

# BIM Modelling of ancient buildings

A. Scianna <sup>a\*</sup>, G.F. Gaglio <sup>a</sup>, M. La Guardia <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> ICAR-CNR (High Performance Computing and Networking Institute - National Research Council of Italy) at GISLab,

University of Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, Edificio 8, 90128 Palermo, Italy  
andrea.scianna@cnr.it; gfulvio.gaglio@gmail.com; marcellolaguardia87@libero.it;

**Abstract.** In the last years, new procedures on design and management of constructions, based on 3D standardised models of building elements, have been proposed. It's the case of Building Information Modelling (BIM) technologies, that, differently from CAD applications, allow to work with libraries of 3D parametrical objects (smart objects) describing geometric, structural and material properties of building elements. These technologies are based on the Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) model, that represents a global standard for the building data exchange. At first used for the design of new architectures, BIM technologies have been even more considered also for the management and the conservation of historical buildings, thanks to the possibilities of implementation of semantic information of 3D objects, guaranteed by the connection with the external database. At the same time, the lack of regular surfaces and standardised objects are relevant problems that nowadays strongly limit the use of BIM for Cultural Heritage (CH). Anyway, in recent times, the study of parameterised objects has opened new perspectives for BIM applications on historical buildings (HBIM). The present work shows the last achievements on this topic, focusing the problems derived from the application of BIM methodology to CH. In fact, the irregular shape of ancient architectural components, the vast variety of architectural languages that characterize historical buildings, the presence, sometimes, of different stratifications, are clear examples of the difficulties of implementing HBIM methodology.

**Keywords:** HBIM, Cultural Heritage, Archaeology, Geospatial DB, Survey, 3D modelling.

---

\* Corresponding author

## 1 Introduction

The digital revolution that is affecting our era, with the huge amount of data that can be shared and/or exchanged anywhere and at any time, has also hit the building construction world through Building Information Modelling (BIM). This term refers to a methodology or process through which it is possible to develop and manage digital representations of buildings, infrastructures and, more generally, built places. In fact, according to BIM methodology, it's possible to take in account not only the geometric information of building components but also information concerning their physical characteristics, functionalities and mutual relationships. Although BIM design has taken place in recent years, it had been conceptually proposed about 40 years ago (Eastman et al., 2008). One of the first examples was, in fact, the prototype of Charles M. Eastman, who in 1975 theorised a unique three-dimensional model to describe the construction elements, also useful for the estimation of quantities and materials, associated with an external database (Eastman, 1976).

BIM software today available on the market favour the sharing of models and information through the network, thus encouraging collaboration between the various professional figures involved in the life cycle of construction. These applications were created for the design of new building (as-designed BIM), based on parametric elements connected to each other through a hierarchical structure of "smart objects" (Garagnani, 2013).

Through BIM technology, the use of shared models among different professional figures, with different skills, allows obtaining continuously updated diachronic information (Garagnani et al., 2016). Therefore, this methodology is dedicated not only to the planning of an architectural or engineering work but also to its management, maintenance and monitoring (Volk et al., 2014).

Then, it's become of fundamental importance how to implement information of existing building assets (such as-built BIM), adding information related not only to design but also to current conditions and structural changes over time (Huber et al., 2011). The use of the as-built BIM approach, therefore, is of particular interest for CH, to manage the information related to the individual 3D components of the cultural good (Saygi, Remondino, 2013). The BIM applications for historical architecture are much more complex because ancient buildings contain elements and materials having geometries that cannot be represented with standard software libraries (Logothetis et al., 2015). Furthermore, CH tends to change over time as a result of deterioration and collapse of structures. A BIM model of a historical building, which, according to the literature, takes the name of Historic-BIM (HBIM), could also contain dynamic information, that, for example, thanks to control sensors and control signals, could support the conservation of the structure. This application allows finding the presence of a possible structural issue, such as a collapse or a fracture, analysing the 3D model itself directly, avoiding the physical exploration of the construction.

This paper intends to evaluate the approaches that allow the creation of HBIM model of architectural heritage, starting from 3D laser scans and photogrammetric techniques, called 'Scan to BIM' (Baik, 2017). HBIM methodology allows providing not only a visual description of the monument but also the implementation of a smart database of

semantic information concerning its conditions, the materials used and its history (Scianna et al., 2014). This information can be used, for example, to support the design of a possible restoration intervention, helping the operators involved in the subsequent management and monitoring of the building. It is necessary to study the architectural good through decomposition of its parts carefully to achieve these goals. An abacus of the constructive elements should be created to solve the problems related to each of them. First, a comparison with IFC standards (Laakso, Kiviniemi, 2012) should be made straight to understand which elements are already included in IFC and which ones can be assimilated to those already present. Another phase concerns the identification and definition of the construction phases of the building, from which useful information can be extracted both for restorations and structural calculations. These phases will flow into the final 3D modelling of the structure, which in fact depends on the use that must be made of the model itself, the software used and the problems related to the modelling and representation of complex objects.


## **2 From BIM to HBIM.**

In the field of building design, the construction industry has increasingly focused on the use of digital models that go beyond the simple geometric representation of construction elements. Between them the most complete and validated model is IFC. This model is the base reference for BIM methodology. The main peculiarity of BIM lies in the creation of a three-dimensional model of a construction, using parametrised smart objects taken from specific pre-defined libraries, to obtain different levels information about the composition of the building hierarchical levels. In fact, it provides quickly and automatically all the necessary information to building's current state, the energy and structural analysis, etc. However, traditional BIM was initially ideated for new constructions, based on standardised elements. Considering the BIM approach applied to historic buildings, called HBIM as mentioned above, the advantages of this methodology would be many: remote control of external and internal parts of the architecture, planning of restoration operations, structural analysis, interactive 3D representations for cultural and educational uses. All this through a single final model. On the other hand, the complexity of historical buildings leads to many problems regarding the application of HBIM methodology. It's necessary to take into account different needs of this methodology, to focus all of the limits and the issues linked to HBIM applications:

- the necessity of a systematic standardisation of every part of the building, useful for the implementation of specific libraries dedicated to CH. These could be considered a particular example of Digital Libraries (Ioannides et al., 2017)
- the necessity of making a classification of the architectural elements, dividing the structure into categories at different hierarchical levels, to create a database for the inclusion of these libraries
- the modelling and parametrisation of new smart objects that represent the architectural elements of historical buildings. In fact, the complexity of these structures needs an in-depth knowledge of historical construction techniques and advanced modelling skills.

During the experimentation in different study cases, it's been possible to individuate a workflow for the creation of a complete HBIM model:

- acquisition of information
- survey operations
- categorization of constructive elements
- 3D modelling
- output.



**Fig. 1.** The workflow for the creation of an HBIM model.

The first phase of acquisition of necessary information about the historical building is fundamental for the choice of the next survey operations and also for making a correct decomposition of the structure. Survey operations are necessary for the geometrical reconstruction of the point clouds, that, together with the decomposition of the structure in macrocategories, categories and subcategories of elements, are the basis for the construction of the 3D model. The 3D modelling phase depends also on the choice of the output model required. In fact, different needs require different model outputs, and, consequently, different modelling techniques.

In the following section of the paper some interesting issues encountered in the application of the workflow will be analyzed:

- the difficulties encountered in the passage between survey operations and the generation of the 3D model;
- the importance of the categorisation of constructive elements, necessary for the creation of a library of “smart objects” and the correct modelling of an architectural good;
- the difficulties in modelling and parametrisation of single architectural elements connected with the output to realise.

In fact, the commercial BIM software, born for modelling new constructions, shows some limitations in the management of data from existing artefacts, especially when there are architectural elements ad hoc designed. These problems are amplified when researchers approach the collection and management of information coming from CH, precisely because of the uniqueness that characterises cultural goods and the elements of which they are constituted.

### **3 From survey operations to general model**

Data collected using the most modern survey instruments and related techniques allow generating models that geometrically describe the building in a very accurate way. They

are the starting point for the next modelling phase of the building. Some software and plug-ins, such as Agisoft Photoscan®, Pix 4D mapper®, Bentley Context Capture® and FARO® VirtuSurv, also allow automatic creation of 3D models passing through processing of point cloud. However, in all of these cases, the 3D meshes generated from point clouds hold only geometric information. Instead, to correctly create smart objects, it's necessary to store not only their whole geometry but also semantic information on materials properties (specifications). These information are required to describe the shape of a smart object and take into account its function and its relationship with other elements (relational system). Nowadays, the complete automatic generation of building elements from a point cloud is almost not possible. The point cloud can be assumed mostly as a spatial reference for drawing of geometric parts of building elements whose semantic description can be associated with.

The above considerations have been tested in a case study regarding the participation to the benchmark activity issued by the Italian Society of Photogrammetry and Topography (SIFET) concerning the "restitution of 3D / HBIM models from point clouds obtained with UAV surveys or terrestrial laser scanning" of the Fornace Penna (an historical industrial building located in Sicily).

Starting from the point cloud, it's been necessary to create a 3D model retracing the shape given from the cloud, using the smart objects of existing libraries. Using FARO PointSense as an Autodesk® Revit plug-in, it's been possible to associate a 3D object, taken from a specific family, to a small part of a point cloud or to convert it automatically assigning also semantic information.

New families of openings, ad-hoc created, have been parametrised to be adapted to the real ones and have been inserted into the library. The difficulty in parameterising the individual segments that make up an opening led to the creation of a family for each opening. In fact, the openings of the building showed small differences in size, although they could look the same at first glance. Even for openings with collapsed elements, dedicated families have been created.



**Fig. 2.** Visualization of the BIM modelling of the walls of the Fornace Penna over its point cloud.

Hence, this case of study highlighted the problems related to the lack of specific libraries of smart objects for historic buildings. This matter leads designers to create new libraries, trying to generate parametrised elements based on possible standards derived from real features. In fact, nowadays, designers are usually obliged to generate a

single model for every architectural element, because HBIM modelling suffers the actual lack of libraries of objects dedicated to CH, as well as some limitations in modelling and parameterisation of certain constructive elements. It's also important to take into consideration the great variety and diversity of building elements in ancient constructions. The subsequent reflection will, therefore, focus on a possible classification of the construction elements of a historic building in order to be correctly inserted into a modelling support database.




Fig. 3. An example of a parametrization of an arc opening in BIM.




Fig. 4. Visualization of information about a selected element of the Fornace Penna BIM model.

#### 4 From the general model to the classification of its elements

One of the main features of the BIM software is the presence of a parametric objects library described in IFC standards. This kind of library helps, a lot, architects and engineers during the design and the management of buildings. However, despite its vastness, the existing elements of software libraries, as seen before, may not always meet the design and management needs, requiring the creation of specific components for each design case, especially in the case of CH. In fact, doesn't exist a complete database of ancient smart objects to use as a basis for modelling, that could give essential

advantages of reducing times and costs during operations. However, this kind of library must meet specific requirements to be exploited in the same way as that already present within the software. Hence, it's possible to notice immediately a very detailed breakdown of the building organism considering new constructions. In Autodesk® Revit or Graphisoft® Archicad, for example, it's possible to find a distinction between architectural elements, structural elements and plant engineering. After this, it's possible to find a subdivision that identifies the classes of objects that allow access to the default library and then load the chosen components in the project.

So, the first problem to be faced for the creation of a standard library of elements belonging to the historical building heritage is precisely the breakdown of the architectural good itself. This technique could allow achieving a global knowledge of the artefact. For example, it's possible to apply this technique to a Greek temple, a structure that can be considered as a symbol of historical architecture and which can also provide interesting methodological considerations. The breakdown to follow derives from the classification of the modern technological building system. So it's possible to divide the parts of a building into macro-categories, categories, micro-categories of elements and technical elements. The components constituting each piece of CH should be grouped and classified according to their function, also identifying a further internal subdivision. For example, the technical element "Column", which in turn is composed of other parts, can be found within the micro-category "vertical elevation structure". This last is part of the "Elevation structure" category, which in turn is contained in the macro-category "Bearing structure".

Thanks to this breakdown, it's possible to associate elements such as columns and lintels with the corresponding modern structural elements. So, they are insertable, through appropriate modelling, within the database, creating a new library of structural elements. For other components such as metopes and triglyphs, the association is not immediate, and it requires an in-depth study of the evolution of historical construction techniques. According to Vitruvius, for example, the triglyphs were used to cover the heads of the wooden beams in the first temples. The metopes instead carried out the function of filling the gaps between the beams. Furthermore, metopes were all different from each other because they were also decorative elements used to tell stories. With the subsequent adoption of the stone, these parts remained, becoming canonical elements and completing part of the entablature (Washburn, 1919; Jones, 2002).

This example is useful for underlining that the knowledge of the origins and functions of historical elements is fundamental for the association to smart objects already present in the software and for the application of the modelling techniques. It's also important to take into account, during modelling, the way in which the elements should be inserted in the overall model and the task they have to play.




Fig. 5. Example of the breakdown of a Doric temple structure.

## 5 Modelling and parametrising objects

The stage of modelling is very delicate and complex. In particular, in the case of BIM, it is important to take into account some fundamental aspects during the creation of objects belonging to a larger and articulated system.


As seen before, the correct use of HBIM methodology needs the analysis and the breakdown of the architectural structure, where every element should be implemented into a specific library of smart objects related to a particular architectural language.

Despite the proposals of some authors on the creation of a library of historical elements based on the manuscripts of Vitruvius and Palladio and on the books of architectural patterns of the Eighteenth Century, nowadays only a few things have been realised and only in relation to specific cases (Dore et al., 2015). In many historical buildings, besides, over the differences caused by degradations or for subsequent alterations, it's possible to find differences between similar elements caused by their handmade production. This aspect greatly increases the difficulty of parameterisation of the geometrical elements that make up the building.

Anyway, the implementation of different databases, based each one on different architectural languages and containing a hierarchic categorisation of elements, could allow creating an HBIM model in a good level of detail (LoD).


Furthermore, according to BIM, it's important to consider that the same architectural elements could be reproduced with different modelling techniques. Even if BIM was born to cover all the aspects and phases of the construction sector, the choice of the best method depends on the final use that has led the model creation. For example, in Revit, an element finalised only to 3D representation or metric calculation can be freely modelled with no limits to surface configurations. Instead, an element finalised to structural analysis (e.g. a pillar), to obtain an association with the analytical model, is obliged to be constrained on both ends to other structural elements (like beams) and to follow a regular path.

The example of modelling here proposed uses a typical column of a Doric temple. In the exposed case it's been applied the creation of nested families. They are families containing other families to better manage the parameterisation of the various parts of the objects. With the help of the Book of architectural patterns "the Classical Order of Architecture" by Robert Chitham (Chitham, 1984), the column was divided into small parts. The dimensions of each piece have been related to a base unit located in the diameter of the column itself (Aubin, 2013).




**Fig. 6.** An example of a proportional ratio between each part of a Doric temple (Source: The Classical Orders of Architecture, p.49).

A key element was the use of profile families containing a two-dimensional closed circuit. In this case, the draw of the sections of the elements that composed the column has been used. These were then inserted from time to time in a "pillar" family where extruding, path sweeping and solid revolutions were applied. In this way, the typical behaviour of a pillar has been associated with the column, in order to create an analytical model useful for an possible automatic structural analysis.




**Fig. 7.** Nested Family “Column” containing three families: capital, shaft and base. Each family includes profile families.



**Fig. 8.** Modelling and parametrisation of a Doric capital using a profile family in BIM.

In this way, the modelled object can be adapted to the real one by varying the base parameter and updating the profile families with the measurements obtained from the survey. This technique allows also representing any degraded elements acting directly on the nested families with solid operations. However, as the case study shows, it's necessary to have a thorough knowledge of the modelling techniques that the software makes available. The same techniques also variate depending on the constructive element to represent.

For example, in the previous case of the Fornace Penna, the construction of the model was also finalised to develop a structural analysis of the building. This requirement needed to take care especially about the connections between walls and to insert the external static constraints opportunely. Furthermore, as described before, the choice of the correct modelling methods for the creation of arcs, windows and pillars, highlighting the differences between different kinds of stones, had fundamental importance for making a correct structural analysis.



**Fig. 9.** A structural analysis result of a Fornace Penna facade from the BIM model.

More difficulties appear, then, in the case of more complex elements and with more particular shapes. Just this aspect leads to many difficulties in the creation of a generic library suitable for CH, always making necessary the use of custom elements to apply case by case.

## 6 Conclusions

This paper investigates some critical issues in the making of HBIM representations of CH. The HBIM process is seen, here, as a set of procedures that starts from the collection of data up to the final creation of a complex 3D model of the building full of semantic information. After a definition of the reasons and the advantages that motivate an approach of this kind to the historic architecture, some technical problems have been presented in relation with some study cases. Indeed, while the survey stage is today enough advanced thanks to available technology, the modelling stage of the HBIM process is still problematic and not well defined. Most of the problems are related to the uniqueness of each existing building and/or its' components. This uniqueness is due to the handmade production of the historical construction elements, the presence of degradation, the irregular shape of some constructive elements and decorations, and the vast variety of architectural languages on CH. Each of these features makes difficult the realisation of a standard library of smart parametric objects about CH for BIM implementation. Moreover, the construction of these libraries needs a standard classification of the parts of historical buildings, but this operation isn't always simple for the reasons indicated before. The categorisation of the components of an ancient building requires an exploration of the old construction techniques to allow an association between their behaviour and the corresponding function of the structural elements formerly inside the BIM software. So, the diffusion of HBIM methodology needs still more technical insights that will be explored in future works.

## References

1. Aubin P.F., 2013. The Doric Column. In: Renaissance Revit: Creating Classical Architecture With Modern Software. Chapter 8, 2013, pp. 209-242.

2. Baik A., 2017. From point cloud to Jeddah Heritage BIM Nasif Historical House – case study. In: *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage*, Volume 4, 2017, pp.1-18.
3. Chitam R., 1984. *The Classical Orders of Architecture*. 1985, Elsevier Ltd. pp 54-59.
4. Dore C., Murphy M., McCarthy S., Brechin F., Casidy C., Dirix E., 2015. Structural Simulations and Conservation Analysis -Historic Building Information Model (HBIM). In: *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, Volume XL-5/W4, 2015, pp. 351-357.
5. Eastman C., 1976. General purpose building description systems. In: *Computer-Aided Design*, Volume 8, Issue 1, 1976, pp. 17-26.
6. Eastman C., Teicholz P., Sacks R., Liston K., 2008. Foreword. In: *BIM Handbook: A Guide to Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, Engineers, and Contractors*. 2008, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
7. Garagnani S., 2013. Building Information Modeling and real world knowledge: A methodological approach to accurate semantic documentation for the built environment. In: *Digital Heritage International Congress (DigitalHeritage)*, 2013, Marseille, France, pp. 489-496.
8. Garagnani S., Gaucci A., Govi E., 2016. ArchaeoBIM: Dallo scavo al Building Information Modeling di una struttura sepolta. Il caso del tempio tuscanico di Uni a Marzabotto. In: *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, 27, 2016, pp. 251-270.
9. Huber D., Akinci B., Adan A., Anil E., Okorn B., Xiong X., 2011. Methods for Automatically Modeling and Representing As-built Building Information Models. In: *Proceedings of NSF Engineering Research and Innovation Conference*, Atlanta, Georgia, 2011.
10. Ioannides M., Davies R., Chatzigrigoriou P., Papageorgiou E., Leventis G., Nikolakopoulou V., Athanasiou V., 2017. In: *Mixed Reality and Gamification for Cultural Heritage*, 2017, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp. 161-199.
11. Jones M.W., 2002. Tripods, Triglyphs and the Origin of the Doric Frieze. In: *American journal of archaeology*, 2002, Volume 106, n°3, pp. 353-390.
12. Laakso M., Kiviniemi A., 2012. The IFC standard – a review of history, development, and standardization. In: *Journal of Information Technology in Construction*, Volume 17, 2012, pp. 134-161.
13. Logothetis S., Delinasiou A., Stylianidis E., 2015. Building information modelling for cultural heritage: a review. In: *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, Volume II-5/W3, 2015, pp. 177-183.
14. Saygi G., Remondino F., 2013. Management of Architectural Heritage Information in BIM and GIS: State-of-the-art and Future Perspectives. In: *International Journal of Heritage in the Digital Era*, Volume 2, n°4, 2013, pp. 695-713.
15. Scianna, A., Gristina, S., Paliaga S., 2014. Experimental BIM Applications in Archaeology: A Work-Flow. In: M. Ioannides et al. (Eds.): *EuroMed 2014, LNCS 8740*, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp. 490–498.
16. Volk R., Stengel J., Shultmann F., 2014. Building Information Modeling (BIM) for existing buildings – Literature review and future needs. In: *Automation in Construction*, Volume 38, 2014, pp. 109-127.
17. Washburn O.M., 1919. The Origin of the Triglyph Frieze. In: *American Journal of Archaeology*, Volume 23, n°1, pp. 33-49.