only the following functions:

- conclusive, aiming at summarising the outcomes of activities and determining the cause and effect relations between the actions undertaken and the outcomes of the projects;
- formative, aiming at improving the quality of the actions and increasing the effectiveness and usefulness;
- socially-political, aiming at increasing the social and political support for the intervention and raising the motivation and co-responsibility of the actors engaged in the project realisation.

2.3. The usage phase

The wrong usage of a historical monument may pose a serious threat to preservation of material cultural heritage. Unfortunately, the current legislation can hardly be considered as favourable for this mission.

The Building Law Act sets for the principles regarding maintenance of civil structures, yet does not concern sufficiently the specifications of historical monuments. Pursuant to the act, the maintenance of a building consists in the duty of keeping the construction log book (art. 6 act 1) and:

- a periodic control, at least once a year, consisting in checking the technical condition (...),
- a period control, at least once per 5 years, consisting in checking the technical condition and fitness for use of a building, its aesthetics and its surroundings (art. 62, item. 1).

Pursuant to the *Building Law*, a building registered in the Register of Historical Monuments is subject to control of "persons possessing *Building qualifications in appropriate speciality*" (art. 62 item 4). In practice, the persons performing "verification of the safe use of a building, its aesthetics and its surroundings" are most

⁵ Napiórkowska-Ałykow M., Ałykow K., 2008. Remonty obiektów zabytkowych – problemy i zagrożenia procesu inwestycyjnego (Renovation of historical monuments – problems and threats for the investment process). [In:] *Renowacje i Zabytki (Renovations and Monuments)* 4(28), pp. 20-23.

⁶ *Guidelines concerning the evaluation of cohesion policy for 2014-2020* issued by the Minister of Infrastructure and Development from the 22nd of September 2015, point 3.1.5., p. 22, which fulfil the obligation imposed on Managing Institution – the Ministry of Development, in art. 56 and art. 114 of the European Parliament and EU regulation No. 1303/2013, dated the 17th of December 2013.

frequently building technicians and engineers. Hence, they are not architects, much less certified monuments conservators, who under the law in force do not have any building qualifications. The usage phase, due to the lack of real control, may then be subject to transformations, about which the provincial monument conservator and construction supervision may not be informed. Insufficient control of the building as well as of its surroundings may lead to destruction resulting from the lack of knowledge of proper usage of a building.

The lack of evaluation during the usage phase of a building may lead to:

- usage discordant with the project:
 - changes to safety conditions (load capacity of a construction, fire safety conditions, occupational health and safety, sanitary condition);
 - not heating;
 - not ventilating;
 - a change of colouring, decoration;
 - using materials limiting the flow of humidity in the wall barriers;
- closing for the users or restricting the access to some building/s – inconsistent with the author's assumptions;
- infringement of copyrights and codes of professional procedures [1, 2].

3. EVALUATION

Experiments conducted on the grounds of already existing buildings and the newly constructed ones may be helpful in the evaluation of the revitalisation process, yet they need to take into consideration the characteristics of historical buildings. First research describing designing processes related to sociology and psychology architecture were conducted in America in the second half of the XX century, at the end of the 1980's, the POE – Post-Occupancy Evaluation methods were developed⁷. Subsequent papers developed the matters of planning and evaluating the functioning of buildings concerning the needs of users of the architectural and urban area, in 2005 r. in the book *Architecture in Use. An Introduction to the Programming, Design and Evaluation of Buildings* by Theo J. M. Van der Voordt and Herman B. R. van Wagen presented research of buildings during the pre-design phase (*ex ante*) and the usage phase (*ex post*) (Fig. 1). However, this research did not take into consideration the characteristics of the historical tissue (Tab. 2).

⁷ More in: E. D. Niezabitowska, 2008. Post-Occupancy Evaluation. The history of emergence and directions of further development. Quarterly of Architecture and Urban Planning LII (2) pp. 22-36.

Table 1. Sample questions for the evaluation of buildings (source: ed. on basis Theo JM van der Voordt, Herman BR van Wegen, Architecture in Use: an Introduction to the Programming, Design and Evaluation of Buildings, 2005, table 5.1, p.143)

Evaluation	
	Ex post
Product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the brief give a clear and complete account of the required or desired user quality and technical quality? • Do the requirements correspond to the wishes of the future users? • Can the design be expected to lead to a usable building? • Is the design affordable? • Does the design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ have sufficient visual quality? ◦ conform with the building regulations?
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How best can the building process be organised? • Who should be involved in the process? • What are the tasks and power of the various participants? • What input is required from future users? • How much time will be needed for the programming phase, design, contracting out and execution? • What information is needed, by whom and when? • What tools are available to ensure that the process runs efficiently and effectively? • What factors might affect the success of failure of the process?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the building being used in the way anticipated by the client and the architect? • Are the users satisfied? • How does the actual energy usage compare with the usage estimated in advance? • What do experts and laymen think about the building's architectonic quality? • Does the building conform with accepted quality standards?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the decision making organised? Who took what decisions, when and on the basis of what information? • How long did the process take, in total and by phase? • What tools were used to prepare the brief, to develop and test plan variants, to coordinate different activities and to monitor costs and quality? • What was done well and what went wrong? • What lessons can be drawn?

Table 2. Sample questions for the historical buildings` evaluation of as a supplement to the table 1 (source: own study edited by the author)

Evaluation		
	Ex Ante	Ex post
Product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the space cubature parameters and spatial disposition bear a new function without prejudice to the monument? • How the proposed scope of interventions will affect the existing historical sub-entity preservation? • What kind of studies and research methods preceded the realization of the project's construction and execution? • What costs will be generated by the object in the exploitation stage/ will it be profitable? • To what extent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the project will intervene into the existing facilities and surroundings? o interferences will be reversible? o The project envisages the possibility of further adaptation and cores of variants. - Please give examples of alternative functions and scope of work necessary to carry out with their efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the object's and the environment function proposed during the programming stage meet the users' expectations? • Did the scope of the intervention coincide with the planned pre-design stage? • What solutions, facilities, could improve the object's function? • Are the costs of the facility maintenance or generated profits consistent with the ones envisaged at the programming stage? • How the object influences the environment (social, economic, economic, cultural, etc.) •
Proces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the pre-design, design and execution phase involve persons familiar with the specifics of the historical tissue intervention? (in regards to every branch) • Was the feasibility study subject to verification by an independent entity? • Was the functional-use program subject to verification by an independent entity? • Were the construction and maintenance works supervised by people with appropriate professional qualifications, including those who know the specific of historical tissue intervention (in regards to every branch)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the decision-making process organized? Who made the decisions, when and on what basis of information? • Were individuals with relevant professional qualifications, including those who know the specific of historical tissue intervention involved (in regards to every branch)? • How were the particular process phases and investment costs reviewed? • Have any of unforeseen circumstances been disclosed?. If so how did they affect the whole process? • How the investment's monitoring was organised and who was responsible for this in the exploitation phase? • Was the assumed budgeted and item schedule exceeded? • What recommendations can be made for other similar investments?

4. SUMMARY

The practice of activities in architectural and urban area exposes numerous undesirable actions during each phase of the investment process: starting with planning, programming, designing, conducting the construction and conservatory-restoring works, usage up to possible re-usage. Analysing the entire process, it is possible to point out not only the weak points resulting from the flaws of the architectural-constructional legislation, but also the loopholes in inspection of the building as well as the processes. Especially the usage phase is not properly monitored.

Due to still extensive reserves of degraded spaces of post-industrial, post-railway, and post-military areas, it is necessary to take into consideration the need of further functional and spatial transformations of such areas. Certainly, future generations, judging the present activities in built-up areas, to a high degree will concentrate on the present manner of development of post-industrial heritage. Hence, it seems necessary to create appropriate procedures of evaluation in the aspect of protection of cultural heritage. At the first stage, entities which would check each of the phases could be appointed. Undoubtedly, it would be necessary to broaden the inspections to the three remaining phases of project, including the pre-designing and usage phases, in which professionals would participate, who are concerned with the subject of the study.

In the author's opinion, despite the fact that evaluation would lengthen the procedures, it would consequently contribute to a significant limitation of mistakes. With time, it could also preclude unfair competition leading to low quality in the completion of tasks and the slumping of prices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kodeks Etyki Zawodowej Architektów, zał. do uchwały 01 III Sprawozdawczego Krajowego Zjazdu Izby Architektów podjętej 18.06.2005 r.
- [2] Kodeks Zasad Etyki Zawodowej Członków Polskiej Izby Inżynierów Budownictwa, wydany 07.01.2003 r., poprawiony 28–29 czerwca 2013 r.
- [3] Masierek E., 2013. Nieudane próby tworzenia w Polsce podstaw prawnych dotyczących rewitalizacji. [In:] Samorząd Terytorialny Miesięcznik 1-2. Wolters Kluwer Polska S.A. Warszawa, 41-59.
- [4] Napiórkowska-Ałykow M., Ałykow K., 2008. Remonty obiektów zabytkowych – problemy i zagrożenia procesu inwestycyjnego. [In:] Renowacje i Zabytki 4(28), 20-23.
- [5] Niezabitowska E. D., 2008. Post-Occupancy Evaluation. Historia powstania i kierunki dalszego rozwoju. Kwartalnik Architektury i Urbanistyki LII(2), 22-36.
- [6] Opałka P., 2012. Problemy projektowe i realizacyjne adaptowanych obiektów i zespołów zabytkowej architektury, maszynopis pracy doktorskiej, Gliwice.
- [7] Tajchman J., 2014. Standardy w zakresie projektowania, realizacji i nadzorów prac konserwatorskich dotyczących zabytków architektury i budownictwa, Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa Toruń–Warszawa.
- [8] Ustawa o rewitalizacji. Praktyczny komentarz, 2016. Ministerstwo Infrastruktury i Budownictwa Departament Polityki Przestrzennej Warszawa.
- [9] Ustawa z dnia 7 lipca 1994 r. Prawo budowlane.

- [10] Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 r. o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami.
- [11] Ustawa z dnia 29 stycznia 2004 r. Prawo zamówień publicznych.
- [12] Ustawa z dnia 9 października 2015 r. o rewitalizacji.
- [13] Van der Voordt T., Cuperus Y., 2005. Epilogue, Architecture in Use. An Introduction to the Programming, Design and Evaluation of Buildings. Delft University Press.
- [14] Wytyczne w zakresie ewaluacji polityki spójności na lata 2014-2020. Ministerstwo Infrastruktury i Rozwoju Warszawa, 22 września 2015.

EVALUATION OF REVITALIZATION PROCESSES

SUMMARY. Despite the large financial resources involvement the final effects of revitalization not always coincide with planned effects from programming phase. The reasons of failure could be errors committed at each phase of the process. That's why it needs to be evaluated especially in regards to the historical buildings and complexes, The article postulates the broad evaluation introduction, from the early, pre-designing phase, during the project's realization up to the utilization phase. Creating the matrix to evaluate both the full process of revitalization as well as the building itself could immensely reduce errors at every stage of the project. For instance, EU financed projects that are subject to evaluation could be enriched with the tool that goes beyond purely utilitarian estimation.

Key words: revitalization, evaluation, designing process