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"We each have our memories of buildings and places, our experiences of architecture that we have lived in or worked in or traveled to see... These memories set a tone for the way we experience the new, since to a significant degree we perceive buildings that are new to us by how they fit into a worldview that is formed by the architecture we have seen before, even if we do not actively remember it"

-Paul Goldberger, *Why Architecture Matters*
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study is to bring attention to the growing trend of new architecture being introduced into existing buildings. Architecture is comprised of a timeline of history and memories that may not be revealed but are still present.

“We perceive ourselves as enthusiastic participants in the ongoing historical narrative, and remain ever keen to personally experience those parts of the story which came before us. Preservation, restoration, and conservation are all factors in the unveiling of the past, and all continue to enrich contemporary knowledge for the benefit of tomorrow.”

As construction moves its way into these older buildings full of history and memory, rather than deleting the past, designers have recently thought of strategies to accentuate the past. Imitation of an old building style is a flawed solution due to unknown knowledge of building materials and construction practices of the past. Due to advancing technologies and possibly lost traditions, styles like the Renaissance and Baroque cannot be imitated exactly as before. Instead, architects have created their own way of merging the new with the old to enhance the existing building by the addition of the new design.

There are many opinions on whether or not preserving aspects of the past is beneficial to architecture. "Ruskin drew instead of promoting restoration. He feared restoration and saw it as a means of hastening the death of architecture." A complete

---

restoration without any new design or architectural insight could be seen as mimicking the past and holding back the designs of the present. The case studies in this paper are chosen in order to show three different situations of a mixture of preservation and conservation work that were successful in their own way. The architects did not hold positions regarding preservation sympathies, but instead worked in the context provided to come up with the best solution for the current state of the existing buildings. In these cases, the point of the work was not to recreate that past, but to respect the past and the changes that have come with the passing of time. It takes skill and attention to detail in order to perfect the completion of a building that takes into account the past, present and future and the three case studies chosen are three renowned examples of this.

Memories are what make designed spaces become places to be associated with time and activities. A building does not have to be perceived exactly as it had been to evoke a memory, rather characteristics and surroundings should spark memories. "The character of our time should be perceptible in our buildings. We want to give our buildings a form that accords with our essential task but utilizes the means available to our age."3 The successful nature of the case studies in this paper is due to their ability to respect a memory, while creating more for the modern place and time.

The three case studies to be presented in order to explain and analyze techniques used to adapt an existing structure to a functional, modern building. The case studies will be explored through the building's history, the architect, and the techniques used in order to preserve the memories of the past. Han's Döllgasts reconstruction of the Alte

---

Pinakothek, Carlo Scarpa's intervention at Museo di Castelvecchio, and Karljosef Schattner's conservation and adaption of the Waisenhaus will be the focus of memory in architecture and how it is possibly locked in place. Included in the research was site visits to each case study location in order to observe and document the building and reactions of the old and new elements. Sketches, architectural drawings, diagrams, photographs and written site impressions were used in order to compare the buildings as well as observe the experience of revealing the memory of the historic buildings.

Using existing buildings as design elements allows architects to create memorials to past events that could be faded in memory throughout time. The case studies show designs that preserve the memory of the old structure, so that even if the old building does not exist, it can still be recognized as a view towards the past, but also a testament to the current architecture. Negative or positive, the recollections of the past are figuratively or literally engraved into every building and transcend through the architecture that is there presently. The techniques employed in these case studies are meant to inspire thinking about possible solutions for preservation architecture today dealing with old and new, in hopes that the solutions may evolve and be developed further.

Döllgast, Scarpa, and Schattner were highly praised and criticized while working on their respected building projects in their treatment of old and new. The analysis of history and memory created by visiting the buildings derives a conclusion to the effectiveness of the incorporation of modern architecture into that of the past seen in the three projects. As much as the history can be studied and essays can be written, the physical, visual, and emotional reactions from a visit to the actual subject reveal the true
effectiveness of the projects. "Everything tells us something about the age in which it was made and in some way signals us as to what that age was. One of the things that characterize great or even very good architecture is that it has meaning that lasts far beyond its time."4

---

CHAPTER II
ALTE PINAKOTHEK

Figure 1. The Alte Pinakothek Southern Façade (Photo by Jessica Stuck)

Architect| Hans Döllgast
Born| 1891
Died| 1974
Location| Munich, Germany
The current Alte Pinakothek in Munich looks as if it is an incomplete building, in the process of being finished; rather, it is a historical monument that physically and emotionally documents the past. The original building was built in 1847 by Leo von Klenze as a neo-Renaissance art gallery and exhibition space. The revival of the Renaissance structured the symmetry and repeating rhythm of the architectural elements in this building. For Munich and Germany, the Alte Pinakothek was the most important gallery of paintings in the world. Citizens took as much pride in the artworks as they did the actual building. For this reason, the mourning and devastation that was triggered by the World War II bombing of the Alte Pinakothek was long lasting and heartfelt.

In 1939, at the start of World War II, the Alte Pinakothek was closed and the artworks were sent into storage. Munich was the capital of the Nazi movement, which prompted the British and allies to target the city as a bombing site. Consequently, the Alte Pinakothek was bombed heavily in 1944 and 1945, which left the gallery with partial external walls and a burnt, unrecognizable interior. The much revered building was extensively destroyed by the war, which left the question of whether reconstruction or demolition was necessary.

The actions of Hitler and the Nazi party before and during the war were something many German citizens wanted to forget rather than create monuments honoring the horrific events that occurred. The goal of the bombings was to physically damage the city, but also emotionally separate the citizens from their traditions and culture. “When physical traces of a place are destroyed, even annihilated, the victors aim
to create hegemony thereby eliminating the memory of icons of that community.”

Rather than allowing the allies ruin architecture that dates back before the Nazi party had influence on Munich, it was decided to reconstruct the Alte Pinakothek in order to preserve its history. Art had always been an important aspect in the German society and was extremely important during the war. The people of Munich had already lost loved ones and buildings, losing something that had the possibility of being saved seemed careless.

“Munich would be as ‘inconceivable’ without the Alte Pinakothek as Paris would be without the Louvre.” Seven years after the war, the decision was made to keep the building and Hans Döllgast was given the challenge of preserving this part of the city of Munich. Not only was Döllgast dealing with limited surviving structure of the old building, but he was also held back financially. At this point after the war, Germany had incurred a large debt due to the war costs, and money could not be spent on expensive materials and intricate designs for the restoration of the building.

The lack of funds seemed to work well with Döllgast’s design, since he did not desire to copy the original work of Klenze. Döllgast was able to take the Neo-Renaissance building and preserve its strongest characteristics, while adding a layer of history and modern German design. He creatively reconstructed the museum in his own way so that even though the old and new were not similar; they preserved the building’s

---

history through a harmonious design. The original building, the mournful memories of
the war and the low budget post-war construction all present themselves throughout the
reconstruction.

The south façade of the Alte Pinakothek after the war showed the most visual
damage, since there was a 45 meter segment missing due to the bombing, shown in
Figure 2. A clear definition is created between the original ornamentation on the façade
and the added, simple, rather plain façade that Döllgast designed. The reconstructed parts
which create the separation between old and new are positioned behind steel pipe
columns which were only intended as temporary design solutions in order to build a new
roof for the Alte Pinakothek. The materiality of the additional structure is not consistent
to match the materials of the Alte Pinakothek designed by Klenze

Figure 2. The Present South Facade of the Alte Pinakothek

“Perfectionist renovation, which would produce a false relationship between the
building’s historicity and appearance” 8 was not the answer to the reconstruction of the
façade. The renewed southern façade reminds people of the financial difficulties of the
era in which Döllgast was working. His original idea for the façade was to create a

8 Rosenfeld. 187.
curtain wall in order to distinguish the new North to South entrance axis. The concept of placing glass and steel construction next to weathered stone materials would have made a very sharp distinction between the design and the original. Döllgast was unable to see the completion of his first design idea based on the budget for the project; instead he had to rethink the design.

While debating what strategy to pursue for the design of the south façade, protection was needed from the elements, since the building was empty and exposed for seven years after the war. In order to build a roof, structure was needed at the south façade where the bomb had damaged the wall. Steel pipe columns were installed, originally these were temporary in order to allow for construction on the new pitched roofs to begin. Döllgast needed to come up with a simple and economical solution to the Southern façade, which seemed to be leading to a solid wall.

The most economical material to fill in the solid southern façade was brick rather than the existing stone of the 1847 building. In a way, these bricks are also a reminder of the devastation and loss that the bombing caused, leaving the city in a state of disrepair. Before renovation started on the Alte Pinakothek, the site had become a ground for rubble for the nearby Turkenkaserne. The bricks used in this structure were large Bavarian bricks, which differed from modern brick. The bricks were not a new material to Munich nor the building, but they were used in a way that was new to the aesthetic of the buildings’ façade. Not only was the use of these bricks economical, but bringing in bricks from a lost building extends the memory of another Munich structure.
A brick façade has a different character and is worked with differently than a stone façade. Detailing brick is not similar to stone, nor was the intention of Döllgast to have the brick to perform as the original façade. The ornamentation of Klenze’s façade is erased in the restoration of the façade. The only thing similar is the shape of the windows throughout, keeping with the rhythm of the existing neo-Renaissance style. The distinct fracture between ornamented façade and plain façade creates an outline of the bombing incident, which is a symbol of the destruction that the bombing caused. Figure 3 shows an ornamental Klenze façade bay and a Döllgast bay on the south facade, where the separation is clearly visible.

“The scars of war and damage due to weather were still visible on the facades of Klenze’s building: cracks in the masonry; scuffed stonework, at times robbed of its profile; numerous gaps in the facing brickwork and the bare parapets of the two, now flat-roofed head-buildings”9

Döllgast did not have to restore the façade just how it had been, instead he took the basic and simplified forms of the existing façade and translated them into a modern design that was appropriate for the age.

For maintenance of the initial proportions and rhythm, the only aspect of the old façade allowed to remain the same was the form of the windows. Everything else was designed in order to engage the idea of the original Alte Pinakothen without imitation. New aluminum downspouts were added to the façade, but in a pattern that would not deviate from the symmetrical characteristic of the original design in order to assimilate to the proportions created by Klenze. The steel pipe columns echoed the Ionic columns of the loggia by placing them in the existing rhythm. Original lintels were replaced with

9 Altenhöfer. 98.
plain concrete beams, which lack decoration, but present a modern element in the presence of old. These elements work together and the façade becomes harmonious as a singular idea.

Figure 3. One Point where the New and Old Facade of the Alte Pinakothek Meet
Memories of the interior of the building were mostly the same; the inside still functioned as a museum of artworks. The major change that Döllgast made to the floor plan of the building was the axis of entry. In the original design, Klenze had the entry of the building located on the east side of the building, with a loggia running the entire south side (highlighted in Figure 4). Döllgast decided to relocate the entry point, and place the main entry on the South facade in the middle, to not break the symmetry. Because of damage and function, the stairs had to be moved, which helped enforce the new entry decision. What had been a grand loggia was torn down and replaced with a long, monumental staircase. Figure 5 shows a diagram of the former floor plan access and the new design constructed by Döllgast. The underlying idea of the space still exists through the new design, preserving the construction and thematic function of the old loggia that Klenze intended.

Figure 4. First Floor Plan of the Alte Pinakothek Denoting the Former Loggia and Current Grand Staircase
Although Hans Döllgast was able to restore the Alte Pinakothek in a fashion that honored the original architecture and also memorialized the devastation of World War II, some people believed it would be better to just temporarily restore the Alte Pinakothek this way and fix it later once the funds were available, rather than keeping a building that was repaired in an era of poverty. “What years ago could have been justified as an admonitory memory of the wartime destruction simple appears shabby in a [city]…that is increasingly returning to its former glory.”\textsuperscript{10} There was a push for the government to have the museum rebuilt once the city was beginning to thrive again, but it never succeeded. Döllgast never intended his design to be the final design for the building. He believed that as time advanced, more design and effort would be put into restoring the building to a more finished composition. His primary goal was never to keep the history and memory of the past events and historical struggles in the building. Döllgast simply was working on a budget and reconstructing an important landmark for Munich.

\textsuperscript{10} Rosenfeld, 186.
CHAPTER III

CASTELVECCHIO

Figure 6. Castelvecchio Courtyard (Photo by Jessica Stuck)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Carlo Scarpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Veneto Region, Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verona, Italy is a city in the region of Veneto that started as a Roman city on the River Adige. Before the expansion of Italy, Verona’s northern geographical location made it an important stronghold for the Romans, who struggled to defend it. The Adige River was the border of the settlement lying at the west of the actual city of Verona. The Roman Gate was built to surround the city and be used as a defense mechanism against intruders. At the point where the Castelvecchio is located, the Roman Gate, Porta dei Borsari still stands amidst the additional protective structures.

Verona had been a contested territory throughout its existence and spanning over many wars. Verona and especially the site of Castelvecchio saw the Guelph and Ghibelline Wars, Venice and Duchy of Milan wars, the Napoleonic Wars, the Wars of Italian Unification and The Great War. Each war brought changes to the site of Castelvecchio, but at all times over its seven centuries, it was an important defensive area for Verona. The Ponte Scaglieri was fortified in order to create a safe exit path to Germany in the case of fleeing during any military conflict which further provided a need for Castelvecchio.

The Romans had placed the Arch of Gavi on this site when they first established Verona as a city in their empire. In the 8th century, the Church of San Martino in Aquaro was built here and in the 12th century, the commune built a city wall on the site of the Castelvecchio. In 1354-1356, when Cangrande della Scala had the castle built as his largest residence in the Ghibelline city, he incorporated the buildings previously on the site in his design.
During the 18th century, under Napoleon, the French damaged much of the history that remained on the site of Castelvecchio, but also added to the building. The Arch of Gavi was taken apart and the moat that was present was reduced in size. A building to serve as a barracks for Napoleons army was added, which closed the defensive wall off by its L-shape. Likewise, during World War I, the castle was used by the army and bombed heavily.

The end of World War One and the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 brought the end of extreme importance to Castelvecchio due to the border of Italy being moved north. No longer was Verona to be a heavily contested area during military struggles, which is why the castle was turned into the Verona Art Museum. From 1923 to 1926, during a Fascist regime in Italian history, Avena and the architect, Ferdinando Forlati worked on converting the museum by converting original walls and adding other buildings. Interior work consisted of Fascist imitation of Renaissance murals and the reconstruction of medieval rooms. The facades of the Napoleonic wing were rebuilt in the Gothic style with other destroyed palaces found locally.

The Galleries were decorated with 16th century and Baroque decoration, while Gothic doorways and windows changed the façade to make the Castelvecchio a more utilitarian structure. More European wars led to damage of the Castelvecchio with World War II being one of the most disastrous. The estate was used as a prison by the German army, which led to bombings. The important escape route of the Ponte Scaglieri was bombed so heavily that it had to be rebuilt, as well as a majority of the complex by 1947.
With the end of World War II, brought the end of Fascism in Italy and the cultural values of Italian arts were becoming more important. Licisco Magagnato was the director of the Castelvecchio and wanted a change for the museum. “The museum has become a landmark that is still rich in relevance to the closely connected problems of restoring ancient buildings and preserving historic urban areas.”\textsuperscript{11} Licisco realized the impact that the Castelvecchio had on Verona and wanted it to be transformed into an art museum that would highlight its importance, which is why he argued for Carlo Scarpa to redo the museum in 1957. Figure 7 shows the history of the addition of structures to the site through its history, ending with Scarpa’s intervention.

Carlo Scarpa was educated at the Venice Academy of Fine Arts, where he studied sculpture and painting. He had always been around Venice and Veneto architecture working in architectural offices, as a site manager, and eventually in Murano as a glass manufacturer. Scarpa was isolated in Venice and not in the circle of architects during his time, which gave him an individual style that was based on the Veneto vernacular, rather than relating to the political and architectural influences of his time. Scarpa was introduced to modern architecture by Wright, from whom he learned imitation and Alvar Aalto, from whom he learned how to deal with materials and light. Scarpa had an extensive background in interior renovations, especially dealing with art and how it was viewed, which made him a smart candidate to intervene at Castelvecchio.

Figure 7. Progression of Additions to Castelvecchio
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Initially in 1957, Scarpa was restoring and adapting the first 2 floors of the Castelvecchio to become an art museum, but as he continued, his restorations took over the whole complex. “Scarpa’s designs constitute so many experiences. Hence the analogies that link them together and also their intrinsic difference.”12 The work that Carlo Scarpa did was executed in three stages in the period after the war starting in 1957 and continuing until 1973. Scarpa dealt with every detail of Castelvecchio during the restoration, but the exterior was hardly touched leaving its presence and magnificence intact. By keeping the exterior similar to before, the upgrades to Castelvecchio helped to restore the urban fabric of Verona, which had been lost.

The three phases of restoration were all in effort to link the gallery with the palace in order to create a large museum, to the liking of Licisco Magagnato. The first step of the reconstruction, or rather deconstruction of parts of Castelvecchio was cleaning and the uncovering of the historic traces left in the complex. The Reggia Wing, where the former palace used to be, was discovered first: Medieval frescoes were found, bricked up windows towards the river were opened and the staircase in the Torre del Mastio was uncovered. One of the most important discoveries of the process of discovery was the Porta del Morbio which revealed the road from the della Scala period and linked it with the Scaglieri bridge. This doorway was the only connection between the building’s two wings that were separated by the Scaglieri moat which was also discovered. Due to the geometries of the moat and the importance of these features to the complex, Scarpa demolished Napoleonic rooms and the 19th century staircase. This is an important

12 Dal Co and Mazzariol, 24.
connection between the courtyards of the palace and museum that had been closed off in the 18th century. Here, also the 12th century commune wall was rediscovered and the city was relinked to the Scaligeri Bridge by the 17th century cobbled passage under the street.

The second stage of the process of rebuilding Castelvecchio started in 1959 and dealt with choosing what to do with the uncovered historic aspects of the complex. Most of the Napoleonic structures were harmful to the nature of the old fort but still important in their own right. Some of the Napoleonic wing, especially the grand staircase, that was against the medieval walls was destroyed in order to reveal original ramparts. “He opposed the destruction of ‘every thick wall, hence every closed volume’; he opposed modern ‘libertarian anarchy,’ which in its flight from the formal rules of the Renaissance had become slave to building regulations; he also opposed purism, which had created ‘nothingness around objects,’ reducing space to bare stereometrics and simplicity to banality of form.”

Through his excavation, Scarpa tried to save as much as he could of the important previous structures, while adding a new layer of his architecture, which worked on top of the old.

On the ground floor of the museum, Scarpa restored the sculpture gallery collection, but changed the entrance and approach to the gallery. Scarpa was primarily interested in the space and viewing experience of the artworks, which was reason why he pulled the artwork from the walls and brought in natural lighting. In the spaces where the Napoleonic structures were taken out, Scarpa had designated a platform for the Cangrande statue to sit at this location. In addition, he rebuilt the floors of the second

13 Crippa, 49.
storey painting gallery, built new exit stairs, and put new offices in the east of the museum.

The third phase of restoration which started in 1964 showed Scarpa’s intervention and design through his remodeling of the central courtyard. Scarpa laid out the main entrance and had to redesign the lawns to reflect the change in door location. He designed the library for Castelvecchio that went into the Napoleonic section by the north east tower, then completed his works in 1973 with the Sala Avena over the library. The unique characteristic about Scarpa’s design, even though after 1973 his work technically was over, was that he left his drawings unfinished with notes everywhere in the margins. “The work often remained open: it could be carried on by experience, by life, by the existence of others in time.”14 On paper, Carlo Scarpa no longer intervened with the building of the Castelvecchio, but through his designs, the building was constantly being added to, even if not physically.

Through excavation, Scarpa was able to find stone, marble, and brickwork from the past and couple it with his knowledge of Verona in order to create a building that matched with the cityscape, and also pay homage to the past. Scarpa used materials from Verona and the past architecture like whitewash, gray mortar, and glossy stucco in order to absorb the local colors of the city. The modern style Scarpa showed through his design was consistent with the forms and essence of Verona, which were joined together in the restoration of Castelvecchio in order to instill a memory of the past.

“Castelvecchio, where the walls, the internal and external spaces, are a total work that speaks of Verona’s history, the civilization of forms, the beauty of her places,

---

14 Dal Co and Mazzariol, 14.
the millenary accumulation of eras-from the Roman ruins Scarpa discovered under the foundations to the medieval paths along the Adige, to the overwhelming encounter with Cangrande, to the works installed along the spacious circuit, rhythmically punctuated by the exquisite and restrained elegance of the décor, so that even the memory of the previous century is retained as testimony to a time reaching down to us: a monument of life, a form of history in the making that lives into the present age.”\textsuperscript{15}

Carlo Scarpa successfully used the strategies of demolition, change and modification to intervene with the buildings of Castelvecchio. An essential part of his architecture was using memory during the process in order to create a dialogue between the old and new. Scarpa highlighted the richness of the past and all the historical moments that occurred at Castelvecchio through his organization and detail of the spaces, which culminated in the placement of the Cangrande statue. His subtle use of new elements and forms juxtaposed to the existing created a physical historical timeline of the art and architecture of Castelvecchio.

By moving the entrance to the Castelvecchio museum to the northeast corner, Scarpa created a linear organization through the spaces, based on chronology. As an extension of memory, the history of the structure is treated as place along which time is experienced. Scarpa carefully chose where he would intervene in the complex in order to unfold the history in chronological order to explain the Castelvecchio and its artwork to the visitor. By demolishing certain parts, he lets the archaeology of the building’s past reflect the history, while adding to it.

\textsuperscript{15} Dal Co and Mazzariol, 16.
“Scarpa leaves a pause in his architecture where he wants to show the evolution of time through his design…show memory in drawings through arrangement.” 16

The museum is set up as a linear path along which aspects are pointed out in order to highlight the history or time period and provide historical clarity. Scarpa was trying to reach “the sentiment that time instills in art“17 in order to use the progression of the artwork as an aid to the progression of the spaces. The evolution of the artwork as well as the architecture exhibits a growing and changing through the years. He trusted time to fuse all aspects of the building while creating a new identity for the space as time advances. In his work, as well as in the museum, Scarpa takes layers of history and flattens them to be seen all at once, in one journey.

Scarpa designed the progression of time through his placement of the artwork in chronological order, as well as creating a linear path for the visitor to follow. “I set a paired steel beam to support the point where the two reinforced concrete beams crossed, so indicating the main lines of the building’s formal structure”18 The path is reiterated by his modern additions of steel beams to the space that structurally supported the floors above in addition to acting as directional lines. The visitor is moved through space that is split up by sutures between time frames where Scarpa inserts paving, catwalks, stairs, beams and other functional yet organizational elements. At these points between different phases of intervention and time, tension points are created in order to allow realization of a change or part of the collage of history.

16 Dal Co and Mazzariol, 27.
17 Crippa, 150.
The sequence of the building (shown in Figure 8) starts at the entrance from the courtyard, which leads the visit through the Romanesque sculpture gallery with works from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, outside the building with views to the Cangrande Statue, then through the Porta del Morbio and up a staircase in the Torre del Mastio. A bridge leads from the tower to the Reggia gallery which consists of two floors of Veronese and Venetian paintings from the Middle Ages until the fifteenth century, mostly Gothic and Renaissance. After viewing these artworks, the visitor returns back through the Torre del Mastio and across a bridge that passes by the Cangrande statue into the Upper Galleries of the original castle, which hold paintings from the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries. The last room visited, the Sala Avena, is also the last room that Scarpa designed and then the exit is down the stairs, through the same threshold as the entrance.

“History itself is a place and can claim all of the characteristics of one: mutability transitoriness, and ephermerality. The situatedness of history means—for a living person—having time and world…man’s transitoriness is projected, in partial compensation, onto this endless backdrop that is history”\(^\text{19}\)

As a visitor is moving along the timeline of the Castelvecchio, the details that Scarpa paid close attention to help define the old and new. Scarpa’s work always dealt with the intimate scale of detail in order to “revive the continuity of history without resort to historical pastiche, by pursuit of craftmanship which mixed traditional materials and

\(^{19}\) Dal Co and Mazzariol, 11.
forms with contemporary ones.”20 Instead of repeating the details that had been present, Scarpa took the shape and made it inspire his modern form that would be placed in the space. Much of the modern details added were to accommodate for the museum requirements of light, progression, and function for the works of art, but also were based on Scarpa’s adoration of the joint.

Figure 8. Plan and Sequence of the Castelvecchio Museum

Scarpa realized the Gothic and Renaissance elements of the buildings and accentuated the orthogonal aspects in order to create a unified idea, but his details created

a clear separation of time period. The first detail Scarpa tackled was the symmetrical façade and windows. The original façade was rough in materiality and organic appearance, but in the existing Gothic windows, Scarpa added his own Mondrian-esque details (Figure 9). The geometric additions filter the craft of the existing windows, as well as the light from the exterior. The Gothic tracery was redefined by iron and wood framed windows that helped reflect the artwork of the interior that had no relation to symmetry.

Figure 9. Detail of Castelvecchio Window

The treatment for the windows was copied in the treatment of the original walls and the new surfaces added. The detail of the separated floors which appear as platforms for the artworks is in the distance given from the wall. The materials around the edges of
the platform were changed to not only add another level of detail, but to also distinguish a space between the old and new through materiality and physical location. The orthogonal floor inserts were designed so that they would not interfere with the naturally rough and unsure nature of the irregular pre-existing walls. The gaps separating the new floors and the patterns on them would fit into the makeup of the old building to create a reference point for unifying history at the Castelvecchio.

The new floors allowed the artworks to be pulled away from the walls as a practice of accommodating the visual affects created by light and space on art. Along with the windows and floors, the doors connecting the spaces were treated in a detailed door made of woven flat steel. The intricate door was set right before the arched opening that had stood previous, showing the craftsmanship of the grill, in addition to the intense arch structure of the past. In the space over the Cangrande statue, the roof is segmented with a copper roof that varies from the red tile of the previous roofing.

“History displays to the full the features of a material, of an obstacle, of a mosaic tile to be developed: like a tree, a running brook, a wall, a hedge, a piazza. In its materiality history is subject to those same approaches, to those same dialogues of self approximation, to those solemn dynamics by which the detail imposes itself …perceived repository, the machine of memories and the past of a city.”

Scarpa designed every detail of his additions and treatment of the old structures so everything had a place and reason that could be traced back to the time period it is from. Every connection and aspect of the project was thoroughly thought out.

Through his work with detail, Scarpa managed to create a dialogue between his new work and the existing parts of Castelvecchio. His choice to demolish things and keep

21 Dal Co and Mazzariol, 19-20.
others was in order to reveal the seams in the moments in time and also add to the conglomeration of history. Scarpa’s intervention within the Castelvecchio “gains its power from its juxtaposition with the existing building rather than as an independent new construction.”22 Placing his new modern ideas next to the remaining structure of city walls and the Cangrande palace helps distinguish the architecture of every time period. Scarpa collaged the existing material together with his designs to create an independent but unified focal point for the building.

The process of juxtaposing old and new objects reveals the built up history present at the Castelvecchio and also allows visual seams to join the various pasts together at one location. The place where the Napoleonic staircase was removed to reveal the old walls of the city as well as other Napoleonic structures, Scarpa placed the Cangrande Statue (Figure 10). The Cangrande statue had three previous locations that were unsuccessful in concluding the design of the Castelvecchio. The statue was first located in the courtyard, then at the entrance, then in the statue gallery and finally at its current place, where it can be isolated in the break between time periods. “If there are any original parts, they have to be preserved…these voids are the medium which both connects the two eras and points out their intrinsic differences.”23 The void created by tearing down the Napoleonic architecture shows the archaeology of the pre-existing buildings, allowing the craftsmanship of the Cangrande statue to stand out against its backdrop.

---


The statue stands right outside the uncovered Morbido door, where it breaks up the orthogonal design of the initial floor of the Castelvecchio as well as the connective paths on the exterior. This stimulates the memory of the integration of different time periods through focusing on one single statue. Since the statue was placed on the exterior, there was need for protection from the weather, which enhanced the separation of history through materiality. The beams from the old roof were extended over the statue, resting on steel supports. The new roof, which is green copper to oppose the red tiles, has stepped edges that stagger away from the existing commune wall of Verona. Scarpa shows these materials across time without interrupting the flow of the building or the historic building fabric, creating a harmonious intervention.

Castelvecchio “attempts nothing less than the revelation of the structure of a historic phenomenon, peeling back the onion-skin layers one by one.”24 These historic layers of the former castle all are different and have their own characteristics that are seen through the progression through the museum. The detail and relationships created through the juxtaposition of old and new reveal more about the past the architectural language they create. The building does not glorify just one time period of the past and also does not overpower the existing elements with modern flare; the refined craftsmanship Scarpa created in the Castelvecchio, “mediated by materials and forms”25 lets the visitor accept the discontinuity of the history of Verona and the castle.

---

24 Jones and Canniffe, 123.
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Figure 10. Cangrande Statue (Photo by Jessica Stuck)
CHAPTER IV

EICHSTATT WAISENHAUS

Figure 11. Waisenhaus Northern Façade (Photo by Jessica Stuck)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Karljosef Schattner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Eichstätt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eichstätt is a small Catholic university town located in a river valley in Germany, between Munich and Nurnberg. Initially, Eichstätt was set up as a monastery in the 8th century by St. Willibald of Wessex. The town became the seat of the Prince-Bishops of Bavaria in the medieval age, which created attention for Eichstätt and led to architectural growth during the Renaissance. The materiality of the buildings in Eichstätt is mostly stone, found locally and most of the architecture focuses around the Catholic Church and religion. The Swedes sacked Eichstätt in 1633-1634 during the 30 Years War, and much of the Renaissance architecture was lost. Italian Baroque architects were brought in during the 17th and 18th centuries to rebuild the damaged buildings. Unlike the Alte Pinakothek, Eichstätt was not targeted in the bombing of World War II, sparing another layer of restoration and rebuilding.

During the Renaissance, the Waisenhaus on Ostenstraße in Eichstätt was originally a large house built in 1581. A second similar house was added with a small alley between it and the old house in 1695, doubling the living area of the structure. During the Baroque restoration of Eichstätt in 1758, Maurizio Pedetti combined the two Renaissance houses as one building. The current Prince Bishop established an orphanage, which was to be housed in these two Renaissance houses which were now linked with a single Baroque façade, but remained two separate buildings. Time took its toll on the building and renovations were needed in 1910, but after World War II, the orphanage was no longer needed and the former orphanage went through a series of program changes. After the war, the building was used as a kindergarten and then it was used as a hostel for
the homeless. Eventually, no use was found for the building, when the last tenants moved out and the building lay vacant.

In 1958, the Catholic University of Eichstätt was founded and started renovating old buildings for use as university facilities. Karljosef Schattner was employed as the Architect for the Diocese of Eichstätt at that time and he designed and restored the historical buildings of the area for the university. Ten years after the vacancy of the Renaissance houses, the university was looking for spaces to expand the departments of Journalism and Psychology. This came at about the time the altered (Figure 12) Waisenhaus was going to be torn down. The university acquired the former orphanage in order to house their additional programs. In 1985, Schattner started work on the restoration.

Figure 12. Progression of the Waisenhaus
Schattner studied architecture in Munich under Hans Dollgast and others, where he gained inspiration about “fulfilling the form, but preserving the wound.” Schattner focused on the way that Dollgast completed the Alte Pinakothek and used this to influence his design decisions when restoring his buildings. Schattner was working under different conditions in Eichstätt; he did not face war damages or economic setbacks when restoring the buildings in Eichstätt. One special characteristic about Schattner and his work is that it all is concentrated in one area, so he was a master of local materials and vernacular. For Schattner, studying the work of Dollgast was enhanced by traveling to Italy to experience works by Scarpa and Giancarlo de Carlo. From Scarpa and the Castelvecchio, Schattner learned the “way of separating the preserved historic substance from new work “with a scalpel.” Schattner learned how to assess a building, to know when to address the historical importance and when to add his own intervention, which culminated in his work at the Waisenhaus.

The importance of the history in the Waisenhaus is not the Renaissance house that it once was or the Orphanage that was housed there for most of its existence; rather it is the story told about its history through its layers of generations and architectural styles. When Schattner started work with the Waisenhaus, the building was in such poor shape that some thought it should have just been torn down. Plaster was off of the damp walls, the windows were removed and bricked up, and the staircases were rotted out. The project was not only a reconstruction, but before design, the structure and integrity of the building had to be addressed first.

26 Jones and Canniffe, 214.
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Schattner had the task of converting a building that had been the subject of conversion many times and was in need of a new face and purpose, while still paying attention to the historical context of Eichstätt. The people of the city were afraid that they would lose what is familiar to them if the Waisenhaus was torn down or altered. Schattner knew how to enhance the historical building in order to please the citizens due to his close attachment to the city.

“Many conversions are done in pragmatic and careless ways, ignoring history and shoe-horning in the new programme, letting the pain show. Schattner’s type of conversion is much more difficult and reinterpretation is essential, both to find a fit between contents and vessel that is unstrained…When he adds a strong new layer to the building’s history, the old layers are not so much cancelled or contradicted as set in chronological perspective, while the newness allows the inhabitants to enjoy their fresh habitat without feeling shortchanged.”

Schattner had previously worked in Eichstätt and his designs caused some controversy due to their modern and minimal characteristics. Citizens were worried “about the sharp juxtaposition of old and new”

The German traditions and memories created in these places throughout the evolution of the town were extremely important to the people of the religious place.

Common styles of architecture in Eichstätt included gables, bays, architraves, columns, transom windows, and symmetry. The Post-Modernist pieces that Schattner designed for the city seemingly had nothing to do with any of the previous parts.” An art which has life in it does not restore works of the past but rather takes them forward into the future.”

---
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to add his time stamp on the city in order to reflect the changing architecture of his career.

“In the past, towns were subject to constant change. Reconstruction, extension and new work were the order of the day, and past architecture was viewed as building material.”31 In the restorations that Schattner designed at the Waisenhaus, he yearned to achieve a unification of the buildings through placing modern elements in the context of the historical buildings, therefore using the past as a platform for designing the future. Schattner was given full control to reinterpret what aspects of history he wanted to preserve and include in his new design of the buildings. Initially, Schattner decided to restore the Baroque façade that faces the street, as well as the Baroque interiors. The building was in such a ruinous state, that work on the interior was completely necessary in order to return the Waisenhaus to a usable space. The floors and doors were torn up and replaced to be utilized in other places. Uncovered murals and ceilings were restored to their former glories, while the exterior of the building was left to provide a new decoration for the urban space.

The front, six story façade (Figure 13) was recreated on the south, and the 18th century east façade was also restored. The north side and the interstitial space between the twin houses is where the most prevalent details of new design came from Karljosef Schattner. The connecting walls that unified the two separate houses were torn down and a new design introduced a new concrete north façade, in front of the existing, with unglazed openings. For the purpose of fire code, two new fire stairs(Figure 14) were

31 Stock, 30.
added between the old and new north facades. The alley was reestablished for the first
time since Maurizio Pedetti joined the two sides of the orphanage. The steel and glass
staircase is located here in this significant central point for the building.

Figure 13. Southern Baroque Facade of the Waisenhaus (Photo by Jessica Stuck)
Reimplementing the Baroque design of the Ostenstraße facing facade was a necessary design move for Karljosef Schattner in order to avoid changing the character and presence of the Waisenhaus. With its counterpart across the street, the Summer Residence, the Waisenhaus’ presence is fundamental to the townscape. At the point in the street the Waisenhaus resides, it becomes tight due to arrangement of the buildings, and also the larger facades hugging the street. These elements are powerful and create a
gateway to the rest of Eichstätt that lies beyond that point, shown in Figure 15. Since Eichstätt has such a vivid religious history, the Summer Palace of the Archbishop holds great esteem and importance for the city and creates a dominant image for those entering the city. The Waisenhaus shares the entrance, emphasizing the importance of religion within the city of Eichstätt.

Schattner did not just focus on treatment of the façade; he also reinvented the alley space created between the two buildings, as shown in Figure 16. He tore down the addition that Pedetti created by joining the houses in order to re-establish the symmetrical divide that was used to separate the female and male sections of the orphanage. The sides lining the alley way are the original Renaissance facades with the original window holes still intact. Pedetti had also added an addition to the back of the houses, which when removed, revealed the original Renaissance house backs as well.
Schattner carefully dealt with the alley space and juxtaposed his architecture next to that of the existing facades in order to highlight the past, with the present design. The alley that once separated the boys and girls, would now separate the Psychology and Journalism departments, but would be used as an entry point for both. Schattner inserted a central, steel staircase in the gap between both houses, which also became the axis of entry through the buildings, reinforcing the original symmetrical design. The staircase has an artistic quality to it, but is engineered and precisely detailed to pay tribute to the Baroque attitude of staging the ascension and descension of staircases. The use of steel as a previously unintroduced element in this space, Schattner is “making legible new
‘entries’ within the ‘document’ of the building.” 32 Instead of keeping the median space closed in with solid walls, Schattner’s inclusion of glazing to zone off these areas helped clearly distinguish the historical work from his own work, even though they were together. The use of materiality and the art of the joint were factors in showing a modern addition into an historic building, while still honoring the building strategies of the past.

The alley was complimented as a buffer space between modern architecture and the past with the introduction of a northern façade (Figure 17) detached from the existing structures. For functional reasons, fire stairs were added to the back of each of the two separate houses. The placement of these stairs between the existing façade and a new masonry screen wall was an effort by Schattner to reunify the buildings as they had been when Pedetti combined them in the Baroque style. The space between both facades is a roofed layer between the exterior and the usable interior space creating a “portal-like gap” 33 revealing the layers of the Waisenhaus.

“The façade is no longer experienced as a threshold between the inside and the outside.” 34 Schattner redefines the façade of the existing building without altering what is actually there, and uses the space created to transition between his modern elements and the past. The façade designed by Schattner is a light concrete painted that has unadorned window like holes that mimic the façade of the Renaissance houses behind it. As an abstraction of the old façade, the screen wall references the previous with its
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slanted steel apertures that point to the doors and windows of the façade behind (Figure 21). The detail that was put into the openings of the concrete wall refers to the old while contrasting it as well.

Looking at the building, there is wonder of what lies beyond the unadorned white, perforated structure. This creates an urge to discover what is behind the façade, which is heightened by the openings in the wall that lead to another layer of the original structure and its history. “Architecture is the reflection of its time. In the course of centuries layers emerge. The joints between these layers should not be slurred, they should remain visible. History is made visible through these joints.”35 Schattner literally layered the history of the Waisenhaus to distinguish the passage of time, architectural styles, and materials.

35 Schattner,53.
Like Scarpa, he uses physical space in order to merge a new idea into an existing context without uprooting the initial characteristics. He was not trying to fuse all the historical layers together or imitate the architecture of the past, but through simple, rational modernism he uniquely contrasted the houses of the Waisenhaus.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

All three case studies employ some form of addition of old to new dealing with buildings full of personal, cultural, and political memories. In all cases, modern elements were respectfully incorporated with existing structures in different ways, for different reasons. As learned from visiting each site, the character of the work of each of the three architects is apparent and beneficial to the building as viewed as a whole. Each work of architecture is responsive of the context surrounding them and the context of the time period of which they were built.

The Alte Pinakothek was built in a post-war period of economic crisis for Germany, which resulted in a restoration on a budget. The financial constraints weighed heavily on the design as well as political factors, but the result acts as a reminder of the war and the struggle that came after it. Döllgast had many other ideas that would have suited the design of the Alte Pinakothek in a more modern style and that would have replaced the hole caused by the bombings, but the funds and support was insufficient at the time to realize his design ideas. Döllgast may have treated the old and new differently if he could have avoided the monetary problems or if he believed his restoration was not just a temporary fix to enclose the space. Even as a temporary solution, Döllgast still carefully managed to respect the existing structure while incorporating new elements among the Alte Pinakothek.
Approaching the Alte Pinakothek, the vast green lawn surrounding the north and south facades are littered with people relaxing, reading, and playing games. Whether those people are there to appreciate the building and work of Klenze and Döllgast or just to enjoy the weather, whenever they see the Alte Pinakothek, they see the restoration without going inside (Figure 18). As if the part of the façade that was bombed was removed and replaced with a less decorative brick carbon copy, the Döllgast pieces stand out. The building acts as a visual documentation of an important event in Munich’s history that will not be forgotten. Functionally, the Alte Pinakothek is a museum showing off some of the finest artwork that Germany has in its collection, which has always been the goal of the museum. In both ways, Döllgast was able to preserve the memories of the museum as a collection of priceless artwork and as a monument to the affects and struggle of one of the worst wars in history.

Döllgast’s economical and respectful solution was able to record an instant of time through permanent structures that continually acts as a memorialization to the war and the love of art. The conclusion that can be taken and expanded from the work in Munich is how to commemorate a history of place or certain events through architecture. Even with struggles in the design process, the Alte Pinakothek is perceived as a complete building that flows regardless of the interaction of old and new. Neither money nor public opinion affected the finalization and completeness of the design, which is one thing that can be learned from this case study.

Scarpa also had to deal with the damaging aspects of military activity when intervening with the museum at Castelvecchio. In contrast to Döllgast, Scarpa was not
limited in his funding or in his design ideas. His decisions had the full support of Licisco Magagnato and his material and design choices were not questioned during his long time working on the museum. It was not Scarpa’s intention to preserve every aspect of all of the existing buildings at Castelvecchio, but creating a dialogue between old and new was a relationship he explored in his architecture. Scarpa was not fearful of demolishing parts of Castelvecchio in order to reveal a greater amount of history that could be found, but he also knew when not to intervene and preserve the existing structure.

Figure 18. Diagram of Damaged Facades of the Alte Pinakothek

The Castelvecchio museum contains centuries of artwork laid out on a linear path to be followed by all visitors, starting with the sculpture gallery. From the exterior, before entering the complex, the concept of a castle is still present due to the limited intervention Scarpa had with the exterior of the complex. Most visitors enter on the drawbridge over the old moat or from the Scaglieri Road through the old city walls. The first things that attention is drawn to when entering the museum would be the Cangrande statue and the entrance at the opposite end (Figure 19), which both break up a seemingly uniformed symmetrical façade. With a closer look and especially from the interior of the sculpture
gallery, the orthogonal work within the Gothic windows reveals the modernity within the historical context. As the spaces progress, the end of the sculpture gallery comes with a steel grated door in front of an archway to the exterior. At this point, it seems the museum may not continue further, instead, the exterior acts as a transitioning space to a new section of the museum which is also a new time period being revealed through the progression. The complexity of the gallery and buildings can be overlooked and the whole project can be viewed at as a collage of eras of history compiled and on display in one place.

The process of being introduced to new sections of the complex and new artworks along the way continues through the Reggia Wing and back into the upper galleries. At every stage, it feels as if a new museum is being entered, due to the different architectural styles and the differing artworks. Scarpa designed Castelvecchio to respond to the years of history that he uncovered on this site in Verona. Beyond his attention to detail and adoration of the joint, the experience at Castelvecchio was designed around the feeling and sequence of the place which revealed the memories and history hidden amongst the ancient walls.

The feeling of the sequence as a person moves through the space is one of the strongest aspects of Scarpa’s design. Combining so much history and memories into one complex in such a successful and complete fashion is a hard achievement and Scarpa realizes this through his timeline sequence. Especially in European countries, the idea of being able to add on to an already colorful history, while respecting the past and being an innovator in modern design is a learning tool that should be researched. Scarpa’s work at
Castelvecchio is a noteworthy project that flattens the relationship of old and new in order to chronologize the building.

Figure 19 Castelvecchio Entrance Sketch

Unlike the Alte Pinakothek and Castelvecchio, the Waisenhaus in Eichstätt had never been a museum or an important defense for the city. Schattner is a very unusual architect because most of his works are concentrated in the same city and for the same client. Schattner had all options open to him in design since he had been working for the Catholic University of Eichstätt and they trusted his design. When the University recovered the Waisenhaus for the purpose of expanding, like Schattner had done in other Eichstätt buildings, he planned to use the existing building. Restoration of the old houses
and additions were functional so that the building could be used again, but also so that a boundary between the past structures would be defined.

Eichstätt is a very small city dominated by the Catholic University and the architecture of KarlJosef Schattner, but intermixed with historical Renaissance and Baroque buildings. Upon visiting the site, the Waisenhaus is extremely hard to locate when approaching it from the west where the train station is; it is one of the last university buildings and the Baroque facade makes it blend in with many other surrounding buildings. The street is wider approaching from the east, but at the point where the Waisenhaus and Summer Residence face each other, the street narrows and a gateway is created. The presence of the road narrowing and the buildings closer to the street gives a prominence to this location.

After entering the university area, the Waisenhaus façade is a conservation project. The interface of old and new is revealed as one enters the alley. The alley shows a distinct division between two buildings that is unnoticeable from the exterior. Schattner’s rear façade is placed away from the existing façade, creating an interstitial space (Figure 20). Schattner worked for the Catholic Church, which has a history of respecting and honoring the past, which lead to a lot of the institutional approaches that Schattner used in his design.

The visual recognition of the Waisenhaus as two different facades creates the memory of the joining of the two buildings, but still realizes their separation. The new facade is perceived as an abstracted whitewashed facade with square punches in it in lieu of windows. The angled steel of the openings of the new façade make a notion to call out
and emphasize the apertures in the existing, historic façade, as diagramed in Figure 21. Schattner does follow the Catholic Church in his techniques to highlight the past, but he does this in a non-institutional way which can be seen in the interference between the old structures. In the alleyway, he places modern design columns directly in front of the façade of the historic building (Figure 22), which could be seen as being disrespectful to the pre-existing. In reality, this feature does more to create a boundary for the portals that are present where the old interacts with the new.

*Figure 20. Interstital Alley Created Between Facades of the Waisenhaus (Photo by Jessica Stuck)*
In dealing with the alley and adding the modern façade before the historic façade of the Waisenhaus, Schattner is able to politely mimic, in a modern way, the Renaissance facades without trying to redesign or copy the exact craftsmanship of the existing. The process of entering in the alley and passing through the separate back facades experientially documents the history present. Passing through the created old and new conflict points leads you to the past, which is masked when the building is first viewed off of the street. This less subtle way of dealing with placing old and new by each other is effective and a notable solution to the problem of old and new.
Upon visiting the sites of the case studies, the visions of the architects were revealed in order to show the effectiveness of their design efforts. Döllgast employed memory triggered by visual projections, while Scarpa used a flattening technique to reveal layered history and Schattner used an experiential memory in order to preserve the history and footprints of past spaces so they were not lost in their modern designs. More studies and investigation can go into the processes utilized in these projects as older structures are increasingly becoming a material for architects in the modern world. The strategies presented in these case studies are just the beginning of what can be done and
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what will be done in future project dealing with the relationships created by new and old structures.


