## 14.23 Techniques used coherence

Project Name: PHUSICOS (Grant Agreement no. 776681)

**Author/s and affiliations:** Gerardo Caroppi<sup>1,2</sup>, Carlo Gerundo<sup>2</sup>, Francesco Pugliese<sup>2</sup>, Maurizio Giugni<sup>2</sup>, Marialuce Stanganelli<sup>2</sup>, Farrokh Nadim<sup>3</sup>, Amy Oen<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aalto University, Department of Built Environment, Espoo, Finland (gerardo.caroppi@aalto.fi) <sup>2</sup> University of Naples Federico II (UNINA), Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, Naples, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI), Oslo, Norway

Techniques Used Coherence		Place Regeneration
Description and justification	Indicators of Application of Suitable Materials and Technologies sub-criterion will assess the coherence of used material and techniques with local materials and conditions.	
Definition	It assesses whether the typology of used techniques is invasive or not for landscape (e.g., huge excavation, cave, deforestation to build new road for caterpillars). In a long- term scenario, those above mentioned Indicators could be re-assessed, monitoring, through a direct survey, if the materials/techniques used have produced impact on landscape.	
Strengths and weaknesses		
Measurement procedure and tool	Survey/Living Labs	
Scale of measurement	Dichotomic (Yes/No)	
Data source		
Required data	Information about used materials.	
Data input type	Qualitative	
Data collection frequency		
Level of expertise required	Medium	
Synergies with other indicators		
Connection with SDGs	11	

Opportunities for	Living Labs		
participatory			
data collection			
Additional information			
References			

## 14.24 Design for sense of place

Project Name: UNaLab (Grant Agreement no. 730052)

**Author/s and affiliations:** Laura Wendling<sup>1</sup>, Ville Rinta-Hiiro<sup>1</sup>, Maria Dubovik<sup>1</sup>, Arto Laikari<sup>1</sup>, Johannes Jermakka<sup>1</sup>, Zarrin Fatima<sup>1</sup>, Malin zu-Castell Rüdenhausen<sup>1</sup>, Peter Roebeling<sup>2</sup>, Ricardo Martins<sup>2</sup>, Rita Mendonça<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> VTT Technical Research Centre Ltd, P.O. Box 1000 FI-02044 VTT, Finland

<sup>2</sup> CESAM – Department of Environment and Planning, University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

Design for sense of place		Place Regeneration
Description and justification	The phrase "design for a sense of place" relates to a complex concept involving the embodiment of tangible and intangible qualities in the design that make a place distinctive (create an identity). The unique place identity or sense of place in turn fosters authentic human attachment and a feeling of belonging. The sense of place concept arises from the examination of people's connectedness and identity with the built environment, in parallel with evaluation of people's perceptions and experiences of the built environment through design (Hu & Chen, 2018).	
Definition	The extent to which 'sense o urban planning or during the of a specific project (unitless	f place' is considered during planning and implementation value)
Strengths and weaknesses	+ Simple and straightforward - Subjective evaluation of peridentity with the built environ perceptions and experiences through design	d assessment ople's connectedness and nment, and people's of the built environment
Measurement procedure and tool	Design principles to foster a preserving existing elements on the creation of places tha - Are welcoming and respond groups within the community designed;	sense of place include 6, ensuring safety and focusing t (Bosch et al., 2017): d to, or express the values of y for whom the place is