



From building to territory: the urban industrial heritage in the trajectory of the Condephaat (1968-2018)

Manoela Rossinetti Rufinoni*

Text translated by Caio Souza Aguiar, Brenda Laís Domingos and Carolina Parente Cardelino under the supervision of Nivia Marcello.

*Professor of the Department of Art History and the Postgraduate Program in Art History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Languages, Literature and Human Sciences of the *Universidade Federal de São Paulo*. Author of the book *Preservação e Restauro Urbano: intervenções em sítios históricos industriais*, 2013.

Abstract

The breadth of the concept of industrial heritage, ratified by the *Nizhny Tagil Charter* (2003) and the *Dublin Principles* (2011), highlights the urban and territorial dimension of the testimonies of industrialization as one of the main challenges to be faced by preservation actions. By analyzing a selection of administrative legal processes of the CONDEPHAAT (Council of Defense of the Historical, Archaeological, Artistic and Tourist Heritage of the State of São Paulo, an organ created in 1968), a gradual perception of urban dimension in studies on the preservation of industrial heritage has been identified since the mid-1970s, despite the limitations of landmarking originally intended for the protection of isolated buildings. From the analysis of some administrative legal process of preservation of São Paulo's industrial heritage, the main aim is to emphasize the presence and breadth of the urban and territorial issue along the CONDEPHAAT trajectory and highlight the ways of understanding urban relations inherent in industrial heritage in each historical period and the possibilities for deepening this recent debate.

Keywords: Industrial heritage, Cultural heritage preservation policies, State of São Paulo.

Introduction

Referred by the Nizhny Tagil Charter (2003) and the Dublin Principles (2011), the breadth of the industrial heritage concept highlights the urban and territorial dimension of the industrialization testimonies as one of the main challenges to be addressed by protection actions¹. The issue is not just about the physical interference of large structures in a given locality, which drives urbanization processes or transforms pre-existing landscapes from the occupation of extensive areas. We should consider actions, flows and forms of use of the city triggered by the industrial activity in addition to this immediate tangible dimension. This is an aspect sometimes still identifiable in urbanization even after its closure. These identifiable aspects are based on the careful observation of the remaining structures, memories, and representations built from this legacy in today's city.

The definition of industrial heritage in international documents, such as the Nizhny Tagil Charter (TICCIH - The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage, 2003) and the Dublin Principles (ICOMOS and TICCIH, 2011), supports this analysis. In the Nizhny Tagil Charter, the industrial heritage is defined as “the traces of industrial culture that have historical, technological, social, architectural or scientific value” with structures and infrastructures destined to productive activities, such as “buildings and machinery, workshops, factories, mines, processing and refining sites, warehouses, production centers, transmission and use of energy, and means of transportation”. These structures are also related to the workers and the surrounding community's daily life “as the places where social activities related to the industry, such as dwellings, places of worship or education are developed.” The guidelines of the document

1. This article recreates and deepens discussions of a paper presented at the 3rd Scientific Symposium of Icomos (International Council of Monuments and Sites) in the city of Belo Horizonte, state of Minas Gerais (Brazil) on May 8th-10th of 2019.

include the documentation related to the industrial heritage and “to the intangible records involved in the memory of humanity and their traditions”. A considerable expansion of this definition has been noticed and it directly incorporates the intangible dimensions of industrialization according to a more recent document, the Dublin Principles. In addition to the tangible testimonies of industrial activities, the concept starts to include “technical knowledge and practice, the organization of work and workers, or a complex legacy of social and cultural actions resulted from the industrial influence on the community life, which have triggered crucial organizational changes in entire societies and in the world”.

In both definitions, there is a certain emphasis on built structures, architecture, and architectural techniques. Yet, these aspects are seen as supports of social, cultural, and memorial relations relating to the world of work and emphasizing heritage values of the testimonies of industrialization manifested in diverse tangible and intangible dimensions. On the one hand, the establishment of factories attracts workers and drives the construction of residences and the emergence of local stories and equipment focused on leisure, education, worship. In other words, the establishment of a factory provides new functions, flows, everyday events, and urban memories. In contrast, industrial sites promote complex functional connections between

buildings and equipment at different levels. For example, structures geared to the supply of water and energy or also those associated with logistics, such as railways for receiving raw material or production flow in a network of connections that can reach territorial dimensions. The industrial building is considered only a small cog of a complex system and it may be incomprehensible if people disregard other elements to understand urban and anthropological dynamics associated with production and work in today’s city. The same happens with other elements such as the representation and memories built around this system over time that relate the past with the present in the modern city. Studies aimed at appreciation and protection of the industrial heritage must pay attention to this complex issue.

Industrial sites have a spatial composition strongly related to the development of the local productive activities and work relations; whether these sites are spaces focused on manufacturing or transportation systems such as railway structures. These industrial sites bring together several buildings and production spaces, built at a different time and with distinct architectural styles. These buildings reveal industrial expansion, new technologies, and their presence in the surrounding urbanization. Sometimes, a single isolated industrial building may represent unique values. In many cases, these buildings are a network of industrial or non-industrial

buildings related to manufacturing in many cases: warehouses, industrial buildings, working villages, maneuvering areas, equipment, facilities for water and energy supply, etc. (RUFINONI, 2013, p.192). The surroundings of these industrial sites, focused on other functions such as dwellings, should also be carefully checked because urban plots were consolidated in these areas due to the presence of the factories. The buildings of these areas keep the homogeneous volume and are horizontality responsible for the spatial configuration of the landscape and urban tradition of many industrial neighborhoods. Antonio Parisella (2000, p.52) views the special characteristics of the spatial, constructive and historical configuration of industrial buildings and emphasizes twofold requirements for the assessment of these buildings as cultural heritage, protection actions and reconversion of use:

The first requirement concerns the building individually and the straight and specific relations between its original use and the possible assumed use. [...] The second requirement concerns the understanding of the double of the system of relations that the building horizontally assumed within the organized urban space where it was situated (neighborhood, zone) and vertically within manufacturing sector.

Based on this guideline, the need to assess carefully the formal, social, and cultural characteristics of neighborhoods occupied or influenced by industrial activity is highlighted,

such as the division of land and the architectural styles, functions and uses in each location. In many cases, it is possible to notice specific spatial planning for the fulfillment of productive functions that affect the whole composition of the building, whether in the distribution of industrial buildings or the location of working villages and other urban equipment in the surrounding area. The importance and cultural relevance of industrial sites are strongly related to the concern for these specific characteristics, the understanding of the tangible, spatial, social and memorial qualities that shape this scenario. As Meneguello (2012, p.82-83) stated, “these assets relate to each other in complex linked networks (such as railways and all associated assets) and their isolated preservation is insufficient to understand the network of raw material, production, and flows responsible for defining the industrial activity”.

Understanding this spatial complexity has been pointed out as one of the main difficulties in preserving the industrial heritage. This is not a recent concern. The issue was raised by Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses (1988, p.68-73), who highlighted the importance of forms of space composition in the assessment of industrial sites at the *first National Seminar of History and Energy* in the 1980s. According to the author, no sampling of “significant structures” of an industrial site - isolated elements - would be able to represent its documentary and, mainly,

2. State Law number 10,247 of October 22, 1968. The law deals with the competence, organization, and functioning of the Condephaat that was established by article 123 of the State Constitution and other measures.

3. In this regard, the Venice Charter (1964) and the Declaration of Amsterdam (1975), among others were cited. The Declaration of Amsterdam seeks the “integrated preservation”, a method aimed at multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary participation of preservation and the integration between the protection initiatives, practices and norms arising from urban and territorial planning (CURY, 2000; RUFINONI, 2013, p.135-165).

4. Urban Environmental Heritage Preservation Program. Condephaat’s Documentation Center, 1976 (mimeo), Case Number 20,025 / 76, Condephaat’s Protocol Section.

its formal and aesthetics value. The corruption of this spatial dimension would misrepresent unique formal compositions, completely disregard any possible aesthetics attributes, and compromise the historical understanding of the entire system of productive activity. For the author, individual preserved industrial structures would be merely “symbolic carcasses”.

It is possible to notice a gradual perception of this complexity in studies aimed at the preservation of industrial assets in the trajectory of the CONDEPHAAT (Council for the Protection of Historical, Artistic, Archaeological and Tourist Heritage). The CONDEPHAAT is a state agency of the Department of Culture of the State of São Paulo² established in 1968 to identify, protect, and preserve the tangible and intangible properties of the cultural and environmental heritage of the state of São Paulo. This perception is found from the late 1970s onwards, despite the difficulties related to the limits of landmarking itself – originally intended for the protection of individual buildings. The historiography of the agency shows a gradual conceptual opening in urban preservation studies from that date. That opening would take place in discussions about new objects of protection considering heritage as a cultural fact in which humanity is the main target of preservationist actions, or these actions would consider the built environment as a cultural fact and a space of social relations.

Preservationist ideas followed the discussions on the international scene observed since the late 1960s through a broader understanding of the concept of heritage with its cultural, environmental and urban dimensions³. As explained by Rodrigues (2000, p.79-80), this attitude coincided with the emergence of demands from society itself in this debate when the issue of heritage preservation gained momentum as a social right.

In this period, in the work of the CONDEPHAAT the debate around the idea of “urban environmental heritage would involve the built tangibility and “social and cultural aspects in all buildings including recent buildings” (apud RODRIGUES, 2000, p.61)⁴. This debate has developed even if the legal means for heritage protection were still linked to landmarking.

Discussions about the concept of urban environmental heritage emerged in urban management state agency of the government of São Paulo and with the engagement of different professionals, especially those working in preservation (RODRIGUES and TOURINHO, 2016, p.80). These discussions have provided the way for the urban preservation of environments and urban and territorial planning actions. The debates explained these spaces in a broader perspective focusing on their social, cultural, memorial and symbolic constitution and gave public value to the preservationist practice

considering the buildings protected in the present and the daily life of the citizens (RODRIGUES, 2000, p.66).

According to Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses, one of the most active professionals in this debate, urban environmental heritage can be defined as “a system of socially appropriate objects thought to be appropriate representations of the urban environment” (MENESES, 1979, apud RODRIGUES, 2000, p.66)⁵. Meneses focuses his on the relationship between artifacts and subjects, not only on the building. He prioritizes the recognition of the social appropriation of space as a decisive stage in the attribution of values to tangibilities understood as “supports of meanings” and not only as “symbolic constructions”. We therefore identify common elements between Meneses’ arguments about the concept of urban environmental heritage in the 1970s and those that would be part of his reflections on the preservation of industrial heritage years later, as seen. The systemic particularities of the heritage of industrialization discuss the breadth of the concept of built heritage and the mechanisms needed to protect it, considering the relationship with the urban environment and the socio-cultural appropriation of space, from building to territory.

In the analysis of the landmarking processes of some industrial heritages listed by the CONDEPHAAT, we have noticed urban and

territorial issues in several reports, sometimes attaching importance to the heritages either for its role in inducing the urbanization of the surroundings, or for its insertion in the landscape and to the promotion of particular urban daily life⁶. These concerns, however, did not even offer effective tools to preservation in this broader dimension. With no intention of reaching a definitive conclusion, we will now comment on some processes in which the urban and territorial dimension of the industrial heritage was considered by technical staff and councilors in their reports in defense of preservation. In our analysis, these processes were considered, on one hand, as administrative documents with methodologies and criteria of the preservation agency; and, on the other hand, historical sources to understand the issues involved in the attribution of values to certain heritages, and in the construction of narratives related to them.

In the case of railway heritages, the appreciation of this heritage is often associated with its relationship with the development and growth of cities, as well as to the immediate physical and symbolic link with the issue of mobility, idea of arrivals and departures and opening new paths at urban and regional level. The careful observation of the urban and territorial characterization of these heritages, in contrast, has intensified significantly since the 2010s, from the study entitled “Railway Heritage: lines

5. SÃO PAULO (Estado). Secretaria de Negócios Metropolitanos, Emplasa. **Comunidade em debate:** patrimônio ambiental urbano. São Paulo, 1979.

6. We emphasize the brief analysis of landmarking processes in this article is not intended to be exhaustive or conclusive. The selection of heritages was based on the frequency urban and territorial issue were mentioned in the case file.

7. As a result of this methodology, dozens of railway complexes were listed, located in the cities of: Franco da Rocha, Jaraguá, Rio Grande da Serra, Varzea Paulista, Caieiras, Turkeys, Ribeirão Pires, and Jundiáí (landmarked in 2011), and Santos (2018), on the São Paulo Railway route; Vinhedo and Louveira (2012), Valinhos, Piratininga, and Sumaré (2013), along the Cia Paulista's railway route; Andradina and Araçatuba (2012), along the Brazilian Northwest Railroad; Botucatu (2012), Piraju (2013), Chavantes and Avaré (2016), Sorocaba and Ourinhos (2018), along the Sorocabana Railway; Piquete (2014) and Cruzeiro (2015), along the Brazilian Central Railroad; Pindamonhangaba (2017), at the junction between the Central Railways of Brazil and Campos do Jordão; Jaguariúna (2016) and Águas da Prata (2018), on the way of the Mogiana Railways Company; and Caetetuba (2018), on the path of the Bragantina Railway. We also highlight the landmarking of the residences and locomotive depots of the Federal Railway Network (RFFSA), in the city of Araçatuba (2012).8. Informação STCR-159/76 assinada por Carlos Lemos, 13/08/1976, Processo n. 20.097/76, fl.85-86.

and railway stations of the State of São Paulo”, conducted by the Study Group of Inventory of the Historic Heritage Preservation. This study has subsidized preservation actions aimed at railway complexes in their functional complexity, in their relationship with the surroundings and with the regional reality that it helped to compose and consolidate. In some regions, the railway area has reached territorial dimensions, with geographical references, connections between cities and sociocultural practices at different levels. The question is pointed out by Martins, Cardoso and Andrade (2012, p.52):

These routes (railroads) not only qualified communication, boosting economy, but engendered culturally homogeneous regions, defined by societies with their own characteristics. In a way, they modeled the respective regions, specific architectural parties, cultural practices and linguistic units that marked the respective landscapes and the societies constituted there. [...] “I am from the region of Vale”, “I was born on Paulista Avenue”, “I come from Mogiana”, “I lived in Sorocabana”, are expressions of their residents, concerning economic stages and networks of cities with their own identities and common denominators.

Unlike the previous selection criteria, the most recent railway-related landmarking show the overall character of the railway facility. They preserve stations and complexes, where they exist, and name the heritages as Railway Complexes or Complexes. It shows the heritage

significance of the relations between the various units built in the same set, key feature of industrial and railroad heritages⁷.

In previous railroad landmarking in the state of São Paulo, in contrast, we observed a clear preference for stations considered in isolation, associated with “a picturesque and nostalgic memory of the old train stops” (MARTINS et al, 2012, p. 55) and valued above all for its architectural or constructive exceptionality. In some railway sites dating from the 1980s and 1990s, the mention of the urban and territorial dimension associated with railway structures was noticed, but preservation is focused on the station building considered in isolation, suggesting a perspective of urban relations. The arguments and considerations in several reports, however, indicate a gradual expansion of this perception.

In the landmarking of Luz Station and Campinas Station, the allusion to the concept of “urban environmental heritage” as one of the main arguments for preservation is found. The architect Carlos Lemos mentions three reasons for the landmarking of the Luz Station. The first reason is the station as a witness of the coffee cycle and the expansion of industrialization between the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Second, it is the role of the station in the reading of our city – its importance in the composition of the landscape and the intelligibility of that

urban space, considering it “an important and undisputed participant reference element of São Paulo’s urban environmental heritage”⁸. Finally, the techniques employed and the architectural qualities of the building (Figure 1).

a striking reference of the city”, referring to the evident urban development announced by the railroad, envisaging a “future metropolitan area” in Campinas. On the territorial occupation of the state railway structures, Murillo Marx justifies:

The landmarking process of the Campinas Station presents similar considerations regarding the urban issue. In addition to the historical and architectural interest, Murillo Marx’s technical advice on the landscape importance “the set is

a) Undisputed historical interest to witness the railway park undertaken by the pioneer capitalist in the implementation of the railways that subverted the traditional occupation of São Paulo’s territory.



Figure 1. Luz Station, in the city of São Paulo, state of São Paulo. Source: Vanessa Kraml’s collection, 2016.

8. Information STCR-159/76 signed by Carlos Lemos, 08/13/1976, Case n° 2097/76, p.85-86.

b) Architectural interest due to the size and care of an early eclecticism in our lands by its romanticism in the picturesque volume, already in the material and techniques employed.

c) Notable landscape interest for all the residents of the city of Campinas and outsiders, as the set is a remarkable reference in the city, which has lost so much in its past, advances rapidly towards a metropolitan future⁹.

construction of important buildings, such as the City Theater. Interestingly, both the initial technical advice and the Council's final decision underscore the importance of the station as a witness to the process of occupation and development of Vale do Paraíba region, as all the railway buildings had been considered of little artistic and architectural interest¹¹. (Figure 2).

In the final decision of the Council, the station was listed as a “monument of historical-architectural interest, linked to the construction of the railways, as a drainage factor of coffee production in our state”, finally considering the building an “important milestone in urban environmental heritage¹⁰. In both processes, from the Luz and Campinas Stations, we observe the same concept of trajectory from discussions of the agency at that time.

In addition, in the landmarking process of the *Cachoeira Paulista* Station there is a reference to the influence of the railroad in the composition of a “peculiar urban environment” as it increased commercial activities, and attracted workers, artists and artisans who contributed greatly to the local urban configuration. The initial technical advice cites the contribution of engineer Newton Bennaton himself, author of the station project and several residences in the city, as well as the presence of great Italian architects, such as Brás Império and João Vitelli, responsible for the



Figure 2. *Cachoeira Paulista* Station in the state of São Paulo. Source: Indira Ferreira Faria's Collection, 2016.

9. Report signed by Murillo Marx on the opening of the landmarking process at the Campinas Railway Station, 11/20/1978, Process n° 20,682/78, p.27.

10. Council decision, 07/21/1980, Process n° 20.682/78, fl.108. Our emphasis.

11. Technical opinion of Antonio Luis Dias de Andrade, on the Opening of the Tipping Process of the Cachoeira Paulista Train Station, 9/15/1981, Process n° 20,316/77, p. 23 and Council Decision, D.O.E. 4/23/1982, p.33.



Figure 3. *Barracão* Station, in the city of Ribeirão Preto, state of São Paulo. Source: Luis Gustavo Pereira Ferreira's collection, 2012.

12. Technical Opinion of Regina Pontim and Opinion of Counselor Eduardo Corona, Case nº 21,364/80, p. 7-9.27.

A similar situation is observed in the *Barracão* Station landmarking process, in the city of Ribeirão Preto. They argued that it had the architectural and constructive characteristics similar to those of other Mogiana Company stations, cultural importance for the community, besides being located in an urbanized area, representing an important witness to the local urban and social history (Figure 3)¹².

These issues were slowly incorporated into the arguments and justifies landmarking, following the increase of civil society participation in the opening of processes and in movements for the defense of these properties. The landmarking of the Paranapiacaba Railway, in 1987, pointed to this direction. The landmarking request was encouraged by popular movements for the defense of local heritage, with associations and

representatives of public agencies concerned with the increasing degradation of the village and its surroundings¹³. The legal protection covered an entire perimeter and included buildings and other rail properties, considered from its relation with the natural and anthropic environment. The “Rail Village, the High Part, railroad and records, landscape surroundings of the *Serra do Mar* mountain range landmarked. In the latter the drainage watersheds that of the *Mogi* River and the cities of Rio Grande da Serra or *Jurubatuba* rivers, headwaters that supply the urban cities are found”¹⁴.

Carlos Lemos was concerned with the need to study and appreciate railway properties as part of a larger set. He warned against the loss of meaning of landmarking single buildings. Besides the immediate reference to the preservation criteria analyzed by the economic cycles in the current historiography – or even by the architectural exceptionality, what was common in preservationist actions of the time –, his concern shows the perception of a narrowed correlation between railway properties and territorial drawings, an important element to understand industrial heritage. The issue is quoted in a few processes, such as the ones of the Luz, Santa Rita do Passa Quatro and Campinas Stations. This issue shows the booming of a debate in the agency’s internal discussions at the end of the 1970s. In the technical advice related to the

landmarking of the Luz Station, Lemos highlights the need of studying it along with other properties related to the coffee era, the observation of a whole context destined to transportation, storage, commercialization and exportation¹⁵. The issue had already been tackled in the agency, as noticed in the landmarking process of the Santa Rita do Passa Quatro Station:

Once again, however, we recommend the need of a landmarking plan that guides us in the sense of what is to be landmarked or not inside the state. [...] If one of the norms is the landmarking of cultural properties that make reference to many economic cycles – to coffee, for example –, we should landmark everything that is related to it, and then the inclusion of the railroads that took the green gold to Santos would be justified. From now on, it is possible to notice that a single station, without its rails and trains, means nothing unless it has exceptional conditions of architectural interest, as in the case of the Mayrinque Station, a Dubugras’ ouvre¹⁶.

Years later, the issue is emphasized again in the landmarking process of the Campinas Station:

It is about the eclectic construction that symbolizes the 20th century coffee architecture, and that we consider worthy of landmarking. However, once again, we judge a landmarking criteria as fair as it might apply to other stations and railways, be it storehouses or bridges that represent all the effort of coffee yield to Santos Harbor¹⁷.

13. In this article, the analysis of the Paranapiacaba Railroad landmarking, in the city of Santo André, will not be deeply discussed because of the complexity of the matters involved, which are beyond our scope.

14. Process n° 22209/82; Res. SC-37, 09/30/1987.

15. Information STCR-159/76 signed by Carlos Lemos, 08/13/1976, Landmarking Process of the Luz Station, no. 20,097/76, p.85-86.

16. Technical advice by Carlos Lemos, 08/03/1976, Process n° 00.467/74, p.20.

17. Technical advice by Carlos Lemos, 06/06/1979, Process n° 20,682/78, p.50. Emphasis added.

Even if, in that moment, these issues had not been effectively incorporated into the landmarking resolutions (generally centered in isolated buildings, such as the stations), based on the given examples, it is possible to notice that the problems related to rail heritage preservation in its urban and territorial dimensions were already a contentious issue in the 1970s¹⁸.

The issue of urban discussions goes beyond the domain of railway universe and appears in landmarking processes of buildings and sites of other industrial typologies. In the landmarking process of the architectural set *Kaigai Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha*, known as KKKK, the building's importance to the urban development of the city of Registro was highlighted as one of the main arguments for its preservation. The sheds for rice beneficiation were placed on the margins of the *Ribeira* River in the 1920s, in a sparse urbanized area close to the river point. Its cooperative warehouse never attracted a great number of workers, but the manufacturing activity allowed the increase of urban functions and city development, what was highlighted in the landmarking process¹⁹.

The importance of the manufacturing set in the urban landscape development appears in many processes. One of them is the São Martinho Spinning and Weaving Company, an architectural set that defines the historical,

cultural and urban identity of the city of Tatuí²⁰. Also, the Francisco Matarazzo United Industries, in the city of Marília, with great industrial set extension and importance in the local urban development²¹. We can mention the Gasômetro Industrial Complex and Casa das Retortas, a set that guided the modernization of the city of São Paulo, and was a reference mark to the landscape of the neighborhood of Brás²². The old Vila Mariana Slaughterhouse was a pioneer and “prompt agent of the region’s urban development”²³. The São Paulo’s City Market is referred to as one of the greatest ouvres made between the 1920s and 1930s and that would have transformed the city aspects, next to the Martinelli Building and the Tamanduateí²⁴. Similar arguments were also observed in recent processes, such as the landmarking of Gessy Industrial Company’s Old Factory Buildings, in the city of Valinhos, 2016, that considered the “relevant role” of the industrial set as “spatial reference in the development of the city’s landscape”²⁵. The landmarking of Fratelli Maciotta Mill’s Building, in the city of Ribeirão Pires, 2018 highlights the relevant industrial landscape formed by the relation between the building and the railroad²⁶.

Other than the importance in the landscape, another aspect was the participation of industrial capital in the urban expansion, a fact quoted in the Paulista Brewery’s process, in the city of Ribeirão Preto (Figure 4)²⁷. The beer fabrication

18. To learn more about the preservation policies of rail heritage in the state of São Paulo, see: OLIVEIRA, 2010, p.179-203; OLIVEIRA and MORAES, 2017, p.18-42.

19. Opinions by Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses and José Pedro de Oliveira Costa, Process no. 22,261/82.

20. Process nº 31877/94; Res. SC-61, de 10/30/2007, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 12/28/2007, p.40.

21. Process nº 26030/88; Res. SC-46, 12/18/1992, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 12/19/2007, p. 25.

22. Process nº 46,662/03; Res. SC-20, 03/26/2010,

OFFICIAL GAZETTE 05/12/2010, p.35.

23. Res. 7, 03/04/1985, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 05/05/1985, p.9.

24. Opinions by Silvia Ferreira Santos Wolff, Marly Rodrigues and José de Souza Martins, Process nº 26,399/88.

25. Res. SC-128, 12/19/2016, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 12/21/2016, p. 55.

26. Res. SC-13, 02/26/2018, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 02/27/2018, p. 32-33.

27. Process nº 39684/00; Res. SC-52, 10/01/2007, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 10/04/2007, p.52.



Figure 4. Paulista Brewery, in the city of Ribeirão Preto, state of São Paulo. Source: Luis Gustavo Pereira Ferreira's collection, 2012.

occupied big terrains and changed the local urban configuration thanks to the great extent of its installations and to real estate investments of the Paulista Brewery owners, mainly in the *XV de Novembro Square*, as the revamp of an old hotel and the building of the Pedro, the Second Theatre and of the Meira Júnior Building. These buildings nowadays form the São Paulo Block, an eclectic set landmarked by the CONDEPHAAT in 1993²⁸.

In the case of the Brás Trolley Car Station, in the city of São Paulo, landmarked in 2008, the urban dimension of the set is highlighted – with the trolley car as a modernization symbol, bringing new perspectives of sociability and urban familiarity. In this process, the study of the trolley car station could join a bigger set of properties in the same neighborhood, to avoid the landmarking of isolated buildings and to show new understandings of the Brás neighborhood's

28. Process n°
29840/92. Res. 26,
12/15/1993, OFFICIAL
GAZETTE 12/16/1993, p.53.

architectonical collection. The opinion showed the quick degradation of the surroundings and suggested that the protection measures of the station had to guide this understanding²⁹, even though it had not been done.

In the 2010 processes (for instance, the Carioba Industrial Complex in the city of Americana in 2013) the arguments in the landmarking resolution value a set of buildings that “synthetizes the industrial lives through the equipment built there”³⁰. Thus, the landmarking tried to unite the manufacturing complex with its functionality and relation with its surrounding urban dynamic – such as in the landmarking of railway properties by the CONDEPHAAT, in this same period. The equipment directly related to the industrial production were also landmarked, such as the weaving sheds, the power plant the school, the church, leisure activities sites and healthcare facilities for the workers and houses linked to the manufacturing complex. In this same way, the characterization as “the last textile industry that maintains the set in the city of Jundiaí” was one of the reasons for the preservation of the built complex, in the landmarking resolution of the Argos Industrial Buildings, its day care center and worker’s village, published in 2017³¹. The following items were landmarked: the spinning, production, mechanical workshops, cotton storage, storehouse, filter, gatehouse, chimney buildings, daycare center and the Argos Village, formed by the Workers Houses. The set was inserted in the resolution because of “the labor relations

were bigger than the manufacturing environment, impacting the workers’ social relations”. In addition, the buildings “are important to the maintenance of the industrial labor memory [and] of fundamental relevance to the understanding of the São Paulo History”. This quote agrees with the definition of industrial heritage found in the Dublin Principles, as mentioned.

In this brief explanation, it is possible to observe in many technical opinions the multiple dimensions of industrial heritage. Still, it is known the available protection mechanisms do not accomplish these specificities and values effectively after legal protection. With the legal tool, landmarking is limited to the tangible protection of buildings or built sets. By adapting the analysis of Italian scholar Gaetano Miarelli Mariani to the Brazilian reality, it is possible to notice the preservation of these properties whose heritage values surpass the dimension of the building and invade the city and territory. The properties have functions, uses and social characters, but lack analytical methodologies and practical tools of protection that go beyond the external, visible and tangible aspects. In fact, we found ourselves before cultural properties, “results of practical activities that tend to make a *living art*, a *making art* and that, in the accomplishment of these purposes, give life to forms and, consequently, to aesthetical values” (MIARELLI MARIANI, 1993). This heritage must be apprehended, valued and protected not only based on formal values, but also based on its testimonial importance and role in the making

29. Opinions by Marly Rodrigues in June 1997 and October 2005. Process no. 28,682/91.

30. Res. SC-021, 05/09/2013, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 05/22/2013, p.68-69.

31. Res. SC-065, 12/19/2017, OFFICIAL GAZETTE 12/22/2017, p. 57-58.

of a structure that is not only physical, but also memorial and sociocultural.

To assure the accomplishment of these values in the preservation of industrialization heritage, other protection measures complementary to landmarking would have to be built and spread, with the participation of the civil society and other groups of public administration, in state and city levels to promote actions proposed by preservation agencies. These findings suggest several courses of action for preservation of city urban plans: researches on urban and territorial scales, heritage education in cities, development of supporting programs to manage landmarked properties, follow-up of its transformation, tax cut and operational benefits. This information can be used to develop targeted interventions aimed at collective participation in the maintenance and promotion of heritage, which have been long discussed, but are still distant from practice.

References

CURY, Isabelle. (Org.) **Cartas Patrimoniais**. 2^a ed. Rio de Janeiro: IPHAN, 2000.

ICOMOS, TICCIH. **Princípios conjuntos do ICOMOS-TICCIH para a Conservação de Sítios, Estruturas, Áreas e Paisagens de Patrimônio Industrial**. [Princípios de Dublin]. Aprovados na 17.^a Assembleia Geral do ICOMOS, em 28 de Novembro de 2011.

MARTINS, Ana Luiza; CARDOSO, Jordana e ANDRADE, Marcelle Marques de. Notas sobre a preservação do patrimônio ferroviário de São Paulo. In: PAULA, Z. C. et al. (Orgs.). **Polifonia do patrimônio**. Londrina: EDUEL, 2012.

MENEGUELLO, Cristina. Patrimônio industrial: memórias, acervos e cidade. In: PAULA, Z. C. et al. (Orgs.). **Polifonia do patrimônio**. Londrina: EDUEL, 2012.

MIARELLI MARIANI, Gaetano. Restauro e Territorio: Appunti su un Rapporto Difficile e Controverso [1978]. In: **Centri Storici**: note sul tema. Roma: Bonsignori, 1993.

MENESES, Ulpiano Bezerra de. Patrimônio, Preservação e História da Energia. In: **Anais do 1º Seminário Nacional de História e Energia**. São Paulo: Departamento de Patrimônio Histórico, 1988.

OLIVEIRA, Eduardo Romero de. Patrimônio ferroviário do Estado de São Paulo: as condições de preservação e uso dos bens culturais. **Revista Projeto História**, v.40 (2010), p.179-203.

OLIVEIRA, Eduardo Romero de; Ewerton Henrique. O patrimônio ferroviário nos tombamentos no Estado de São Paulo. **Revista Memória em Rede**, v.9, n.16, Jan./Jul.2017 p.18-42.

PARISELLA, Antonio. Il futuro del passato industriale. **Roma Moderna e Contemporanea**, anno VIII, n.1-2, 2000.

RODRIGUES, Marly. **Imagens do Passado**. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp, 2000.

RODRIGUES, Marly; TOURINHO, Andrea de Oliveira. Patrimônio ambiental urbano: uma retomada. **Revista CPC**, São Paulo, n.22, p.70-91, jul./dez. 2016, p.70-91.

RUFINONI, Manoela. **Preservação e Restauro Urbano**: intervenções em sítios históricos industriais. São Paulo: Ed. Fap-Unifesp, Edusp, Fapesp, 2013.

SÃO PAULO (Estado). **Lei Estadual 10.247 de 22 de outubro de 1968**. Dispõe sobre a competência, organização e o funcionamento do Conselho de Defesa do Patrimônio Histórico, Artístico e Turístico do Estado, criado pelo artigo 123 da Constituição Estadual e dá outras providências.

TICCIH. **Carta de Niznhy Tagil sobre o patrimônio industrial**. Niznhy Tagil: The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage, 2003.

Processos de Tombamento

SÃO PAULO (Estado). Secretaria de Estado da Cultura. Conselho de Defesa do Patrimônio Histórico, Arqueológico, Artístico e Turístico. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 00467/74. Estação de Santa Rita do Passa Quatro.

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 20097/76. Estação da Luz (São Paulo).

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 20316/77. Estação Ferroviária de Cachoeira Paulista (Cachoeira Paulista).

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 20682/78. Estação Ferroviária de Campinas (Campinas).

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 21364/80. Estação Barracão (Ribeirão Preto).

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 22209/82. Complexo Ferroviário de Paranapiacaba (Santo André).

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 22261/82. Conjunto Arquitetônico da Kaigai Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha (Registro)

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 26399/88. Mercado Municipal de São Paulo (São Paulo)

_____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 26030/88. Indústrias Reunidas Francisco Matarazzo (Marília).

- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. 28682/91. Res. SC-37, de 30/09/1987. D.O.E. de Estação de Bondes do Brás (São Paulo). 03/10/1987, p.18.
- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT.** no. Res. SC-46, de 18/12/1992, D.O.E. de 29840/92. Quarteirão Paulista e Praça XV de 19/12/1992, pg. 25.
- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. Res. 26 de 15/12/1993, D.O.E. de 16/12/1993, 31877/94. Indústrias Têxteis São Martinho (Tatuí). p.53.
- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. Res. SC-61, de 30/10/2007, D.O.E. de 31877/94. Indústrias Têxteis São Martinho (Tatuí). 28/12/2007, p.40.
- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. Res. SC-52, de 01/10/2007. D.O.E. de 39684/00. Cervejaria Paulista. (Ribeirão Preto). 04/10/2007, p.32.
- _____. **Processo CONDEPHAAT** no. Res. SC-20, de 26.03.2010, D.O.E. de 12/05/2010, 46662/03. Complexo do Gasômetro e Casa das p.35.
- Retortas (São Paulo). Res. SC-021, de 09-05-2013. D.O.E. de 22/05/2013, p. 68-69.
- Resoluções de Tombamento**
- Res. SC-128, de 19/12/2016, D.O.E. de 21/12/2016, p. 55.
- Res. SC-22, de 03/05/1982, D.O.E. de 07/05/1982. Res. SC-065, de 19/12/2017, D.O.E. de 22/12/2017, p. 57-58.
- Res. 7, de 04/03/1985, D.O.E. de 05/05/1985, Res. SC-13, de 26/02/2018, D.O.E. de p.9. 27/02/2018, p. 32-33. ■