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Starting from the urgent problems and complex challenges for the conservation of stratified landscapes, places of the synthesis between human activity and nature, the volume presents the results of a research project that involved since 2008 the cultural site of Crapolla, located on the southern slope of the Sorrento-Amalfi Peninsula and within the Punta Campanella Marine Protected Area.

Paradigm of landscapes where a thousand year old history has settled and where the emotional values emerge with strength, because of the presence of spring waters and of hills jutting into the sea, of the etymological allusion to ancient myths and gods, the site of Crapolla is full of a dense sense of the sacred. With it, the deep cracks of the rocks and the dizzying height of the latter assure a romantic aura to the whole. The deep “gorge” includes impressive buildings referable to ancient usages of the place, a port for sailors, site for the storage of food and for the supply of fresh water. The forms of architecture of the monazeni embedded into the rocks, the ruins of a Medieval abbey, the imposing mass of a sixteenth-century tower witness all the high strategic significance that the cove has assumed in the historical landscape of the Peninsula over the centuries.

In the symbiosis between sublime nature and architecture, the landscape of Crapolla is, at the same time, very “fragile” and at risk of oblivion. The research here published, together with the numerous studies and experiences carried out in Italian and European contexts, face with rigor of analysis and active approach many issues related to the understanding of the intangible values – i.e. anthropological, literary and social ones – and of the physical and construction characteristics of the artifacts and the landscape.

This is in order to highlight, through an integrated methodology of research, a coherent approach from the small to the large scale for a programmed preservation of the cultural landscape so as to prevent, through restoration and with the involvement of the local communities, the irreversible loss of precious vestiges of the past.

A partire dalle cogenti problematiche e sfide complesse connesse alla conservazione dei paesaggi stratificati, luoghi di sintesi tra azione umana e natura, il volume presenta i risultati di un percorso di ricerca che ha interessato dal 2008 il sito culturale di Crapolla, posto sul versante meridionale della Penisola sorrentino-amalfitana ed entro l’Area Marina Protetta Punta Campanella.

Paradigma di paesaggi nei quali è sedimentata una storia ultramillenaria e nei quali le valenze emotionali emergono con forza, per la compresenza di acque sorgive e di rilievi strapiombanti verso il mare, per l’allusione etimologica ad antichi miti e divinità, il sito di Crapolla è intriso di un denso senso del sacro. Con esso, le profonde spaccature nelle rocce e l’altezza vertiginosa di queste ultime conferiscono un’aura romantica all’insieme. La profonda “forra” accoglie fabbriche imponenti riferibili ad usi antichi del luogo, approdo per i navigatori, sito per la conservazione di derrate alimentari e per il rifornimento di acque dolci. Le architetture dei “monazeni” incastonati nelle rocce, le rovine di un’abbazia medievale, la possente massa di una torre cinquecentesca testimoniano tutti dell’elevato significato strategico che l’insenatura ha assunto nel paesaggio storico della Penisola attraverso i secoli.

Nella simbiosi tra natura sUBLime e architettura, il paesaggio di Crapolla è, al contempo, particolarmente “fragile” e a rischio di oblio. Le ricerche che si presentano, intrecciate a molteplici studi ed esperienze condotte in contesti italiani ed europei, affrontano con rigor analitico e slancio propositivo molteplici questioni connesse alla comprensione delle valenze intangibili – antropologiche, letterarie e sociali –, nonché delle caratteristiche fisiche e costruttive dei manufatti e del paesaggio.

Ciò con l’obiettivo di evidenziare, attraverso una metodologia integrata di ricerca, una coerenza di approccio dalla piccola alla grande scala per la conservazione programmata del paesaggio culturale allo scopo di prevenire, attraverso il restauro e con il coinvolgimento delle comunità locali, la perdita irreversibile di preziose testimonianze del passato.
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Pasquale Miano

From panorama to landscape. The case of Punta Corona in Agerola

There are many designs that pursue the staging of land as panoramic view. There are of course many projects designed with this very purpose, such as certain magnificent scenic roads and cornices, or dwelling houses whose large windows open onto the landscape (...). They instead are the relations between forms of the land, landscape, their photographic representation and designs to signal inspiring avenues of research. The landscape is not only panoramic vista; photographs allude, represent its sensitive characteristics and open to an interpretation of the design as their description\(^1\).

The Punta Corona Tourism Park project, developed in the context of the design competition launched by the Municipality of Agerola, focuses on this aspect highlighted by Paola Viganò. Punta Corona is an observation point for a wonderfully attractive scenic view, but it is also, and above all, an interesting and multifaceted landscape, which will be reconfigured through the design.

The project area is in fact characterised by a very specific morphology and a landscape configuration that derives from the particular structure of the valley, crowned on three sides by the Lattari Mountains, an agriculturally rich terrain with evidence of historical and cultural value, and which takes on a huge positional value as an extraordinary “terrace” on the Amalfi Coast. Historically, the relationship between Agerola and the coast is built on outstanding vistas and views, reinforced by the network of paths, communication trails between mountain and coast, paths endowed with spectacular scenic qualities, which suggest conditions of continuity, so often underestimated.

The Punta Corona Park project has the emblematic goal of grasping two potentials: the enhancement of an entire area of Agerola, partly flat and agricultural and partly more rugged terrain of ancient chestnut forest, recently converted into chestnut production, and at the same time the development of a prime viewing point overlooking Conca dei Marini and Praiano, which is an integral part of a much more varied and complex landscape.

---

Any design assumptions for this area must take account of not just these intertwined and inseparable goals, but also the situation regarding preservation obligations that apply to the area – a situation that has led to a degree of stasis and ossification and in some instances the potential scrapping of the project. We are well aware that for areas which are highly sensitive in terms of hydrogeological balance and environmental landscape, the slowdown of operations and the abandoning of the project can even play a positive role.

But the area of Punta Corona identified by the Competition Rules is not an area in its purely natural state. On the contrary, it is an area where a series of precarious and incomplete methods of use have been pursued, altering, through multiple small and unfinished actions, a landscape of a completely original character. Despite this, the clarity and particularity of the morphology effectively expose the layers of a recognisable landscape, a “palimpsest” landscape, according to the famous definition of André Corboz. In this case, the preservation of the landscape is only within certain limits, the preservation of the physical conformation of the land. More than anything else it is the preservation of a process,

one that reveals to us the modes that caused not just the transformations, but also the unfinished and unstable aspects, which are waiting for a more effective systematisation.

For these reasons, the design for this landscape, where we get glimpses of natural and historical-cultural elements, frozen by the restrictive regulatory regime, has been structured as an investigation into the characteristics that distinguish it. This has also led to a reflection on the landscape of Punta Corona, on the ways of artificialising the natural elements, through reinterpretation of the concept of panoramic landscape.

With this in mind we have singled out three components of the landscape, each representative of a part of the Punta Corona Park project:

- **the terrace**, as a system of anthropization of the steep slopes towards the coast, constructed in drystone walls of local stone and accessible through stairs and stone paths, partly using the same local stone;
- **the path**, as a system for crossing the woods, where the less difficult routes have been consolidated through the continuous transit of the human population, with the location of safe routes handed down from generation to generation;
- **the ager**, or medium-size cultivated field, embedded in a mostly flat system with slightly staggered levels and arranged with walls placed against dry earth.

As Paola Viganò says, «these materials are not so much poor but commonplace, modest or ordinary; in a certain sense trivial, faithfully reprised from the real and reassembled as if, through them, the contemporary context is expressed, not in the sense of mimicry, but of representation and knowledge. Underlying it is the potential autonomy of the single element, the idea of heterogeneity as a value (a position previously supported by Laugier) and therefore the opportunity offered by deconstruction».

In this sense the three identified components have become, appropriately reconstituted, design elements, or in other words, they have become the building blocks of the park project.

There is a long, established tradition of the formation of parks in the contemporary city, which regard the urban environment not only in the strict sense, and which also constitute a precise and tangible reference point. Punta Corona potentially falls into the debate on the formation of large territorial parks at regional level, but it also presents a situation – the characteristics and the potential for a true urban park. The ensemble taken into

---

consideration in fact appears as a unit in terms of perception, about three hundred meters in length and two hundred wide, a controllable site, easily walkable in a short time, and yet articulated and varied. We need only recall the considerations of Benevolo on this fundamental aspect of the dimensions of parks. In any case, this fact further strengthens the choice of grouping together the entirety of the competition areas of Punta Corona, as areas that possess the initial conditions that may favour the siting of a park. In this sense, the story of Punta Corona as a park is similar to many other parks that have been created in the course of history where conditions have allowed it, in that it positively reverses the theme of abandonment.

Looking again at the Abbot Laugier and his idea of the park as unity and variety, it is possible to describe Punta Corona as a park, referring to the three areas identified and their different characterisations.

For the belvedere, the work has been based on the theme of terracing, i.e. the artificialisation of the rocky outcrop. From this perspective the arrangement of the part underlying the existing plan has become especially important. The strengthening of the containment walls, the inspection and safety of the crowning of the rocky part represent the opportunity to be able to suitably equip this important perimeter walkway, gaining also a further advanced viewing point of the coastal landscape, the perception of which thus becomes changeable and not locked into a fixed objective.

This possibility is boosted further by establishing a new belvedere point through the construction of a terrace on the rocky platform below the plane of the current belvedere, thus exploiting the existing containment walls. This intervention therefore allows us to create a further viewing point with a much more advanced perspective, to create a “landmark”, an element of recognition visible to those coming from the Amalfi side of the coast.

This last aspect is very important in view of the fact that the Punta Corona Tourist Park
is presented as an element of territorial worth, capable of attracting the interest of the huge tourist flow on the Amalfi Coast. An element, visible from the twists and turns of highway SS 366 – itself closely integrated with the natural and landscape components – that can help attract the curiosity of those unfamiliar with Agerola and Punta Corona, without in any way becoming an obstacle or an “annoyance”. Instead, it strengthens the area’s peculiarities and exceptional qualities.

The extension area to the west of the belvedere was conceived of a continuation of the same viewing point, but retaining its currently visible character, through the creation of a grass-covered, walkable parterre with benches and paths.

The belvedere and its extension are enclosed and held together by a single demarcation indicator configured as an element of recognition and specificity within the park. This is a wooden pergola, a linear structure bounded above and laterally by a series of wooden slats along which local creeper plants can be arranged. This perimetral element gives a clear definition of the area in relation to Via Casalone and the chestnut wood, helping to make the belvedere area more contained and identifiable, perceivable as a collective space of the park. Additionally, in order to thoroughly capture the breadth of the “view” and the panoramic character of the site, it was thought useful to introduce an element of balance through the sharp demarcation of the area on the opposite side. On the other hand, the pergola is not arranged merely as a clear and compact border, but simply as a diaphragm, a filter through which the belvedere and the chestnut wood can be reciprocally glimpsed. This new architectural sign also accommodates the entrance to the belvedere, in the form of an artificialisation of the still perfectly recognisable natural element. Access to the panoramic terrace is in fact through a very different spatial context, i.e. the trees, shade and short visual rays that characterise via Casalone and the area of the chestnut wood.
Through the filter of the pergola, the abrupt brightness of the free space of the belvedere is perceived, but it does not immediately reveal its natural component. The perception of nature on the terrace, a free plane suspended towards the horizon, is eventually carefully dosed out, enhancing the spectacular and surprising impact of the final panoramic view. The pergola area also houses the bar kiosk and the service block, previously existing elements that were however constructed in a somewhat haphazard manner. Both were designed as mobile forms of architecture simply ballasted to the ground and equipped with the bare essentials so as to enjoy the area in the summer and winter months.

Considerable importance attaches itself to the arrangement of the rocky cliff top ridge underpinning the extension part. It is to be achieved by reshaping the existing rocks and supplementing them with paths and ramps in local stone and removable wooden platforms. This will make possible the controlled and safe use of the areas most accessible from the slope. This configuration, as well as the scenic walks, offers the possibility of organising outdoor events. Also in this way the view is “activated” becoming, through the various staging possibilities, the background of a dynamic situation and not simply a view. The lower platform can in fact be used for performances while the intermediate platforms are set up as proper stages, accommodating groups of about twenty spectators. This new
terrace artificially represents the most advantageous viewing point to enjoy open-air shows.

Summer events can be staged here also, thanks to the green parterre space of the belvedere extension, space, which can be used, for example, as an area for film screenings. To do this, the western part of the intervention area was designed with the option of temporarily mounting a system of rotatable platforms, conceived as “temporary architecture”, which could be set up in different configurations. This reaffirms our desire not to project a unique and definitive image, but rather the idea of a landscape that can still evolve, in harmony with its fundamental prevailing characteristics.

The belvedere is connected to the various intervention areas through the network of paths in the chestnut wood, which connects both to the existing plane and to the belvedere path, without stairs or other obstacles. In this way it also ensures good accessibility to the entire panoramic area.

The means of crossing the chestnut wood was based on the characterisation of the internal trails, intended as pathways through which you access different areas with various specialised functions, organised around small squares, simple points of enlargement of the paths. In this part the woods clearly prevail, with few artificial elements, and this is intended to strengthen and emphasise the peculiar traits of the existing morphology.

For the wider area, arranged towards one of the inhabited centres of Agerola, there is a resumption of the turf clods at staggered levels, the “Ager”, with specific functions assigned to them. This part of the project is functionally more complex because it includes a variety of tourism and recreational activities, as requested by the Competition Rules. The mix of intended uses, in fact makes this part of the park a reference point for the network of paths, the itinerant coastal tourism and the local food and wine tourism. The current “clods” trend of the area has not been modified. Indeed this specificity has been absorbed into the underlying idea of the project: each plane, with a slightly staggered altitude, is characterised by a specific function. The perimeter loop path and the transversal path crossing the three plots represent a unifying element of the various planes. The secondary network of internal routes ensures the functional continuity of the intervention. The mild discrepancies in altitude will be shored up with traditional “drywall” in local stone. This design approach is well described by Sara Marini when she says

Among the existing layers you seek new lands, you look at products that no longer make sense; not to recover them, but to welcome the prospect that they pose. New themes emerge from the incorporation of sidelong glances on what is discarded (...). In fact, if every day you choose and you throw or leave something, these bits of history, although personal, are selected to enrich lists, records: then perhaps this second life, these new lands that unfold (...) pose the question that the problem, the new opportunity, is not in the objects, but in the manner in which they are arranged5.

The abandoned green planes are arranged with this approach so as to accommodate, at the south-eastern part, the parking zone that serves the entire area, with a capacity of about 60 cars, direct pedestrian access and permeable paving to the north-east. The botanic gardens were sited at a higher level. These contain aromatic plants and extensive flowerbeds featuring combinations of various colours. To the west, below newly planted Red Oaks, is the camping area and adjacent to that, the volleyball courts and football pitch integrated with the natural trend of the ground.

The central strip, the spine of the entire park, is then located along the main north-south path, is mostly free and is arranged as a grass parterre for the organisation of festivals, fairs, and outdoor events. The northern part of this strip is equipped for shows, with benches and a removable stage.

Two pavilions, serving the entire park, adjoin this central strip. The buildings complete, define and identify the open places of the park, taking shape as forms of architecture defined in relation to the general system, or in other words as structural elements of the open space. This also allows us to move beyond the interpretation of the buildings of the park as elements of furniture or, at any rate, of autonomous superimposition. These structures, which reflect in any case a typical condition of temporariness, are endowed with a unifying role between the various sectors of the park. Hinging on the building in existing stone, in which the pathways info-point will be housed, there are plans to install a greenhouse pavilion, simply ballasted to the ground. This will also be the venue for a ristobar. Wooden slats, similar to those of the pergola situated in the first lot, can be closed in winter and opened in summer months or arranged as protective shelters for outdoor tables. The bota-
nic gardens of aromatic herbs – which enhances the level of biodiversity within the zone and where is a greenhouse is planned – can be equipped with tables and chairs in the spring and summer months. Along with the addition of the pavilion-greenhouse to the pre-existing block, a wooden tower is planned, which will offer amazing views over the entire Agerola valley, and, beyond the chestnut trees, the distant horizon of the sea.

The second installation is located on the opposite side, parallel to the large central space. Constructed in wood and simply ballasted to the ground, it houses the campsite facilities and a small sauna and massage centre. This element ends with a large platform that accommodates a water tank above ground, also integrated with the natural trend of the ground, arranged as a solarium and central gathering space for the camping area. The football pitches and volleyball courts are freely distributed around this part, integrating with the natural features of the area. The ring circuit path, along with the existing chestnut woods, surrounds and encloses this recognisable pattern of ground.

The three areas, each with their own functional and morphological characters, are held together by a system of paths, a system of weak tracks that cross the different areas of the park. A central thoroughfare, predominantly rectilinear with a cross section of 2.50 metres, allows a direct connection among the three lots. The main course is “stretched” between the two cornerstones of the park – on the one hand, the existing volume, situated in the innermost area, rearranged to accommodate the paths infopoint with the adjoining greenhouse pavilion in conjunction with the ristobar – and on the other, the belvedere. Tracing the western edge, the central path deviates and follows the rugged relief of the southern part of the area looking out towards the coast, then widens into loops and folds, thus building a complex system of terraces at staggered altitudes, which ends at the lowest and farthest point of the area of intervention. The park road is particularly significant, it originates from existing roadways, following a sinuous course through the whole area of intervention. The road has been completely rebuilt in its material component and transformed into a wide vehicle-passable driveway in stabilised earth. In this way the existing road becomes the main path of the park, ensuring necessary through-access for the residents of via Casalone, and providing better integration with the entire system of open spaces considered in the project. Still on the road-park theme, a ring connection road has been designed, running around the innermost area and acting as the main border and distribution path. The width of the section and its flat course also render it suitable for a great variety of uses (walking, cross-country sports, horse riding). The network of internal paths that cross the different areas of the park is conceived of as a system of paths with a 1.80 metres section. This allows the usability of all parts of the area and the functional continuity of the spaces, which are characterised differently depending on the functions fulfilled.

The various proposed interventions allow us to transform the potential conditions for the formation of the physical elements with which to construct the park. This step is very important, but should not be construed as accomplished. The consolidation of a landscape as park is the result of a slow and gradual long-term process. The task of the project was to engage this process and to develop a part of the forward progression.
che concorrano al valore paesistico. L’applicazione cieca di quell’istanza consacrata la conservazione di tutto ciò che si è fatto, in un’aggregazione illimitata e acritica che impedisce ogni diverso percorso e inverna l’infelice espressione di Ranke, secondo il quale «wie es eigentlich gewesen ist»: un fatto è ciò che propriamente è stato; così lo storico e l’operatore contemporaneo sono ridotti alla funzione di semplici astanti ed enumeratori del passato.


Il caso Fuenti è in tal senso significativo: la massiccia edificazione sulla costa, a picco sul mare, di un grande albergo, in un’area di grande valore paesistico. Dopo molti anni e molte vicissitudini giudiziarie, i proprietari vengono costretti alla demolizione, ma ottenno un contentimento: l’edificazione di una beauty farm con stabilimento balneare a mare, che sarà costruito in cemento armato, per meglio difendersi dalle mareggiature. Esempio ancora esploso, ma poi definito nell’esecutivo dall’ufficio tecnico comunale, di una conformazione della vallata, coronata su tre lati dai Monti Lattari, ricca di meraviglie, che assume un enorme valore posizionale di straordinaria “terrazza” sulla costiera amalfitana. Il rapporto tra Agerola e la costiera si struttura storicamente su scorci e vedute straordinarie ed è rafforzato dal sistema dei sentieri, vie di comunicazione tra montagna e costa, percorsi caratterizzati da notevoli qualità panoramiche, che delineano condizioni di continuità, spesso sottilissime. La realizzazione del Parco della Punta Corsona si pone emblematicamente l’obiettivo di cogliere le due potenzialità: la valorizzazione di un’area intera della Costiera Agerolese, in parte pianeggiante a vocazione agricola ed in parte più accidentata, caratterizzata da un antico castagno sylvatico, recentemente convertito a castagno da frutto, e nello stesso tempo la valorizzazione di un panorama panoramico privilegiato a strapiombo tra le Conca dei Marini e Praiano, che è parte integrante di un paesaggio molto più vario e articolato.

Qualunque ipotesi progettuale per questa area deve tener conto di questi obiettivi intrecciati e insindacabili, ma anche della situazione di vincolo di protezione integrata che caratterizza l’intera area intervento, una situazione che di fatto ha determinato una condizione di blocco e di cristallizzazione e per alcuni versi ha anche favorito l’abbandono. In realtà, l’area di Punta Corsona non è un’area naturalistica allo stato puro, anzi al contrario è un’area in evoluzione, in modo precario e incompiuto, sia pure persegue modalità di utilizzazione, alterando,
attraverso molteplici piccoli interventi, un paesaggio dai caratteri asso- lutamente originali. Nonostante ciò, la chiarezza e la particolarità della morfologia consentono di evidenziare gli strati di un paesaggio ricono- scibile.

Nel caso specifico, la conservazione del paesaggio è soltanto entro certi limiti, la conservazione della conformazione fisica del territorio: più che altro è la conservazione di un processo, del quale sono leggibili le modalità che hanno indotto le trasformazioni, ma anche gli elementi incompluti e l’instabilità, che attendono una più efficace sistemata- zione. Per queste motivazioni, il progetto di questo paesaggio, in cui si rintracciano elementi naturali e storico-culturali, immobilizzati dal regime vincolistico, è stato strutturato come un’indagine sui caratteri che lo contraddistinguono. In quest’ottica si sono individuate tre com- ponenti del paesaggio, ognuna rappresentativa di una parte dell’inter- vento del Parco di Punta Corona:

- il terrazzamento, come sistema di antropizzazione dei versanti sco- scesi verso la costa, realizzato con le macerie a secco in pietra locale, reso accesoiblaversoattraverso scale e percorsi in pietra, lavorando in parte la stessa roccia in situ;
- il sentiero, come sistema di attraversamento dei boschi, dove le vie meno impervie si sono consolidate attraverso i continui passaggi degli uomini che si tramandavano, di generazione in generazione, la localiz- zazione dei percorsi sicuri;
- l’ager, ovvero il campo coltivato di media dimensione, inserito in un sistema prevalentemente pianeggiante a livelli leggermente sfasati e sistemati con muretti contro terra a secco.

Le tre componenti individuate sono diventate, opportunamente ricom- poste, gli elementi di progetto, ovvero, in altri termini, sono diventati gli elementi di costruzione del progetto del parco.

Per il belvedere si è lavorato sul tema della realizzazione di un terrazzo poggiato sulla piastra rocciosa sottostante il piano dell’attuale belve- dere, sfruttando le opere murarie di contenimento esistenti, concepito come un ulteriore punto di vista con una prospettiva molto più avanzata, ma anche un “landmark”, un elemento di riconoscibilità visibile da chi proviene dal versante amalfitano della costiera. Un elemento, visi- bile già dai tornanti della Statale 366, strettamente integrato alle com- ponenti naturalistiche e paesaggistiche, può contribuire a attirare la curiosità di chi non conosce Agerola e Punta Corona, senza in alcun modo costituire un ostacolo o un “disturbo”, anzi rafforzandone la peculiarità e l’eccezionalità. L’area di ampliamento ad ovest del belvedere è stata pensata come prospiegia del belvedere stesso, ma conservandone il carattere attual- mente rintracciabile, attraverso la realizzazione di un parterre erboso calpestabile con panchine e percorsi. Il belvedere ed il suo ampliamen- to sono racchiusi e tenuti insieme da un unico segno di bordo che si configura come un elemento di riconoscibilità del parco: un pergolato poggiato sulla piastra rocciosa sottostante il piano dell’attuale belve- dere, configurandosi come solarium e spazio di aggregazione centri- verità turistiche e ricreative, secondo le richieste del bando di con- corso. Il mix di destinazioni d’uso, infatti, configura questa parte del Parco turistico come centro di riferimento per la sentieristica, il turi- smo itinerante della costiera e il turismo legato all’enogastronomia locale. L’attuale andamento a “zolle” dell’area non è stato modificato, anzì questa specificità è stata posta alla base dell’idea di progetto: ogni piano, a quota leggermente sfasata, si caratterizza per una specifica funzione. La fascia centrale, spina dell’intero parco, disposta lungo il percorso nord-sud principale, è prevalentemente libera e si configura come par- terre erboso destinato all’organizzazione di sagre, fiere, ed eventi all’a- perto. La parte più a nord di tale fascia è infatti attrezzata per spetta- coli, con panche e palco removibili. A partire da tale fascia centrale sono disposte le due installazioni a servizio dell’intero parco.

Facendo perno sull’edificio in pietra esistente, nel quale si prevede la sistemazione dell’infopoint della sentieristica, si prevede l’installazione di un padiglione-serra, semplicemente zavorrata sul suolo, nel quale si colloca un risto-bar. Le lammelle in legno, simili a quelle del pergolato disposto nel primo lotto, possono essere chiuse nei mesi invernali ed aperte nei mesi estivi, configurandosi come pensiline a protezione di tavoli all’aperto. La seconda sistemazione, posta sul lato opposto, paral- lelamente al grande spazio centrale, in legno e semplicemente zavorra- ta al suolo, ospita i servizi del campeggio e un piccolo centro sauna e massaggi. Tale elemento termina con una ampia pedana che accoglie un piccolo bio-lago, integrato con il naturale andamento del suolo, configurandosi come solarium e spazio di aggregazione centrale rispet- to all’area campeggio. Intorno, si dispongono liberamente, integrati con la sistemazione naturalistica dell’area, i campetti. Il percorso ad anello di bordo, insieme ai castagni esistenti, cinge e racchiude questo riconoscibile disegno di suolo.

Le tre aree, ognuna con i propri caratteri funzionali e morfologici, sono disposte in modo che attraverso molteplici piccoli interventi, un paesaggio dai caratteri asso- lutamente originali. Nonostante ciò, la chiarezza e la particolarità della morfologia consentono di evidenziare gli strati di un paesaggio ricono-