

Surveying New Muralism in Italy: Urban Art Interventions for the Regeneration of Turin's Architectural Heritage

Giovanni Caffio

Dipartimento di Architettura, Università degli Studi "G. d'Annunzio", Chieti-Pescara, Italy

giovanni.caffio@gmail.com

Abstract

The phenomenon of urban art is one of the forces shaping contemporary urban spaces. Historically fought as vandalism in its "writing" component (the "black sheep" of the urban actors performing in the contemporary city), urban art has recently become more appreciated as an artistic expression, especially when regarded as a stage in the historical evolution of muralism. As several examples worldwide have shown, in the context of urban renewal, urban art can set off positive dynamics. Focusing on the Italian scene, I recognize the importance of past Italian interventions realized both in big cities, such as Rome, Turin and Bologna, and in small cities, such as Grottaglie (Taranto), Gaeta (Latina), Catanzaro, and Dozza (Bologna). In addition, the growing number of urban art festivals and public interventions seems to voice the citizens' will to take the streets back, particularly where institutions are unable to intervene effectively in the urban domain due to political short-sightedness or lack of financial resources. The first aim of this paper is to illustrate and analyze some collective projects and informal actions through which citizens, associations, and institutions have given added value to the urban space. I will focus particularly on Turin, which has become one of the most interesting and rich urban art territories, thanks to public projects such as Murarte, Picturin, Nizzart and B.Art: Arte in Barriera. This study offers insights on how, by way of artistic deeds and apparently "weak" transformation systems, urban art may take innovative action so as to regenerate the city's architectural heritage. The second aim of this paper is to propose a methodology for architectural surveying techniques applied to urban art. In current critical analysis, as well as in the representation and documentation of this type of work, the fundamental importance of the physical, architectural and urban environment in which the work is placed is often overlooked, if not completely omitted. In acknowledgment of these limitations, this paper proposes a documentation methodology that respects both the values of the process and the work itself. In this regard, painted walls must be considered as inseparable from the space in which they are located, from the material substrate supporting them, and from the time conditions in which they were realized. The process of examination and documentation therefore requires observation in situ, new digital and traditional survey techniques, and a variety of representations at different scales; with a view to understanding the reasons that led to the selection of a particular place in the city, and the way in which artistic action arises in relation to the historical environment and the social and political system that influenced its creation.

Keywords: Urban Art, Renewal, City, Turin, Survey, Architecture.

1. Turin and urban art

Thanks to the numerous urban art projects which have taken place in the last few years, Turin is more and more an open art space, where institutionalized interventions coexist with illegal acts and where large murals by famous international street artists cohabit with those made by anonymous local writers. Over time, important events have colored the city, from the three editions of PicTurin (Turin Mural Art Festival) to the interventions of MurArte, from SAM in Parco Michelotti

to MAU in the Campidoglio area, from NizzArt interventions to the latest achievements of B.Art, not to mention the several Halls of Fame organized by writers, galleries and associations. In brief, this is a fragmented and confrontational scene within the peculiar space of the city of Turin. Moreover, instead of having of a proper operating network, it puts together many artists open to independent collaboration. Alongside this, there has been an effort to institutionalize the phenomenon by means of an agreement between asso-

ciations (including *Il cerchio e le gocce*, *Urbe Rigenerazione urbana*, *Variante Bunker* and *Monkeys Evolution*) and the municipality, as well as several attempts to assemble collections and designate places specifically devoted to urban art. One of these places is the SAM (Street Art Museum), an outdoor gallery of murals located in the former municipal zoo, in Parco Michelotti, and led by Carmelo Cambareri. Currently waiting to be reorganized, the SAM was promoted by the cultural association *BorderGate* between 2011 and 2012 through the *Border Land* project; it contributed to redevelop the area through more than sixty works on walls, cages and tanks involving many Italian and foreign artists. A similar project is the MAU (Museo Arte Urbana), whose core is located in *Borgo Vecchio Campidoglio*, a late nineteenth-century working-class neighborhood, which has now become an urban museum chaired and directed by Edoardo Di Mauro and headquartered in association with *Galleria POW* by Alessandro Icardi. More than one hundred murals have been realized since 1995, both by writers and by artists who are normally distant from the urban art sphere.

The case of Turin is a prime example of how the general attitude towards urban art has changed together with its reception, which now benefits from the joint perspective of institutions, citizens and artists. Graffiti as an aesthetic, political, anthropological and pervasive act, has always been experienced controversially by observers (both belonging to the artistic milieu and to city life). Since the 1970s, urban murals, especially in their unauthorized expression, have challenged the citizens' idea of taste and decorum, whereas in recent years they are moving from being illegal and spontaneous practices to being works resulting from a process of participation, coordination, and institutionalization, in which a political/anthropological message gives way to the artistic value of the image. This is exactly what happened in the passage of urban graffiti to the so-called phase of post-graffiti or New Muralism. In 1999, when the *MurArte* project was initiated, the city of Turin was still divided between a majority of citizens who considered graffiti as offensive to decorum and private property and a minority of fans who saw these works as an aesthetic and engaged means towards a grass-roots re-appropriation of the city's image. Unlike what happened in other Italian cities, such as Milan, Turin's administration decided to engage in dialogue with young artists and writers. Instead of suppressing and rigidly fighting graffiti, they

decided to discourage vandalism by recognizing the artistic and expressive importance of graffiti. This is the basic idea from which *MurArte – Young Writers – Urban Graffiti* sprang. Quite significantly, its subtitle, "from a free expression to interventions of urban aesthetics", clearly states the project's aim to support and appraise young artistic expression, provided that it is performed within a top-down control system. In other words, the administration found a way to weaken or discharge acts of vandalism by channeling their energy within the borders of its aesthetic (rather than anthropological or social) component, and at the same time to undertake low-cost interventions of "clean-up aesthetics" of degraded areas.¹

On a more general level, whereas many institutional activities carried out by municipalities to use urban art to redevelop degraded areas, are often labeled as "urban renewal", this term could be used more appropriately since "urban renewal" actually involves a different attitude and a different degree of commitment, including a careful financial planning to tackle the complex socio-urban dynamics at work in large areas of the city.

Going back to the Turin initiatives in the 2000s, it is undeniable that the city administration has the merit of having taken deterrent, rather than punitive, actions and, above all, of having tried to establish a dialogue with local writers. In line with this, the *MurArte* project was part of a general plan of policies to encourage the active participation of broad sectors of the civil society and thus it fostered the birth of many associations, such as *Il cerchio e le gocce* and *Monkeys Evolution*. These associations are still very active and their greatest accomplishment is that of having turned graffiti and mural painting into a concrete form of active citizenship with multiple purposes, from urban aesthetic transformation to juvenile recovery. In addition, the exhibition *Pittura dura. Dal graffitismo alla Street Art* (hosted in *Palazzo Bricherasio*, Torino, from 24 November 1999 to 30 January 2000) should be mentioned, as it gathered together many urban artworks of the 1980s, so as to give a theoretical and historical background to *MurArte*.

Another remarkable aspect of the Turin case is the continuity of the city's government policies. Over a decade the administration made uniform and long-term interventions, which transformed Turin into the principal Italian workshop of ur-

ban art. This continuity ensured the long-standing presence of planning activities (of which MurArte is one of the most representative examples), which in turn underscores the artistic and global evolution of the urban art phenomenon from acts of vandalism to a new form of muralism. Although a very similar shift was observed in many other cities such as New York, Baltimore, London, Berlin, Barcelona and Lisbon, Turin stands out as the only city which nestled the birth of an international festival of writing and mural art named PicTurin. The event had three editions (2010-2012), during which interventions of great artistic quality generated a large international impact and a growing recognition both in the traditional art system and in the urban art milieu. Compared to the MurArte project, PicTurin had different objectives as graffiti was no longer considered as a phenomenon to be fought against, but a new artistically acknowledged form that could add cultural value to the entire city.

On the occasion of the 2006 Winter Olympic Games, Turin faced a major overhaul in terms of territorial and urban marketing, through which the city strategically embraced a new set of values in order to “sell” its image to a national and international public. The physical and material features of the city, as well as its historical and cultural heritage contributed to define Turin as a city that wanted to appear not just with a refreshed image but also as a sort of newly conceived commercial brand. In this regard, the First Strategic Plan drawn up by the City of Turin defined the main objectives to be sought at the level of communication, namely to make Turin known to the largest possible audience and to change the general perception people had of the city. Notwithstanding its impressive industrial and historic past, Turin had to project itself through the image of a friendly, dynamic, creative and forward-looking city, ready to offer itself to the international view/market as a place of lively cultural, architectural and economic improvements.²

Thanks to PicTurin, Turin became a great art workshop in which more than 3,500 square meters of murals were made. The finished result of this performed transformation was as important as the act of its realization, a way to stage art and its protagonists to the audience of city viewers. While for MurArte the walls had been randomly assigned, for PicTurin they underwent a careful selection that led to choosing walls sites that had having maximum visibility and better aesthetics. The administration no longer spoke of urban regeneration of degraded or peripheral areas by means of a new ex-

pressive and artistic value, but of an open-air museum using the walls of the city to exhibit its collection. The selected walls were always large and committed to a single artist, as opposed to what happened in MurArte in which many writers were given the possibility to share the same artistic space. PicTurin thus sealed the passage from a bottom-up participation of local crews to a selection process following the blueprint of curatorial mechanisms in academic art. Even though both famous and emerging artists could participate, they were nonetheless artists in a position to give the city the international resonance it sought. One of the most visible outcomes of PicTurin was that lettering disappeared from the walls, replaced by the strong expressive individualities of the artists involved. Among the personalities who contributed their works to PicTurin are the German DOME, the Belgian ROA (Figure. 1) (whose macabre drawing of a weasel holding the dead body of a rat continues to create strong responses), the Catalan Aryz (Figure. 2) and the Italian artists Ericailcane, Pixel Pancho, Hitnes, Etnik, Gianluca Scarano, and Agostino Iacurci.

A few years later, in 2012, a new urban art project arose. URBE association promoted the NizzArt project in collaboration with Circoscrizione 8 of the city of Turin on the axis of Via Nizza, thanks to the support of the newspaper La Stampa. The works, carried out in a portion of the city not yet involved in previous initiatives, were made by important Italian artists, such as Agostino Iacurci (parking lot in via Lugaro, in front of La Stampa headquarters), Moneyless (via Rosmini), as well as by international names including Alexandre Farto aka Vhils (via Nizza).

2. B.Art, Arte in Barriera

After PicTurin in 2012 and NizzArt in 2013, a new large-scale intervention project arose in 2014. B.ART Arte in Barriera, features urban art as an opportunity to re-interpret and transform degraded areas of the city by promoting shared collaborative work of artists, administrators and citizens, with a view to giving new values to the urban space. In this case, rather than involving different parts of the city, attention was given to a single historic district, Barriera di Milano, one of the most complex and varied areas of Turin. The main aim of B.ART was that of making the Barriera di Milano a more welcoming place without altering its original historical and social vocations. This neighborhood was born on the road to Milan in the second half of the 19th century and became, in

the following decades, the industrial hub of the city, as opposed to the Mirafiori area and Fiat industries' headquarters. It saw the birth of textile mills, workshops and confectioneries, as well as foundries, car, transport and logistics companies, many of which have since closed down leaving behind abandoned and disused areas. An international public art call (expiring on 30 June 2014) was launched. It was aimed at increasing the quality and attractiveness of the urban environment through the creation of 13 artistic interventions spread across the district. The call, sponsored by the City of Turin and the Urban Barriera Committee and organized by Fondazione Torino Contrada, was open to artists, graphic designers and architects, who were assigned the task of designing a unique concept to be realized on 13 facades (9 private and 4 public), which had been selected in advance by the organizing committee as the most representative of the history and characteristics of the Barriera di Milano. Two juries, one of experts, and one of the territory – composed by 33 local residents, representatives of associations and schools – discussed the 84 proposals received. In September, after consultation with the local residents' representatives, the winning artist, Millo, started to paint the 13 walls. This announcement follows the track of many constructive experiences of public art previously occurred in Turin, but it introduces some innovative aspects as well: instead of committing the facades to different artists, a unique concept elaborated by a single artist was chosen. In this way, the works unfold a narrative and define, for the first time, a uniform and evocative image that is diversified according to the various spaces. It is not an isolated action, but it is part of a series of actions developed by the Urban Barriera program, including a series of redevelopment interventions on deteriorated infrastructure and public spaces.

The winning project, by the artist Francesco Giorgino, aka Millo (born in Mesagne, near Brindisi, in 1979), is titled *Habitat* and consists of thirteen drawings characterized by black and white lines and some disruptive color spaces. The common thread in the scenarios is the analysis of the relationship between man and the urban fabric, which invariably acts as a background for each work. Each mural features one or more off-the-scale giant children (like some sort of Gullivers in the land of Lilliput) performing simple gestures and interacting with what is around them and with the elements of the architecture on which they are painted. As the artist says: *“Being off-the-scale is in fact a metaphor of our habitat and*

of how the places where we live in have been transformed over the years and are now, paradoxically, no longer human-friendly. The ultimate hope is that, beyond the level of the mere embellishment intervention, each category of viewers can find their own space for reflection and access new possibilities (B.ART, 2015: n.p.).”

Millo is a trained architect and, therefore, the design of the city with its buildings and infrastructures plays a paramount role for him. His works are arguably conceived/designed with the eye of an architect who works on the city using the means of an artist. Seemingly, his architectural background has a strong influence on the way his murals are incorporated into the urban environment, thus creating a sort of game of mirrors or semantic loop in which the city hosts the murals, which in turn represent the city, which is in turn is transformed by the murals themselves. As Millo said in a recent interview:

“Murals change the urban space and the way people perceive those areas within the city. Urban art makers do it also to improve and make more interesting and lively a space that before was not so. When you think about it, rather than being accessory, decorum in architecture was a key part of the wall surface. I am not just referring to pictorial or graphical elements; architectural orders themselves had both a structural and an aesthetic function. For me, murals give a new aesthetic value to merely blind surfaces. [...] They are an additional layer to the existing one, and we basically exploit a bug in the building process. When you build in adherence to another edifice along a bigger number of floors, you have to leave a blind wall free to allow the adjoining owner to build up another story. This rule creates a whole series of unused surfaces in our cities that lend themselves to being used as canvases. This seems to me a good way to use a systemic failure, or in other words, an unwanted side effect, to create something new and positive (Architettisenzatetto, 2015: n.p.).”

Millo's words offers a new and fascinating interpretation of urban art as a symbiotic and parasitic life form that exists by exploiting the inconsistencies of the urban organism. His vision affirms the impossibility of urban artworks to live outside their architectural support and, on the other hand, their urge to strike a balance between the mutual needs of the city and of artistic expression. When this compromise appears achieved, all of the parties will benefit from its positive and lasting outcomes. When, instead of participation and a com-

mitment to sharing, rules are imposed or spaces and artists are used for non-shared aims, the resultant work will remain an end in itself, with no positive impact on the context and on the people who live those spaces.

3. Documenting and Surveying

The analysis I present here derives from an ongoing research project started at the Faculty of Architecture of Pescara in 2012. The goal of the project is to study and survey urban art in Italy through the tools and methodologies of urban and architectural survey. My choice to study urban murals in cities, whether they are graffiti or urban artworks, springs from the awareness that they represent a vantage point to analyze and understand how city architecture can become an open ground for discussion and social evolution, beyond its merely functional aspect and aesthetic and formal implications.

I started this research following my desire to know better those who act with lightness and irony on the subtle line between shared rules and arbitrary expression. It is a journey into the contemporary urban space, fuelled by an urge to walk through the streets, step by step, observing the way in which drawing fosters the dialogue between space, architecture, and people. My very first case study was Grottaglie, near Taranto, and the works carried out during the various editions of Fame Festival (see Caffio, 2012). In this first study, I gave special attention to the surveying and drawing methodology of the mural works, with an aim to establish a practical canon to be applied to specific occasions and that would overcome some of the commonly adopted settings in urban art representation.

Urban artworks are often appreciated for their visual and aesthetic quality, which is surely essential but somehow obscures other important features. Murals owe their success to the media thanks to their extraordinarily photogenic power; nevertheless, photography does not do justice to all their features. When reduced to two-dimensional images, exchanged and disseminated in the web as disposable iconic material, murals tend to become blank signs used by different communication systems such as politics, institutions or advertising. Even though there is not a unique attitude towards these works, they are usually judged by categories that can be summarized as two conflicting positions. On the one hand, they are regarded as artworks and therefore may be analyzed through the interpretative tools already applied to works of art. On the other hand, rather than artworks, they

may be seen as illegal acts of vandalism to be suppressed and erased. In both cases, these considerations do not give space to alternative interpretations, and they avoid the most challenging questions that may arise around urban art. For example, in the critical analysis and in the representation and documentation of this type of work, the fundamental importance of the physical, architectural, and urban environment in which the works are settled is often overlooked, if not completely ignored. When dealing with graffiti, books and monographs very often just select photographs of murals closing in up on the drawing itself detached from its context. If this approach is useful to spotlight the aesthetic and compositional content of a mural, it tells us nothing about the space in which it is located and the materiality of the medium on which it was realized. In other words, this kind of representation, having photography as its main instrument, ensures a complete documentation of the work in its primarily aesthetic and visual aspects, but it often neglects the relationships between the mural and its surrounding space. Such photographs erroneously prompt us to conceive of the mural as a pictorial representation, almost like a painting exhibited on a wall, forgetting that a mural is instead a more complex system that lives in a specific and unique space and provides observers with a more articulated interaction than those offered by a museum gallery. To this I add the paradox of documentation: although indispensable to the temporary and ephemeral character of these works, documentation in fact distorts their essence by transforming them into two-dimensional and incorruptible objects. In the search for a methodology of documentation that respects the values of the process as well as the work itself, it is necessary to consider the walls as artefacts inseparable from the space in which they are located, from the material substrate that supports them, and from the time conditions in which they were made.

In this sense, the examination and documentation process necessarily requires observation in situ, through which we can understand the reasons that led to the choice of a specific location and the way in which artistic action arises in relation to the historical, social, and political environment that together constitute the conditions for its creation. This kind of information is so complex and elusive that it can hardly be represented simply by means of photographs and furthermore, works do not always show their deep meanings and relationships through their materiality alone. Photography, however, has the undeniable merit of being able to

freeze in time works that often go beyond their own pictorial technique, so as to become happenings and performances (and in this respect, video appears to be the most effective means). Photography also offers a sense of authenticity and dramatic urgency that is often at the base of the artistic gesture. Following these intuitions, the artist is not a mere executor of an artifact, rather the director of a theatrical action in which space interacts with its inhabitants.

A mural is a catalytic event around which the different characters involved – institutions, inhabitants, and critics – introduce new elements of dialogue and participation. A mural thus goes beyond its material essence and becomes the document of an event that takes place over time, the trace of a Situationist provocation. Photography, therefore, should avoid facile aestheticism to document, in a clear way, the author's point of view, the space in which he/she acted, his/her actions and his/her intentions – the traces of which remain only as an echo in the drawing. Moreover, photography should not fail to investigate the complex net of implications that the artist has decided to weave between the work and its surroundings: some works are incomprehensible if we do not look through specific viewpoints, as if it were an anamorphic drawing.

Another specific aspect of murals is the discovery of the work, which causes the viewer's experience of wonder and interest. In this respect, photography can hardly convey the viewer's excitement at discovering an unexpected image. This consideration clarifies the paradox of photographic representation. In freezing a complex and evanescent event on a two-dimensional support, photography jeopardizes and permanently alters the relationship between drawing, material support, and environment. Once this connection is lost, the masonry becomes an independent and autonomous object, ready to be circulated and exchanged as a pure image on the Internet, as a page in a catalogue or a framed print hanging on the walls of a gallery. With these considerations I do not intend to demonize or discredit photographic representation. On the contrary, I am perfectly aware of how its contribution has been crucial to the study of the evolution of urban art over the years. Without important documentation work, such as that by Martha Cooper and Henry Chalfant (1988) now we could not now appreciate and study the graffiti made on New York subway cars by the early epic writers, nor would this artistic expression have had a strong impact on the worldwide audience.

However, it is important to highlight the danger of delegat-

ing the entire documentary task only to photography, without taking into account its limitations. De Certeau (1984), for example, describes the difficulty of freezing the act of drawing on the walls in a single picture. Speaking about the movements of passers-by in the city streets, the French scholar compares pedestrian trajectories to rhetorical exercises, such as synecdoche and asyndeton. These figures of speech would correspond to the different ways in which we move through the streets editing the scene. But, De Certeau (1984: 102) adds:

“they cannot be fixed in a certain place by images. If in spite of that an illustration were required, we could mention the fleeting images, yellowish-green and metallic blue calligraphies that howl without raising their voices and emblazon themselves on the subterranean passages of the city, ‘embroideries’ composed of letters and numbers, perfect gestures of violence painted with a pistol, Shivas made of written characters, dancing graphics whose fleeting apparitions are accompanied by the rumble of subway trains: New York graffiti.”

De Certeau considers the drawings on the walls as moments in which sign and action collide. For this reason, they are important traces of individual and uncontrollable tactics within the regulated space of the city. In these acts, the form and power of drawings are inseparably linked to the material they are made of, both the drawing tools and the support; by the same token, the tracing gesture leaves a trail of intentions behind it and a mark of the precise moment of realization. We will then find brutal and dirty traits when the work is carried out without authorization; conversely, we will find precise and clean traits when the artist creates under calmer conditions of consent.

4. Instruments and Representation Methods

Once realized, the drawing lives in a symbiotic way with the building on which it is painted. Instead of being randomly chosen, the site or architecture on which a mural is painted responds to specific requirements of visibility, accessibility, and dangerousness of execution. Each of these features influences the way in which the work will be received both by the community of artists and by the wider audience of the city's inhabitants. It is precisely the geographical and temporal variables that give a specific and unique meaning to an urban artwork, not just its aesthetic qualities, performative techniques, or the presence of a more or less shouted political message. Given the complexity of internal and external

relationships and references in a mural work, I propose a documentation and representation process that includes a variety of tools, methods, and integrated techniques – which are different from those normally used for art catalogues. For what concerns the material phase of documentation, the proposed instruments are the following:

- Cameras;
- Video cameras, which are particularly useful for documenting all the stages of the making of a work;
- Direct and indirect survey instruments borrowed from architectural survey. Since a mural lives in a specific space of the city, it is important to document the proportional as well as the dimensional and spatial relationships with surrounding architectures. In the documentation process, alongside photographing a mural, it is also helpful to detect the basic architectural volumes, assuming that in the future a laser scanner capable of fixing through a cloud the spatial and chromatic characteristics of each measured point will be available. Laser scanners can be a powerful tool to document urban art because they allow us to store the urban space and the photographic texture of the painting in a single 3D model. However, the currently unaffordable cost of this instrument, along with the general prejudice towards this kind of art, prevents its use in it in a survey campaign. It is my conviction, nevertheless, that when new and more affordable tools are available, they will become indispensable to field research;
- A new experimental tool based on the use of cameras for stereometric or 360° recording. As regards methods of representation, I propose the following:
 - Photographic representation, provided that it describes the work at different scales:
 - The environment as a whole;
 - The work;
 - The material, technical, and stylistic details of the work.
 - Graphical representation illustrating the spatial and metric characteristics of the work, in particular maps (for example, online maps allowing us to geo-localize photographs and film with just a few clicks), floor plans, orthophotos, orthographic and isometric projections.
 - Three-dimensional digital models, possibly to be explored in an interactive mode obtained through metric data or photo-modeling.
 - Representations obtained by cylindrical or spherical projections, as is the case with digital panoramas.

5. Conclusion

Since the end of the 1990s, Turin has been a key contemporary workspace where different political and aesthetic approaches have come into contact. Turin has proved a significant case study for two main reasons: the temporal stratification of its interventions and the ongoing transformation in which the final result is as important as its process and realization.

To study the case of Turin, therefore, allows us to understand the evolution of contemporary Italian graffiti over the past fifteen years, as well as to address the following issues at stake in the theoretical and critical debate: the power of mural art to trigger urban renewal processes; the relationship between the various administrations over the years and the once illegal artistic practices; the relationship between a local context and a global art movement spread through the web; and finally, the need to design and organize a documentation system for works that are ephemeral by their own nature. The experiences of urban art in Turin examined here also show how an artistic practice can serve as a means to re-appropriate the city, thanks to the cooperation between institutions, citizens and cultural communities.

Acknowledgements

This research on Italian urban art is being carried on in collaboration with the architecture photographer Pippo Marino. The ideas concerning the creation of a standard process to photograph urban artworks within their context are the result of an ongoing dialogue on theoretical principles and of practical fieldwork. All the photographs featuring in this paper are by Pippo Marino.

Notes

1 - For more on urban art in Italy, see Mastroianni (2013); Brighenti (2009); Caputo (2009); Gargiulo (2011); Castelvetchi, Naldi and Musso (2013); Omodeo (2014); and Tomassini (2012).

2 - The starting point of this new communication vision of Turin was the adoption in 2000 of a Strategic Plan, which was followed by another plan prepared in 2006 on the occasion of the Winter Olympic Games. For further reading, see the official strategic plan available at: web site URL <http://www.torinostrategica.it> and P. Bondio (ed.), 2007. *A giochi fatti. Le eredità di Torino 2006*. Roma, Carocci.).

References

B.ART (2014) B.ART *project website*. [Online] Available at: <http://arteinbarriera.com/online/it/il-bando/> [Accessed 5/12/2015].

Architettisenzatetto (2015) *Millo a Torino*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.architettisenzatetto.net/wp2/it/millo-a-torino/> [Accessed 5/12/2015].

Bondio, P. (2007) *A giochi fatti. Le eredità di Torino 2006*. Roma: Carocci.

Brighenti, A.M. (2009) *The Wall and the City*. Trento: Professional Dreamers Press.

Caffio, G. (2012) *Il disegno nelle città. Street art is dead. Long live street art!* Naples, 44 Edizioni.

Caputo, A. (2009) *All City Writers*. Bagnolet FR, Kitchen93.

M. De Certeau, 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press, p. 102.

Cooper, M. and Chalfant, H. (1988) *Subway Art*. New York: Henry Holt.

Gargiulo, M. (2011). *Street Art Diary*. Rome., Castelvechi.; Mastroianni, R. (2013) *Writing the City. Graffitismo, Immaginario Urbano e Street Art*. Rome: Aracne.

Naldi, F. and Musso, C. (2013) *Frontier: The Line of Style*. Bologna: Damiani.

Omodeo, C. (2014) *Crossboarding: an Italian Paper History of Graffiti Writing and Street Art*. Paris: LO/A Edition.

Tomassini, M. (2012) *Beautiful Winners*. Verona: Ombre Corte.



Figure 1.ROA, Lungo Dora Savona n.30, PicTurin 2010. ph Pippo Marino



Figure 2. Aryz, Cso. San Maurizio, PicTurin 2010. ph Pippo Marino



Figure 3. Millo, c.so Vigeveno n. 2. B.ART 2014. ph. Pippo Marino



Figure 4. Millo, via Cherubini n. 63. B.ART 2014. ph. Pippo Marino



Figure 5. Millo, piazza Bottesini n. 6. B.ART 2014. ph. Pippo Marino



Figure 5. Millo, via Cruto n. 3. B.ART 2014. ph. Pippo Marino.