The teaching of architecture in the Seville of the Enlightenment began with the foundation of the Real Escuela de las Tres Nobles Artes. In the architectural setting of the Real Alcázar, the teaching of architecture was divided between the drawing of models of Antiquity, the study of books on architecture, and the creation of models or replicas of architectural elements or types of architecture. A new, more complex interpretation of the teaching of architecture in the Escuela de Sevilla is proposed for the period between 1771, the year the school was founded, and 1807, the year of the death of Francisco de Bruna, the school’s promoter, first protector and leading figure in its relationship with the Spanish royal palace. This is achieved by reviewing the known documentation, incorporating new sources and taking a new critical approach based on analysing the teaching of architecture and considering its relationship with other arts and teaching activities, and with the architectural setting and collections housed in it.

Taking the Royal Academy in France as a model, the promotion of academies in Spain coincided with the royal state project and the ideology of the Century of Enlightenment. The Real Escuela de las Tres Nobles Artes (Royal School of the three Noble Arts) of Seville was founded in 1771. Under the protection of the Real Academia de Nobles Artes de San Fernando (Royal Academy of the Noble Arts of San Fernando), it founded its Preparatory Board in 1744. The school’s origin and the first decades of its academic life were very closely linked to the Real Alcázar of Seville, where painters, sculptors and architects – “working in common” – had the aim of restoring the principles of “good architecture” based on academic teaching that would put an end to the guild teaching carried out by master builders “without any knowledge of the good rules of art”.

The historical transformations in this institution are well known, particularly in relation to its protector Francisco de Bruna y Ahumada (1719-1807), some aspects of architecture teaching, and the importance of the Alcázar collection for art learning during the Enlightenment. Between copy and invention, teaching of the arts in the architectural setting of the Gothic palace and the Courtyard of the Cruise was divided between drawing models of Antiquity from local antiquities in the collection of architectural remains of Baetica and universal replicas of casts from the Anton Rafael Mengs collection, the study of architecture books, and the creation of models and replicas of architectural elements or architecture (fig. 01). Through a review of known documents, the integration of new sources and a new critical approach based on analysing the teaching of architecture considering its relationship with other arts and educational activities, and the architectural setting and collections housed in it, a new, more complex interpretation of the teaching of architecture in the Seville School is proposed for the period between 1771, when the school was founded, and 1807, the year of the death of Francisco de Bruna, who had been the school’s promoter, first protector and an important figure in the school’s relationship with the Spanish royal palace.

Art teaching in the academies of the eighteenth century was based on the educational value of drawing and copying works of art. In relation to the three noble arts, the effectiveness of copying selected art models, particularly from Antiquity, was more immediate for painting and sculpture than for architecture. Even so, all students of the art of architecture received solid training in drawing and copying works of art, architecture and architectural elements. This consolidated the training of architects as liberal artists, from the Renaissance to the importance of drawings in the learning of Royal Academy of San Fernando students pensioned in Rome.
The nocturnal exercise of drawing in this academy took place in the architectural setting of the headquarters of the consultate of the Cargadores a Indias (Chargers of the Indies) (c. 1583-1646). This architecture had recently been completed in the Sevillian architectural scene. At the time, it was one of the most didactic examples of the use of the language of the classical orders, specifically in the courtyard, which was clearly influenced by Andrea Palladio’s (1508-1580) design for the cloister of the convent of Santa Maria della Carità in Venice through the *I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura* (Venice: Domenico de’Franceschi, 1570) (fig. 02). The importance of the architectural setting in which the academic life was carried out is what linked this academy to that founded in 1771 as the Royal School of the Three Noble Arts of Seville.

In fact, in its Statutes of 1807, the Seville School was considered inheritor of the School of Murillo, Valdés Leal and Herrera el Mozo, which was recognised as a “public academy of drawing”, the leading one “among all the towns and cities of Spain”. The document also explicitly mentioned the teaching of the art of architecture in Seville a century after the foundation of the first school, when “a number of fine arts enthusiasts met in a house in the Calle de las Palmas of this city, and with an Assistant licence they opened a public school at their expense; and so that nobody would go without teaching in the three arts, they furnished it with engravings, designs, models, live models and teachers”.

According to Justino Matute y Gaviria (1764-1830), in 1769 an academy reopened in the Alcaicería de la Seda, which was more informal that that of Casa Lonja and was situated in the house of well-known artisan D. Pedro Miguel Guerrero, native of Jerez de la Frontera, in which he taught Arithmetic, Algebra, Elementary Geometry and Architecture. Due to the great influx of people who had come together “where between draftsmen, students of mathematics, clay modellers and painters, up to two hundred people used to come together”.

**The Royal School of the Three Noble Arts of Seville (1771-1807): rooms, programmes and books**

The promoters of this academy requested in March 1770 royal protection from Carlos III (1716-1788), which included the cession of suitable rooms in the Alcázar. The matter was left in the hands of Francisco de Bruna y Ahumada, an educated royal official who, from 1766, had held the role of deputy governor of Alcázar and other roles in the state bureaucracy of Seville. His decisive support led to the academy’s activity becoming official, recognition of the Academy of San Fernando, financial protection of the Alcázar rent and cession of the requested premises in the royal palace complex. Bruna became the official protector.

According to the first records, academic life mainly took place in the Alcázar itself. The academic year lasted six months, from November to April, with two-hour daily sessions held in six classes: principles, academies (or drawing of whole figures), plaster model, life drawing, and two architecture classes, including a preliminary class of arithmetic. The first director of architecture was Pedro Miguel Guerrero and the deputy director of architecture was Lucas Cintora up to 1781, when Cintora was promoted and Francisco de Paula Guerrero, son of Pedro Miguel Guerrero, was appointed deputy.

The chapter on the “Director and Deputy of Architecture” in the first draft of the statutes, which is undated but considered to be from around 1778-1800, established that these figures:

*will attend the architecture class to oversee the studies according to the method prescribed by the Royal Academy of San Fernando. They will explain to their students the Geometry and Arithmetic required for architecture and instruct them point by point on its theoretical and practical rules, ensuring that the students study and memorise the very well-received books of these faculties to illustrate the rules. They will only admit to their classes those who are very far advanced in Drawing, either through having learnt it at the same school or in another school anywhere else."

In a second version of the statutes, from 1807, the directors and deputies of Painting and Sculpture were allocated each one to the life drawing, drawing, principles and plaster classes. They alternated every month in a kind of coordinated, complementary teaching. In contrast, without this alternation with these arts and physically separate, in the teaching in the Architecture classes, the director taught “the way to arrange and construct all kinds of buildings” and the deputy taught “the elements of art until all the members and proportions of the five orders had been delineated.”

The statutes indicated for “The system of study of Architecture and the transition from one class to another” that “the method that the Royal Academy of San Fernando has adopted to teach this profession should be adopted”.

Indeed, in 1782 the Seville School was used as a model the academies of Valencia and Madrid to establish rules and operation. In turn, the Madrid academy had used as a model the academies of Paris and Rome. At the time of the foundation of the Seville School, the directors of the Royal Academy of Madrid were Ventura Rodríguez and Diego de Villanueva. According to its statutes of 1758, the Architecture course lasted “two, three or more years [...]. When completed, another course would be started and only at the start of the courses could students begin their study”. Architecture studies did not appear to be completely isolated from the studies of Painting and Sculpture, at least regarding the practice of drawing. It was indicated that the directors “would not accept in the Architecture class anyone who is not sufficiently instructed in Geometry; neither will the Deputies admit in their class any student who has not learnt to draw well. Regarding the correction of drawings, what is foreseen by the Directors of Painting and Sculpture shall be observed proportionally.”

Indeed, from the Statutes of 1807, integration can be observed in the teaching, practice and exercise of drawing between the three arts in Seville. Student candidates in the classes of Architecture had to have learnt to draw well in the classes led by the directors and deputies of Painting and Sculpture “or in another school anywhere else” and architectural drawings were corrected made considering what had been taught in those classes.

The first course of the Seville School began on 18 January 1772. Architecture classes were taught as well as other classes on models, life drawing and principles. By way of a report on the development of the course, Francisco de Bruna al Rey sent at the end of the year a series of works, mainly drawings, to be assessed by the Academy of San Fernando. Among the drawings were “Four Architecture papers worked on by Don Lucas Zinlora, Architect” which were analysed by Ventura Rodríguez. Unlike the Painting and Sculpture works, these drawings were not appreciated and the advice given was to pay closer attention to the doctrines of the former Vitruvius (according to Daniele Barbaro’s edition) and those of the modern Vignola, Palladio, Serlio and Alberti.

Perhaps for this reason, the school formed in the following years a library of treatises and other architecture books, like that previously established by the Academy of San Fernando. From purchases and donations, the institution’s accounting reveals the books of architecture that were available to teachers and student. These were mainly supplied by the bookshop Hermanos Bérard y Compañía, located in Calle Génova. Between 1775 and 1787, four editions of *Regola delli cinque ordini di architettura* by Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola (1507-1573) were purchased, which may have included the Spanish edition of 1764 illustrated by Diego de Villanueva (1713-1774). In addition to the Renaissance treatise, Antiquity was present in the treatise of Vitruvius and catalogues of architecture in Rome, which also represented the...
study of the History of Architecture and not just a contemporary operational theory. Beyond Spain, the academic study of Antiquity in the Academy of France, which was the model for the Madrid academy, had covered since the previous century theory – through the edition of *Les dix livres d’architecture de Vitruve* (Paris: Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1673) by Claude Perrault (1613-1688) – and constructions such as those of Antoine Desgodets (1653-1729) in *Les Edifices Antiques de Rome* (Paris: Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1682). Both were of interest to the circle of the Academy of San Fernando. An edition of the former, the *Compendio de los diez libros de arquitectura de Vitruvio* (Madrid: Imp. Gabriel Ramírez, 1761), was published by the deputy director of architecture Joseph Castañeda. The reedition of the second work (Paris: Antoine Jambert, 1779) was in his library. Both books were also in the library of the Seville School. Vitruvius by Perrault was not explicitly mentioned in the accounting – as it could be any of those among the various “books on architecture” noted in the records and inventories. However, the school purchased in 1787 “the new Vitruvius”, that is, the Spanish edition (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1787) by José Francisco Ortiz Sanz (1739-1822) (fig. 03). The book by Antoine Desgodets entered the school’s library on 12 July 1687. It had been donated by a Peruvian living in Seville, Francisco Domingo de Barreda Benavides, who was a trader, politician and founder of the Academy of Fine Arts and had a considerable library. He gifted this book “for the advancement of the teachers”27. Possibly a reedition (Paris: Antoine Jambert, 1779), the Desgodets book was published in a large format and profusely illustrated with 138 plates of ground plans, sections and details of 25 old monuments that had been carefully measured and delineated by him in Rome between 1676 and 1677 (fig. 04). The book was unrivalled, as Barry Bergdoll stated, as a source of dimensional drawings of old buildings during the first half of the century. It was particularly interesting for studying in the academy of France, where Desgodets had trained with Françoise Blondel, and renewed the vision of old buildings, making them an important element in teaching and academic debate on the Querelle and the modern recovery of architecture of Antiquity that spread to the rest of the academic institutions up to the end of the nineteenth century28.

**BETWEEN COLLECTIONS, REPLICA’S, MODELS AND ARCHITECTURE: THE ALCÁZAR OF SEVILLE IN THE PERIOD OF THE ROYAL SCHOOL**

**Architecture setting**

The school had its first premises in the royal palace of Seville. The model of being housed there, and thus showing the school’s royal ties, could have come from France where the royal academy of architecture was situated in the Louvre Palace of Paris from its foundation in 1671. It was promoted by Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683) and directed by Françoise Blondel (1618-1694). The settings that were selected by Francisco de Bruna in 1771 were the most representative of the Alcázar at that time. The academy occupied the Courtyard of Lady María de Padilla and the Courtyard of the Cruise and the rooms of the Gothic palace. For additional uses, the school was ceded a house adjacent to the Alcázar, with an entrance in the small plaza of Piña Seca, behind the garden of the Prince29.

The Almohad Courtyard of the Cruise and the Gothic Palace were the place with the oldest, most stratified remains in the complex. In turn, they represented the space that had been the object of the most recent modernisation works after the damage caused by the Lisbon earthquake of 1755. The old Andalusian and subsequently Castilian garden was transformed into a representative courtyard between 1768 and 1760 by filling in the four landscaped courtyards up to the level of the platforms, to create a new unified space at the level of the palace of Alfonso X, which was also the object of considerable transformation by the corps of engineers’ architect Sebastian van der Borcht (1725-1778) (fig. 01)30. The Lisbon earthquake revealed the weakness of the Palace of Alfonso, particularly the portico, which was constructed over the Almohad foundations. The platforms and sunken gardens that awoke the interest of Andrea Navagero (1483-1529) in 1526, and the narrow medieval portico facing the courtyard were no longer suited to the taste of the mid-eighteenth century or to the new needs for semi-public use and representativeness of this area of Alcázar. El Plano de los Reales Alcázares drawn up by Sebastian van der Borcht in 1759 was largely carried out because of these works of remodelling the Gothic Palace, particularly the “gallery” whose explanation took up most of the inscription and revealed the central importance of the new courtyard in terms of representation and distribution (fig. 05). The static and functional determining factors contributed to a portico design loaded with experimentalism, far from other exercises of van der Borscht in the more canonical use of the language of orders, as in the Royal Tobacco Factory or the Casa de la Moneda. The gigantic Ionic order structured the solid pilastered columns whose lower register was interrupted in favour of twinned columns that introduced another lower scale to the composition: that of the start of the arches. Isolated marble elements fitted with others of the same or a different era recur within the Alcázar. The coupled columns alluding to Carlos V are also a recurring symbolic element and link this new portico to compositional elements from the sixteenth century taken from the Courtyard of the Maidens, in a play of relationships within the stratified architectural complex (fig. 06).

When Bruna arrived in Alcázar in 1765, the works on the courtyard had ended. Although van der Borscht’s proposal would not enter the most orthodox of the new academic canons, Bruna did not hesitate to situate between the Courtyard of the Cruise and the Gothic Palace the intellectual project that best represented his personal enlightened proposal: the public collection of local antiquities that coexisted with plaster models sent from the Royal Academy of San Fernando.

**Collections**

In Volume IX of his *Viage por España*, dedicated to Seville and published in 1786, Antonio Ponz (1725-1792) reported the presence of “paintings by different authors” from the houses of the Jesuits, which were hanging in the north hall of the Carlos V rooms – currently the Tapestries Hall – in the Gothic Palace. It was probably Bruna who indicated that they were there “for the benefit of the drawing school established in this City”. In this first journey, Ponz did not mention any collection in the “beautiful gallery with marble columns” that he noted in the Courtyard of the Cruise31. In the next volume, published in 1792, he mentioned the large collection of antiquities that was being formed in the Alcázar. Since his previous visit, he said that Bruna “has increased the number of things of beauty, and has further ennobled the great hall every day, through his zeal and extraordinary diligence; in such a way that it can already be used as a place for more instruction”32.

The “things of beauty” that Ponz considered to enrich the great hall of the Gothic Palace were comprised of the *Colección de estatuas, inscripciones y antigüedades de la Bética* created by Bruna33. In the name of the king and as a public collection, these objects were operational along with the paintings for the “instruction” and benefit of teaching drawing at the school.

The collection that Francisco de Bruna placed between the outside gallery and the inside rooms in the Gothic Palace (fig. 06) was comprised of pieces from excavations of Italica, from other archaeological sites in the Kingdom of Seville and, above all, from local antiquities that the Genoese family of the Centurion, which had settled in Estepa from the mid-sixteenth century, had collected in their suburban villa of Lora. Ponz saw the most important sculptural fragments of this collection “placed in the gallery beside the entry to the rooms of the Alcázar” (fig. 07). This collection also contained epigraphic inscriptions and other sculptures, which have mainly been identified, unlike the potential architectural elements (fig. 08)34.
As they were not part of the local artistic heritage, Ponz did not mention in 1792 the plaster casts that were already exhibited, along with the most significant antique sculptures, in the South hall of the Carlos V rooms – the current Vault Hall – in the Gothic Palace. Along with the paintings and the statues, these were vital for the “drawing school”, as Fermín Arana de Varflora indicated in the same years (fig. 06). The “plaster models” that Varflora referred to had their origin in the casts of sculptures that Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1779) created throughout his life in Florence, Rome and Madrid. The court painter of Carlos III gave them to the king in 1775 as a teaching instrument for the Royal Academy of San Fernando. At the heart of the donation was his desire to encourage the provincial schools that were being created in these years, such as those of Valencia, Zaragoza, Barcelona and Seville, where the sculptures that were most recognised as classical models could be studied. The casts would have been requested from Madrid before 1780, as Antonio Ponz wrote that “if the Seville Study attains as requested the best of the plasters, it will have more at hand the certain, sure sources of knowledge”. Casts were already mentioned as an active part of teaching in 1790. The Laocoonte group, the Apollo of the Belvedere Vatican and the Gladiador Borghese of the Louvre Museum were certainly among the casts received in Seville. Possibly, by analogy with the documented delivery during the same years to the Academy of Valencia, other casts may have been the Apollo Medici of the Galleria degli Uffizi, the Hermes of the Belvedere Vatican and the Fauno del Cabrito from the Prado Museum. Their central role in the academic life of the school can be seen in the description of the M étodo de estudio para los dis- cípulos y paso de una sala a otra en los Estatutos de 1807, but also in the students’ drawings from the first years of life of the School, like one of the Fauno del Cabrito that is the work of painter and engraver Francisco Pardo (1752-1800) (fig. 09). Along with the sculptures and casts, the elements of the collection included architectural pieces. These would also be instrumental, through drawing, for study by students in the classes associated with the three arts. Of less interest to visitors and scholars than the paintings and sculptures, the Chilean Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others, mentioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de the classical orders, such as capitals, friezes and cornices. The repetition in plaster of these elements when he mentioned them as examples of the seven “magnificent works” of architecture carried out in Seville since the “restoration” and as models of “good architecture”. In addition, commissioned by Diego de Vergara (1509-1583) models were made in plaster and one model in wood in the mid-sixteenth century for the Cathedral of Malaga. Almost two centuries later, in 1722, architect Miguel de los Santos recognised the practice of making models “in wood and plaster as was done in the past” to continue the works of the cathedral of Malaga. In the second half of the eighteenth century, the role of models was notable in the circle of teachers of the architecture class of the Royal Academy of San Fernando, including Giovanni Battista Sacchetti and Ventura Rodríguez. In this academy, there was a specific room and office for models. The only models that are known from this room are made in wood for final rather than experimental purposes in relation to construction aspects.

Returning to the “quarto de montear con yeso” (room for assembly with plaster), in this context perhaps Bruna extended the concept of “statues” to the more sculptural elements that comprised the classical orders, such as capitals, friezes and cornices. The repetition in plaster of these elements could have been a focus of the academic programme. Thus, a “modern” collection of architectural elements was formed that could be confused with the aforementioned collection of fragments of antiquities by Nicolás de la Cruz Bahamonde, among others. As was common in the artistic spirit of schools and academies, including the Academia del Diseño de Florencia, the house Lonja de Sevilla and the Spanish royal examples of the Enlightenment, in the Seville School drawing took precedence. This was confirmed by the statutes and by illustrious visitors. For example, Ponz described it as a “school of drawing” situated “on a site of greater instruction”. Copying works from Antiquity was added to the usual academic exercise of drawing principles or life models.
The Seville School appeared to be up-to-date compared to its contemporaries as it used replicas of “universal” antique works from the Mengs collection. This was combined in a very original way, considering the national and international panorama, with the study of “local” antique works such as those of the public Baetica collection put together by Bruna. In addition, the local school produced modern painting masters whose works were sold as copies in the same rooms of the Gothic Palace.

Drawing, in its many variants, and the copying of works of painters who were forerunners of the school appeared as an initiation experience that was common to the three arts. In the training of architects, drawing-based education was integrated with that of the classes of painting and sculpture, although the architecture class also had its specific characteristics. To the exercise of drawing from local and universal modern paintings and old sculptures should be added the drawing of architectural fragments that were also a part of the collection of classical, and to a lesser extent Andalusian, antiquities.

In addition, in all the disciples of the three arts, possibilities were provided by the architectural setting of the Alcázar itself, where elements from all historical periods coexisted in a wide range of spaces, including gardens and courtyards, from medieval Andalusia to the latest “modern” works represented by the anticonvivial experimentation in van der Borcht’s transformation of the area where the school had its headquarters.

In addition to the exercise of drawing, the teaching of architecture included theory that ensured knowledge of the Vitruvian and Renaissance interpretation of the classical orders, and of the most important buildings in Antiquity, through more modern constructions. The desire to update the library was shown by the presence of the book Vitruvius by Ortiz y Sanz and the book by Desgodets.

One aspect that was as little investigated as it was original in the development of the Seville School was the provision of a workshop for replicas or models of architecture in plaster – the “quarto para montear con yeso” (room for assembly with plaster) – within the academic teaching of architecture. The aim was to integrate construction and plastic aspects. We can interpret this as an attempt to expand the horizons of the academic teaching of architecture that had been based only on drawing and theory.

The creation of architectural models in plaster, whether they were replicas of small elements or models of design proposals, appears to have been a refreshing proposal in the teaching of architecture in Seville that oscillated between copy and invention. Compared to other academies within and outside of Spain, Bruna’s interest in introducing the practical, technical and construction dimension to architectural academic studies complemented in Seville the usual curriculum based on drawing and art literature.

In his Oración of 1778, Bruna praised the Sevillian school of architecture, and the illustrious teachers of painting and sculpture, at a time of consolidation of teaching that developed in the setting of Alcázar with many programmes. They integrated drawing and the study and copy of antiquities, books and plaster models. Regarding the objectives and the development of the school itself, it is necessary to consider the impact on teaching and the practice of architecture in Seville of these intense years of experience in the Alcázar. There, teachers and students of the three arts “worked jointly” to establish the bases of “good architecture”. The recognition of the Enlightenment – in its final stages – as a “territory” that was becoming less monolithic and unitary and instead plagued with contradictions and fragmentation, would require investigating in greater depth the debates around the teaching of architecture and its connection with culture in each local environment. This would capture the specific characteristics that could enrich the main national and international syntheses on the architecture of the Enlightenment and Reason between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the case of Seville, this would enable an investigation of the attempts to renew architecture through academic teaching and whether this was the definitive decline of a “school” – as Álvaro Recio Mir considered for the case of sculpture – or a specific teaching experiment within the Enlightenment project that had declined in a certain way in Seville. A deeper interpretation of the teaching of architecture in Seville provides new assumptions for a more complex, less orthodox interpretation of the architecture that would be developed from 1771 and throughout the nineteenth century, in the context of the latest teaching developments in which there was still a debate between architecture as a liberal art based on drawing, the arts and theory, or as a mechanical art linked to the knowledge and teaching of master builders.
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Mitjans as a Reference of Mitjans
Félix Solaguren-Beascoa de Corral

In his prolific professional career, Mitjans used study and reference as his main design tools. When he designed Barcelona’s football stadium, Camp Nou, he travelled all around Europe visiting other stadiums and gathered documents and postcards of them. In 1968, he participated in the competition for the new Telefónica headquarters in Fuente del Arroyo (Madrid), and had El Escorial, Mies or Harrison on his drawing board. In the definitive version of the Atlántico building at the junction between Calle Baumes and Avenida Diagonal de Barcelona, his gaze turned to Gio Ponti. However, in his first works on dwellings, also in Barcelona, his referent was Raimon Duran i Reynals, who followed the aesthetics of US architect Charles Platt for the composition of façades. Thus, in 1944, next to Turó Park in Barcelona, Mitjans created a work in brick and artificial stone, with a flat façade and two dwellings per landing. Sometime later, he would design another building on an adjacent plot with a different dwelling typology. However, the façade was similar and provided a united, unique canvas that would help to give a uniform character to the green space of the urban park, Turó Park.