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ABSTRACT
The paper explores the possible influence of archaeological heritage and archaeological data on urban planning, i.e. the role of archaeology in the contemporary world and the possibilities of presenting and preserving historic traces in the urban tissue.

Based on the analysis of selected cases, the model of reinterpretation is recognized as one of the possible means of presenting and using archaeological heritage. This is a conditional type of archaeological heritage presentation, as it does not include the presentation of visible remains, but rather their urbanistic or architectural reinterpretation in the form of streets, squares, pedestrian paths, passages, construction lines, architectural design, landscape design etc. Use of this type of presentation is applicable to presentation and urban integration of specific types of archaeological heritage in which the application of classical forms of in situ presentation is hampered (urban grid, centuriation, historic roads and paths, historic landscapes, etc.).

The research included an analysis of the urbanistic reinterpretation of the ancient Roman centuriation in the case of the planned city district Split III in Split (Croatia); urbanistic reinterpretation and integration of the ancient Roman road in the case of the Sopnica-Jelkovec housing complex in Zagreb (Croatia); the architectural reinterpretation of the Roman forum and the Late Antiquity building in the case of commercial and residential complex in Ljubljana (Slovenia).

The paper further explores the possibility of applying this type of presentation in the case of enhancing urban integration of archaeological heritage in the Spanish city of Alcalá de Henares, whose historic centre is on the list of UNESCO World Heritage Sites. The remains of the ancient town of Complutum are located outside the historic city centre, in the area of expansion of the city in the 20th century (setting of WHS). Archaeological remains of the ancient town are partially presented in an archaeological park as visible remains, while its parts in the built up area, which partially preserved the ancient urban grid, are not presented and interpreted. The main streets of the ancient town, the cardo and the decumanus, exist in the spatial sense in the contemporary city as today’s streets and parks, and their presentation and content reinterpretation are possible.

The aim is to attract more visitors to the archaeological area, achieve better social integration of archaeological heritage and local inhabitants and create, by using archaeological heritage, particularity and recognisability of the area, enhance identity, show historic continuity and raise the overall quality of life in the city district with poor social structure.
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RESUMEN
Este artículo explora la posible influencia del patrimonio arqueológico y los datos arqueológicos en el planeamiento urbano. Es decir, el función de la arqueología en el mundo contemporáneo y las posibilidades de mostrar y preservar rastros históricas en el tejido urbano.
Basado en el análisis de casos seleccionados, la reinterpretación es una de las formas posibles de presentar y utilizar el patrimonio arqueológico. Es una forma indirecta de mostrar el patrimonio arqueológico, ya que no muestra restos visibles, sino su reinterpretación urbanística o arquitectónica en forma de calles, plazas, caminos, pasajes, líneas de construcción, diseño arquitectónico, diseño de paisaje, etc. El uso de este tipo de presentación se aplica a la integración urbana de tipos específicos de patrimonio arqueológico en los que es difícil la aplicación de formas clásicas de presentación in situ (rejilla urbana, centurización, calzadas y caminos históricos, paisajes históricos, etc.).

La investigación incluyó un análisis de la reinterpretación urbanística de la centurización romana antigua en el caso del distrito urbano planificado Split III en Split (Croacia); la reinterpretación urbanística e integración de la antigua calzada romana en el complejo de viviendas Sopnica-Jelkovec en Zagreb (Croacia); la reinterpretación arquitectónica del foro romano y un edificio de la Antigüedad tardía en el caso del complejo comercial y residencial en Ljubljana (Eslovenia).

El documento explora además la posibilidad de aplicar este tipo de presentación para la mejora en la integración urbana del patrimonio arqueológico en la ciudad española de Alcalá de Henares, cuyo centro histórico figura en la lista del Patrimonio Mundial de la UNESCO. Los restos de la antigua ciudad de Complutum se encuentran fuera del centro histórico de la ciudad, en el área de expansión de la ciudad en el siglo XX (entorno de WHS). Los restos arqueológicos visibles de la ciudad antigua se muestran parcialmente en un parque arqueológico, mientras que en el área edificada, que conserva en parte la antigua cuadrícula urbana, no se muestran ni se interpretan. Las calles principales de la ciudad antigua, el cardo y el decumano, existen en el sentido espacial en la ciudad contemporánea como las calles y parques de hoy, y es posible su presentación y reinterpretación.

El objetivo es atraer a más visitantes al área arqueológica, lograr una mejor integración social del patrimonio arqueológico y los habitantes locales y crear, mediante el uso del patrimonio arqueológico, la particularidad y el reconocimiento de la zona, mejorar la identidad, mostrar una continuidad histórica y mejorar la calidad de vida en este distrito con una estructura social pobre.

PALABRAS CLAVE: planificación urbana, patrimonio arqueológico, integración urbana, reinterpretación, presentación

1 INTRODUCTION

The paper explores the possible influence of archaeological heritage and archaeological data on urban planning, i.e. the role of archaeology in the contemporary world and the possibilities of presenting and preserving historic traces in the urban tissue. The often unfavourable relation between spatial development and archaeological heritage, especially pronounced in the second half of the 20th century, should be substituted with a different approach based on archaeological heritage preservation and recognition of its value for contemporary cities in the context of sustainable development and enhancing the quality of life. The aim is to explore architectural and urbanistic reinterpretation of archaeological heritage as a possible type of presentation and integration of archaeological heritage in towns and settlements. The research used case studies to explore the archaeological heritage reinterpretation in two cities in Croatia (Zagreb, Split) and one city in Slovenia (Ljubljana). A comparative analysis was based on: results of archaeological research and other archaeological data; built architectural or urban planning projects; current state; existence of accompanying interpretive infrastructure and other available data.

The research was conducted within the framework of the Heritage urbanism (HERU 2032) research project funded by the Croatian Science Foundation.
2 TYPES OF IN SITU ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE PRESENTATION

Usual types of in situ archaeological heritage presentation in a town/settlement include:

- **presentation of visible remains**
  This is a type of archaeological heritage presentation which implies visibility of archaeological finds in situ (architectural remains). It is the most complex type of presentation as it requires a solution for the physical protection of archaeological finds from the many natural and antropogenic factors of decay and calls for their integration into a contemporary city/settlement. It includes presentation in the open air and indoors. Comprehensibility and visibility of this type of presentation are the highest compared to other conditional forms of presentation in situ, although this type requires interpretive infrastructure as well.

- **floor graphics**
  Most often applied in the case of design of public spaces (squares, streets), represents a relatively simple and economical solution compared to presenting the visible archaeological remains. The layout of the discovered remains is shown by using different material, texture, surface treatment or colour at the walking surface level. The downside of this type of presentation is reflected in frequent uncomprehensibility and poor visibility to the average passer-by or visitor without the supporting interpretative information (interpretive panels, marking etc.). This form of presentation is also suitable for interiors and may include in situ preservation of actual remains or simply represent a memory of removed remains.

- **marking of a site**
  Usually applied to present movable archaeological finds or the finds of the type that is almost impossible or very difficult to preserve in situ (organic material). May include the erection of info boards, replicas, display cases etc. on sites where original finds were found.

In practice, the aforementioned types of archaeological heritage presentation are often combined and complemented.

3 REINTERPRETATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE AS A TYPE OF IN SITU PRESENTATION

Based on the analysis of the selected cases (see next paragraph), the model of reinterpretation is recognized as one of the possible means of presenting and using the archaeological heritage. This is a conditional type of archaeological heritage presentation, as it does not include the presentation of visible remains, but rather their urbanistic or architectural reinterpretation in the form of streets, squares, pedestrian paths, passages, construction lines, architectural design, landscape design etc. Use of this type of presentation is applicable to presentation and urban integration of specific types of archaeological heritage in which the application of classical forms of in situ presentation is hampered (urban grid, centuriation, historic roads and paths, historic landscapes, etc.).

The established model can include two levels of reinterpretation: the formal/spatial level and the content level. The formal level of reinterpretation concerns the design while the content level includes historic use reinterpretation. It is also possible to connect it with other types of archaeological heritage presentation (visible remains, floor graphics or site marking). This type of archaeological heritage presentation has a low level of comprehensibility for residents or

---

1 Types of presentation were researched as part of an unpublished doctoral dissertation Archaeological Heritage Integration Method in Urban Planning (Rukavina 2015).

2 The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (ICOMOS 2008)

3 For example, the Zagreb while it wasn’t project - replicas of discovered movable archaeological and paleontological finds together with interpretive panels were placed in several locations in the city of Zagreb (Archaeological Museum in Zagreb 2014).

4 Different authors use different terms for this presentation form: reminiscence, referring, evoking etc. (Potokar 2014; Vodopivec 2014; Županek 2008).
visitors (Županek & Mlekuž 2008) without the use of accompanying interpretive means (interpretive panels, models, interpretation centre, use of modern technology, etc.).

Just like other types of *in situ* archaeological heritage presentation, it should be based on cooperation between archaeologists, the conservation service and urban planners in all planning stages.

## 4 EXAMPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE REINTERPRETATION

The research included an analysis of urbanistic reinterpretation of the ancient Roman centuriation in the case of the planned city district *Split III* in Split (Croatia), urbanistic reinterpretation and integration of the ancient Roman road in the case of the *Sopnica-Jelkovec* housing complex in Zagreb (Croatia) and the architectural reinterpretation of the Roman forum and the Late Antiquity building in the case of residential and commercial complex in Ljubljana (Slovenia).

![Figure 1: Marked roads and pedestrian communications of the Split 3 district that overlap with ancient Roman centuriation lines (Brune Bušića Street 1, Papandopulova Street 2, Marina Getaldića Street 2, Grada Trondheima Street 3, Vukovarska Street 4, Polička Road 5). Asterisks mark locations of floor slabs with inscription *centuriation*. Note. Drawn on the Google Earth satellite image.](image)

### 4.1 Split 3, Split

The selected case study is located in Split, the second largest city in Croatia, known for the Diocletian's palace built in the 4th century, whose ancient remains are integrated into the medieval historic city centre that has been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List since 1979. The *Split 3* city district was partially built (1970-1979) according to the urban design concept by a team of Slovenian architects Vladimir Mušič, Marjan Bežan, Nives Starc and associates which won the first prize at the public competition held in 1968 (Kukoč 2010; Pasinović 1970). The new city district - a new city for 30 thousand inhabitants on 330 ha with all accompanying community services was planned at the eastern outskirts of the city at the time (Kukoč 2010), which, just like the whole Split area, belonged to the town of *Salona* ager.
in the Antiquity (Marasović et al. 1958; Suić 1955, 2003). The antique land division into centuries was executed in regular squares with sides of approximately 710 m. Initially, centuriation was marked by centuriation stones and communications at the boundaries of adjacent centuries which, during land cultivation in the Middle Ages and the Modern Age often took the shape of a continuous drywall and a dirt road (Marasović et al. 1958; Suić 1955). The preserved traces of centuriation in the area planned for city expansion were respected by the selected urban design from 1968. The plan was based on two grids: the Roman centuriation grid and the Diocletian’s palace grid. All buildings and communication network (roads, pedestrian paths and passages) were placed within these systems (Kukoč 2010, Mušić & Bežan 1973, Pasinović 1970) (Figure 1). In some places, former centuriation lines reinterpreted as pedestrian pathways are marked with a stone slab in the floor, but without additional interpretive infrastructure and hence the comprehensibility of the centuriation network remained extremely low.

Figure 2: Siscia - Poetovio Roman road in the Sopnica-Jelkovec housing complex in Zagreb reinterpreted as a park promenade. (Photo: T. Oberman, 2015.)

4.2 Sopnica-Jelkovec housing complex, Zagreb

The analysed example of archaeological heritage reinterpretation is located in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia which was founded in the Middle Ages and experienced greatest spatial

---

5 Ancient centuriation in Split is not legally protected, but it is protected by master plan ordinances (Master Plan Split, Article 94. [Grad Split 2014]).
6 Papandopulova Street, Marina Getaldića Street
and economic growth in the 20th century. Sopnica Jelkovec housing complex in Zagreb\(^7\) was built in 2009 on the site of a former pig farm in the most eastern city district of Sesvete through which, in Antiquity, ran the Roman road Siscia-Poetovio, mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary (Gračanin 2010, Gregl 1984). After Siscia, the road led to the Roman town of Andautonia (Dautonia), then crossed the Sava River and continued through the present-day Sesvete towards Pyrr (Gračanin 2010; Gregl 1984, 1991; Nemeth-Ehrlich & Kušan Špalj 2007). Visible remains of the ancient road embankment in the Sesvete area\(^8\) were partially preventively protected by a 1994 decision, but as the decision has not been revised, they are no longer legally protected as a cultural good\(^9\) (Rukavina, Petrić & Obad Šćitaroci 2015, 2016). The urban design concept by the team of authors preserved the route of the ancient road in the new settlement and incorporated it into the central public park area, reinterpreted as a promenade (Figure 2, Figure 3). No archaeological research/excavation was carried out during the construction of the housing complex and hence no precise data regarding the position of the ancient road exists.

![Figure 3: Roman road marked on the territory of the Sopnica-Jelkovec housing complex. Note. Drawn on the Google Earth satellite image.](image)

In an immediate vicinity (Jelkovec), a milestone of Emperor Maximus was accidentally discovered in 1934 (the only milestone ever found in the Zagreb area) (Gračanin 2010; Gregl 1984, 1991; Nemeth-Ehrlich & Kušan Špalj 2007). The preserved route of the Roman road in the Sopnica-Jelkovec settlement has still not been accompanied by interpretive infrastructure

---

\(^7\) On the basis of the first prize at the competition held in 2003 as part of the government’s social construction program, a detailed urban plan of the Sopnica-Jelkovec housing complex was developed the same year (Nadilo 2009). The team of authors consisted of architects of the Institute for Urban Planning, Physical Planning and Landscape Architecture of the Faculty of Architecture, University of Zagreb: Sanja Gašparović, Darija Maletić Mirko, Nataša Martinčić, Ivan Mlinar, Marija Premužić and Krunoslav Šmit (Mlinar & Šmit 2008; Nadilo 2009).

\(^8\) The route of the ancient road was about 15m east of the present-day road bearing the name the Roman Path (Rukavina, Petrić & Obad Šćitaroci 1015).

\(^9\) Protected by general protection measures in Master Plan Sesvete (Grad Zagreb 2015).
and hence the road remains unknown to local residents while its heritage value goes on being unused.\footnote{10}

\subsection*{4.3 Ferant Garden residential and commercial complex, Ljubljana}

The selected case study is located in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, which was founded in the Middle Ages not far from the remains of the ancient Roman town of Emona. Ljubljana’s expansion began already in the 18th century, slowly occupying the area of the former ancient town which nowadays comprises an integral part of its historic centre. The \textit{Ferant Garden} residential and commercial complex in Ljubljana was built in 1973 according to the first award-winning design by architect Edvard Ravnikar\footnote{11} and associates\footnote{12} on an area of the ancient Emona's forum. Before the construction, rescue excavations were carried out in the area designated for construction, led by the City Museum on several occasions (1963-1964, 1968-1971, 1974) (Gaspari 2014). The research discovered remains of the forum, \textit{porticus}, basilica, curia, commercial and warehouse buildings and the remains of a rotunda (4th-6th c.) which most probably served as an early Christian cult building (Gaspari 2014).

![Image](image.jpg)

\begin{itemize}
  \item Figure 4: Reinterpreted Late Antiquity rotunda at the front of a building along Slovenska Street in Ljubljana. (Photo: M. Rukavina, 2017.)
\end{itemize}

\footnote{10} The Study of the Protection and Presentation of the Potential of the Archaeological Site Kuzelin and Adjacent Archaeological Sites proposed that the route of the Roman road be included into the archaeological and recreational path and an interpretive centre of the Roman road to be established within the Sopnica-Jelkovec library on the route of the ancient road.

\footnote{11} One of the most prominent Slovenian architects of the 20th century.

\footnote{12} Jože Koželj, Mika Berlič and Judita Černič (Vodopivec & Žnidaršič 2010)
The residential and commercial complex built in today's central part of the city reinterpreted the discovered archaeological finds. On the facade of the building along the present-day Slovenska Street, a concrete rotunda was built, placed above the ground floor, corresponding in position and dimensions to the Late Antiquity rotunda, while its layout is also shown on the street floor with the use of different material - floor graphics (Figure 4). The construction of the building was carried out in a way to ensure the preservation of remains of ancient walls in the basement floor intended for public use (gallery) in which the remains of the basilica and the rotunda are visible in situ (Vodopivec 2014). The inner courtyard of the complex can be associated with an attempt of reinterpreting an ancient forum (Potokar 2014, Županek 2008, 2010, 2014). The yard was designed in two levels: the public ground floor of the yard contains commercial and business premises corresponding to the ancient forum, while the basement floor contains parking spaces for tenants, thus significantly disrupting the experience of the former Roman forum. According to some authors, even the brick cladding on the facades evokes the ancient art of brick building (Potokar 2014).

Unfortunately, this attempt of reinterpreting archaeological heritage has not been accompanied by interpretive infrastructure and remains mostly incomprehensible to the average passer-by or visitor (Županek & Mlekuž 2008), although it is included in a sightseeing tour (Županek 2014). The current state of maintenance and use of business and commercial spaces does not ensure the liveliness and proper use of the inner courtyard, while the visibility of archaeological finds, ensured from the public space with the use of glass windows on the basement floor facing Slovenska Street, disappeared with opaque foils placed on gallery windows.

5 THE POSSIBILITY OF APPLYING THE REINTERPRETATION MODEL IN THE CITY OF ALCALÁ DE HENARES

The paper further explores the possibility of applying this type of presentation / model in the case of enhancing the urban integration of archaeological heritage in the Spanish city of Alcalá de Henares, whose historic centre is on the list of UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

The ancient Roman town of Complutum with a municipal status was built in the 1st century on the principle of an orthogonal urban network in the Henares River valley on the main road Emerita Augusta – Cesar Augusta (Fernández Ochoa & Salido Domínguez 2016; Sánchez Montes & Rascón Marqués 2014). The remains of the ancient town are located outside the medieval historic centre of the present-day Alcalá de Henares, in the area of the city expansion in the second half of the 20th century. Rapid urbanization prompted by industrialization in the 1960s, when the number of inhabitants grew multiple times within just a decade, led to unplanned construction spreading along the existing roads (Ciudades Patrimonio de Humanidad). The construction spread onto the previously unbuilt archaeological area of the ancient town, occupying 50% of its surface area (1970-1974) (Garcés 1978; Sánchez Montes & Rascón Marqués 2014). Archaeological rescue excavations prior to construction were not carried out, only some of the most significant mosaic finds were saved and relocated to a museum (Garcés 1978, Sánchez Montes & Rascón Marqués 2014). It was only in 1984 that the remains of the ancient town were protected by provisions replacing the plan and in 1988 they were proclaimed a monument (BIC), thus putting an end to further construction and devastation of the archaeological area (Sánchez Montes & Rascón Marqués 2014). The first planned housing complex with all accompanying amenities, Puerta de Madrid (the 1973 detailed plan [Ciudades Patrimonio de Humanidad n.d.]), partially built in the

13 The city did not have a master plan until 1991 (Ciudades Patrimonio de Humanidad n.d.). In the context of UNESCO’s historic centre protection, the surrounding area of the present-day Alcalá de Henares should be seen as its setting.
14 Normas subsidiarias del Ayuntamiento de Alcalá
15 Bien de Interés Cultural
archaeological area (Regio VI), along Calle Nuñes de Guzmán street, once the main *decumanus* of the ancient town, assumes/continues the same geometry / urban grid as the ancient town. The same grid is partially taken over also by other development located directly in the archaeological area north of *Camino de Juncal* street (Regio V and Regio VI).

![Google Earth](image.png)


Archaeological remains of the ancient town are presented in the archaeological park opened in 2009 (Sánches Montes & Rascón Marqués 2014) as visible remains, while its traces in the built-up area of the city, which partially preserved the ancient urban grid, have not been interpreted. Although the site was significantly devastated without previous archaeological research, the streets of the ancient town exist to a certain extent in a spatial sense in the contemporary city as present-day streets and parks, and their interpretation is possible (Figure 5). By setting up the interpretive infrastructure (interpretive panels, mobile applications, etc.) and using content reinterpretation (commercial and restaurant facilities), in particular in present-day *Camino del Juncal* and *Calle Nuñez de Guzmán* streets on the route of the main *decumanus* which directly connects the archaeological park with the UNESCO protected historic city centre, it is possible to better integrate archaeological heritage into the contemporary city and rectify earlier planning mistakes of not recognizing the value of archaeological heritage for the city and its inhabitants (Figure 6).

The aim of the proposal is to attract more visitors to the archaeological area, achieve better social integration of archaeological heritage with local inhabitants and, by using archaeological heritage, create particularity and recognisability of the area, enhance identity,

---

16 The division of the ancient town according to Sánches Montes and Rascón Marqués (2014) was used.

17 The archaeological park has a relatively small number of visitors compared to the historic city centre (oral information by Alicia Castillo Mena, May 2017).
show historical continuity and raise the overall quality of life in the city district with poor social structure.

Figure 6: Building with porches on the ground floor that follows the former decumanus maximus of the ancient Complutum - present-day Calle Nuñes de Guzmán street in Alcalá de Henares. (Photo: M. Rukavina, 2017)

6 COMPARISON OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE REINTERPRETATION EXAMPLES AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREA IN ALCALÁ DE HENARES

The comparison of the explored archaeological heritage reinterpretation examples in the three cities and the built-up archaeological area in the Spanish town of Alcalá de Henares, which preserved the ancient urban grid, is presented in table 1. The analysis included: type of archaeological find; historic period to which the find belongs; implementation of rescue excavation; legal protection status; location in the city; year of a competition for an architectural or urban planning project; obligation to present the finds determined by a competition program or urban planning documentation; realization period; content and spatial reinterpretation of archaeological traces/remains; existence of interpretive infrastructure; combination with other types of presentation; and inclusion in sightseeing tours.

The comparison has shown the following:
- the reinterpretation model is applied to different types of archaeological heritage of very different scales;
- the analysed reinterpreted archaeological traces belong to the Antiquity;
- in three analysed cases (Split, Zagreb and Alcalá de Henares) no archaeological rescue excavation was carried out prior to construction nor were archaeological remains legally protected at the time of construction works (two are protected by planning ordinances);
- archaeological remains are located in the historic centre only in the case of *Ferant Garden* in Ljubljana while in other examples they are located outside the historic centre;
- in three analysed cases (Split, Zagreb and Ljubljana) architectural or urbanistic competitions were carried out while the analysed area in Alcalá de Henares was largely built up without a plan;
- the obligation to present archaeological remains has been confirmed only in the case from Ljubljana;
- partial content reinterpretation of archaeological heritage is present only in the case from Ljubljana;
- partial interpretive infrastructure (stone slab with an inscription centuration) was recorded in the *Split III*;
- combination with other types of presentation exists in the case from Ljubljana (*Ferant Garden*) where the site is also included in sightseeing tours.

Table 1: Comparison of the explored archaeological heritage reinterpretation examples and the archaeological area in Alcalá de Henares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Ferant Garden</em> (Ljubljana)</th>
<th><em>Split III</em> (Split)</th>
<th><em>Sopnica-Jelkovec</em> (Zagreb)</th>
<th>Alcalá de Henares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type of find</td>
<td>remains of forum complex, rotunda</td>
<td>centuriation</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>urban grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic period</td>
<td>Antiquity, Late Antiquity</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>Antiquity, Late Antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeological rescue excavation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location in the city</td>
<td>historic centre</td>
<td>outside historic centre</td>
<td>outside historic centre</td>
<td>outside historic centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition (year)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligation to present the archaeological finds stipulated in the competition programme or the urban planning documents</td>
<td>yes (Master Plan Ljubljana 1965)</td>
<td>undetermined information</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial reinterpretation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content reinterpretation</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive infrastructure</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination with other types of presentation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion in sightseeing tours</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 CONCLUSION

In addition to the usual three forms/types of *in situ* archaeological heritage presentation (presentation of visible archaeological remains, floor graphics and site marking), the paper identified/emphasized the fourth conditional type of presentation - archaeological heritage
reinterpretation. The analysis of selected case studies was used to show some advantages and disadvantages of applying this type of archaeological heritage presentation:

- The advantage of this type of presentation lies in its applicability in the case of presenting specific types of archaeological heritage where the use of other forms of presentation is hampered (centuriation, historic roads and paths, street grid, historic landscape, etc.).
- Another perceived advantage is the ability to achieve added value in urban and architectural projects that reinterpret archaeological traces.
- When it comes to disadvantages, this type of presentation is generally poorly comprehensible, which is additionally highlighted in the absence of accompanying interpretive infrastructure.

The paper also shows the possibility of applying this type of presentation on the example of the Spanish city of Alcalá de Henares in the archaeological area that is presently built-up, but has partially preserved the ancient urban grid. It suggests content and spatial reinterpretation of present-day streets that overlap with the routes of ancient streets, especially the streets on the route of the ancient *decumanus maximus*, nowadays connecting the archaeological park with the historic city centre under UNESCO protection with an aim of better integration of archaeological heritage into the contemporary city and contemporary life as well as enhancing this urban area in general.
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