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Heritage is just one component of the existing environment. It expresses uniquely the accumulated experience, identity and product of man. If it is valued and can contribute to modern life, it delivers multiple benefits. Of course realizing these benefits requires careful consideration of the users and stakeholders, and a clear vision of how the heritage can complement modern life while retaining its values. Heritage is for the people to use and to enjoy, and like any other element of the built environment, it has to be supported by the people, it has to be economically viable, and has to be funded either by the public or private purse. If there is no long term economic benefit, the conservation management process will fail over time, especially when public funding becomes constrained.

But achieving such benefits is the outcome of a disciplined process, which I believe must be built upon our appreciation of the people who will use, visit and appreciate the heritage, and the tangible and intangible potential for education, cultural identity, and employment.

We must lay the foundation for sustainability through developing economic as well as cultural benefits, since proof of economic viability should be one of the basic justifications for the conservation process and for the alterations required to make heritage environments valuable to the contemporary world. Of course, the degree of intervention required for sustainability varies enormously from project to project, but any planned intervention should incorporate assessment of economic benefits and costs as components of management and business planning.

The conservation process starts with holistic research, recording and analysis, as part of the project’s preparation. A diverse range of factors will then impact upon the successful and viable outcome of a heritage project. I suggest hereafter some of the factors for developing the economic benefits of heritage that the planner and architect and all stakeholders must consider:

Management factors:

Whether there are adequate capacities and competence of all stakeholders concerned with the project process:- local government, land owners, professionals, contractors, clients and project sponsors, managers;

Whether there is the support of clear and enforceable legal and regulatory systems;

If there are effective administrative and institutional systems;

Whether there is the political, social, and technical determination to address all issues fully and fairly. Conservation issues are more demanding than for new build projects;

Are there ethical codes and respect for human rights, accompanied by transparent and consensual approaches to problem resolution by all stakeholders?

Does the political environment require us to choose between autocracy or democracy, alienation or inclusion of stakeholders.
Are the principles of good governance applied, involving consultation, participation, inclusion, teamwork, and consensus?

**Technical challenges to achieving economic benefits:**
Factors that will impact upon the conservation outcomes might be seen in the nature of the cultural heritage, its condition and processes of change, and the decay mechanisms. Risks to sustainability may result from social, demographic, cultural, climatological, ecological, political, environmental, structural, accessibility and availability of services infrastructure, markets, financial and **economic** conditions.

Values assessment is fundamental to defining the historic, cultural, social, aesthetic, scientific and technical, associational etc. qualities that are to be protected. Equally important will be if the public are to be made aware and how they perceive these values, since it is only with the support of the public that conservation and maintenance is effective.

Are the values defined and agreed, not only of the historic environment but also of its context and is the degree of protection to be given to these values accepted in the local legislative and regulatory context?

**Is there a Conservation Plan which is accepted publicly?**

**Design must focus on factors that affect economic outcomes:**
Designers must analyse the design and management options, including benefits and risks to achieve effective and sustainable use and management, supported by business and management plans. This is important for national and international agencies who wish to limit their reputational risks through exposure to visibly loss making activities.

Professionals must look holistically at all capacity and human resource, planning, design, cost and revenue issues, whether dealing with micro or macro environments.

Financial support depends upon answering all issues upon which investment confidence depends. There may be several options for the future, and the economic arguments for the favoured option must be argued.

Mechanisms must be in place to seek market or institutional support through appropriate marketing. This is extremely relevant to sustainability and the delivery of economic benefits that can amortise investment costs as far as possible. The fact that the heritage is of public value, does not mean that rules for cost recovery and viability should not be taken into account.

If the project direction looks only at part of the problem, it will only get part of the answer.

**Management, maintenance and monitoring:**
Heritage and its context, once valued and designated, has to be attractive to the modern markets and adapt, if possible, without significant loss of value.

Heritage may not deliver economic benefits and its preservation may be required for historic record and future research. It may require moth-balling. It may need archaeological works to yield its historical message and values.

Heritage benefits may be sustainable to differing degrees. There can be no pre-set rule for how we can develop economic benefits of heritage since circumstances are so infinitely variable. It requires management paradigms for handling generic issues, and rules as for any effective business.

It requires sensitive leadership of very varied stakeholder interests to give assurance to the project sponsors that the outcomes are to be achieved. Failure in any one relevant aspect courts equal risks of failure to deliver identified benefits,
Most importantly we can only determine economic and other benefits if we can undertake a baseline survey, of both tangible and intangible factors, before works are implemented and after works have been completed. Seldom do surveys take place accurately before works commence.

At present economic analyses of the heritage and the assessment of costs and benefits are too weak, and this presents us in ICOMOS with our own reputational risks. Government surveys can also be subject to political bias, and I recommend that all market and economic assessment is undertaken most scientifically.

I believe that ICOMOS needs to strengthen its advice on best practice in developing the economic benefits of heritage.
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Abstract. The regeneration historical city centres requires an institutional framework to provide favourable conditions for appropriate private investments. The case of Pretoria shows that private investment can also precede (and provoke?) public intervention while capitalising on the iconic value some heritage structures present. In both approaches the main challenge is to identify and use development potentials of the historical features at stake.

1. Introduction

In September 2009 the authors took part in a successful field academy conducted between the University of Pretoria’s Department of Architecture, the Netherlands Cultural Heritage Agency, ICOMOS ISC SBH and the ArchiAfrika Foundation. The project was supported by the Dutch programme on Mutual Cultural Heritage (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands 2008) and executed within the Memorandum of Understanding on Mutual Cultural heritage between South-Africa and the Netherlands (Republic of South Africa and Kingdom of the Netherlands 2004). The aim of the academy was twofold: the first being educational, the second to establish if and how the Pretoria’s historical features could contribute to a desired regeneration of its historic core.

At the time, the inner core of the City of Pretoria had been subject to a systematic abandonment dating from the mid 1980’s when new commercial cores were established to the East thereof, leaving the core to decay. This process was expedited by the systematic dismantling of the Apartheid state and the repeal of the Groups Areas Act of 1966 in the year 1991, leading to the financially privileged to withdraw into gated office parks and neighbourhoods. The realisation that this process of decay was in fact becoming epidemic lead to the field academy workshop being undertaken.

Local architecture students were invited to take part in this 4-day academy in which a large portion of the historic core of the City was ‘quick scanned’, mapped, photographed, assessed and debated. The development of the City was studied through archival material at the same time to understand the current character of the City as a consequence of its past. In considering the outcome of the fieldwork and the analysis of Pretoria’s spatial development through time, the work party formulated a development perspective for the City with, as departure point, it’s historical features. The main result was a strategy map showing development opportunities and risks along with more detailed perspectives for six selected precincts in the city centre. They were presented to an audience composed of representatives of the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (CTMM), the Provincial Heritage resources Agency - Gauteng and stakeholders from the real estate sector.

The field academy proved to be a success on an educational level. This is evidenced by the fact that the method has permeated the school of architecture at the University of Pretoria and students now apply this methodology as standard part of their investigations. It has also since been used with success in in Maputo, Mozambique, in an intercontinental project involving the University of Pretoria, South Africa, The University of Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique and the Technical University Delft, the Netherlands, with support of the ArchAfrica Foundation. This project was in response to a request received for the Maputo Municipality to investigate future perspectives for the revitalisation of the Baixa de Maputo, the historic core of the City (Clarke, Corten and Peres 2011). The outcome of the Pretoria workshop results have been presented as a policy advise document to the CTMM. Thus its final success can be gauged by the impact it may have on municipal policy. Revitalising urban structures of historical significance is internationally addressed as Integrated Conservation.

1 Peter van Dun (ICOMOS ISC SBH), Jean-Paul Corten (Dutch Cultural heritage Agency), Berend van de Lans (ArchiAfrika) and Nicholas Clarke (University of Pretoria) lead the project in Pretoria.
Integrated Conservation theory, as applied through the workshop, presupposes a supportive institutional environment in which authority actively engages in a city’s redevelopment. The reality on the ground in Pretoria is unfortunately quite different. The City has seen some attempts to inner city rejuvenation including sporadic restoration and redevelopment of late, but no successful integrated project has been attempted that could be called ‘systematic’ from the institutional perspectives. Still, private parties have showed a willingness to invest in the city centre and use its historical features to commercial gain.

2. Urban regeneration

Conserving urban buildings is not merely a matter of repairing physical dilapidation. Usually physical dilapidated areas result from social and economic disorder. Rather the underlying challenge is to restore the social cohesion and economic feasibility in order to provide a sustainable base of existence for the structures to be preserved and restored. The preservation of an individual dilapidated building sometimes can be achieved by incidental funding, this strategy, however generally does not work for larger areas. The investments required are usually simply far to high to be covered by subsidising bodies. Thus the main strategy should be to tempt inhabitants and investors to invest in a dilapidated area in an appropriate way. A clear perspective on the area’s future is a first prerequisite. This can only be provided by the local authority and legally secured in an appropriate development plan supported by a political will which should have a live longer than a single political term of office. A first step toward integrating historical features into future developments is therefore to convince decision makers of the development potentials the historical features offer and how a city will profit from this (Van Dun 2002).

A policy on Integrated Conservation aims at revitalising dilapidated city quarters by reusing the existing building stock and infrastructure. This means adapting them to today’s society in a solid social and economic way. In Europe this approach was promoted by the Council of Europe in its Declaration of Amsterdam of 1975 (Council of Europe 1975). ICOMOS accepted the same principles in the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas in 1987 (The Washington Charter) (ICOMOS 1987). In the Netherlands it was put into practise during the programmes of inner-city renewal, as executed during the last quarter of the 20th century (Mollema 2005). The methods used during the Heritage Field Academy are derived from this experience.

3. Pretoria and the City of Tshwane

Today’s Pretoria is the historical core of the larger City of Tshwane. It is located on the well watered plains in the Apies River Valley at 1 300m above sea level, nestled between the Magalies Mountain- and Bronberg ranges. The Tshwane Metropole is located in the Gauteng Province, the economic heart of the country and in a way of the whole African continent. Gauteng’s favourable economic and developed position is based on its natural resources, financial institutions and processing industries. The City of Tshwane, forming the administrative capital of the country, presently contains approximately 2.5 million inhabitants spread over an area of 6 368km2 (City of Tshwane 2011). Gauteng as a whole contains over 10 million. Within 15 years the City of Tshwane is expected to form part of a megalopolis of 20 million or more people (City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality 2005). This is an economically and socially dynamic place, still developing and of relatively young age.

* In South Africa a single term in office for a politician is four years.

Figure 1. Aerial Photograph of Tshwane, 2009.
The history of the City of Tshwane can be traced back to the early 1850’s, when iterant Boers established Pretoria as the capital of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek (ZAR), granted independence in 1852 by Great Britain, which at the time dominated Southern Africa politically. For hundreds of years preceding Boer settlement the Apies River Valley had supported a large population of iron-age peoples of different cultural groupings, notably small tribes of the AmaNdebele. However, the militant growth of the Zulu and the splintering of the Matabele people during the first half of the 19th century, resulted in great disruption and massive dislocation of the original peoples. When the Boers arrived in the year 1841, they trekked into a temporary uninhabited region and settled in an area over which a vacuum of power existed (Guiliomme and Mbenga 2007).

The first plans for what still had to become the City of Pretoria date from the time the tiny frontier village was created as Capital of the ZAR. To accommodate the capital’s needs, an orthogonal grid was designed. Tradition has it that the width of the streets forming the grid, was determined by the length of the oxen wagons, used by the Boer famers, and the street width required by these vehicles to make a U-turn (Allen 1971). These wide streets today still gives evidence of Pretoria’s rural origin. In the early years the building blocks within the grid contained single storey buildings for residential use with large backyards, or offices for administration and regional services as well as shops for retail trade. While building sites were mainly closed, building lines were strictly regulated in order to keep the orthogonal grid. Citizens were obliged to plant and maintain trees in front of their property to provide shade in the streets. Dwellings were provided with fresh water by canals that were running along the streets and were fed by the source of the Apies River, a fountain located at Elandspoort to the south of the fledgeling settlement. At the crossroad of the central axes of the orthogonal grid there was an open square, containing the church where the Boers of the region gathered for Sunday services and where they put their tents for the duration of their stay in the capital (Holm, 1998).

Figure 2. Pretoria’s growth over the years 1855-1928 showing eastward expansion. (Authors)
The discovery of gold in the Witwatersrand in 1886 had a major impact on the ZAR as a whole, as well as on its, thus far, unpretentious settlements. For Pretoria the gold rush not only caused an enormous influx of people, but also transformed a rural community to an urban society. The first expansions of the City could be accommodated within the central grid, being bordered by the Apies River in the North, East and South and by the Steenhovenspruit (Steenhoven Stream or rivulet) in the West. But by the end of the 1880’s the City had already expanded outside its central grid. While administrative use expanded within the city centre, a new orthogonal grid was laid out to the South-East to accommodate residential dwellings. The new city quarter was optimistically baptised Sunnyside. The next expansion, called Arcadia in the same optimistic mood, was also directed Eastwards, using Church Street, the main East-West axis of the central grid, as its base of expansion and connection to the city centre. Expansions to the North and South were limited due to the mountainous geography and to the West due to the horse racing track, located beyond the Steenhovenspruit. Only halfway the 20th Century the Western side of the City developed, in the end incorporating the horse racing track.

The economic and social transformation, underlying Pretoria’s growth and morphological changes during the second half of the 19th century caused political tension within the young and somewhat feeble republic. This lead to a series of military conflicts. Pretoria became was the centre of several sporadic disputes during the second half of the 19th century: among the Boers, between Boers and indigenous tribes and between the Boers and the British rulers over the South of Africa. These conflicts culminated in the South African War (or Second Anglo-Boer War) (1899-1902), bringing the ZAR under British rule. The first half of the 20th century, in contrast, was a period of political stability and economic growth. This city prospered especially after 1910, when Pretoria became the administrative capital of the new Union of South Africa, under the British Crown. Its importance as administrative centre grew with more civil servants demanding more office accommodation. Meanwhile industrialisation took off. Both developments caused further urbanisation and a building boom (Fisher 1998).

When Prime Minister Verwoerd withdrew South Africa from the Commonwealth in 1961, Pretoria became the capital city of the newly born republic. By then economic recession and Apartheid politics, dating from post-war times, had already brought about new major changes in Pretoria’s features and urban morphology. Racial segregation deprived blacks and coloureds from their rights to live, and sometimes even visit, the city quarters reserved for whites, legislated through the Group Areas Acts of 1950 and its revisions of 1957 and 1966. New townships, like Mamelodi to the far East of the City centre, were constructed to house the non-white population and within the City public facilities for whites were separated from those for blacks. Racial segregation left its marks on the City of Pretoria, even noticeable after Apartheid was abolished in 1994 - these are still present today. Unlike the Union Buildings, the main architectural icon of the City, once the home of a racist regime, now the symbol of cultural diversity and reconciliation, the City centre has not yet regained its diversity of functions and facilities needed to serve an urban society and rainbow nation.
4. The present situation

Most lasting of Pretoria’s features is its identity as capital city and centre of administration. This is still apparent today and the City is likely to stay the seat of government for the near future, notwithstanding the long distance to the Legislative seat in Cape Town and Judiciary seat in Bloemfontein.

Morphologically, Pretoria’s urban grid is one of its main historical features, and has turned out to be its most lasting and sustainable aspect. It dates from the start of this city’s existence and has been able to accommodate a remarkable number of developments and changes since that time. Only at Skinner Street has the grid been altered to accommodate a new, yet never completed, traffic circulation plan, proposed by Baron William Holford in 1949 (Holford 1949; Bryant 1963). The urban grid seems flexible enough to accommodate future developments and is expected to have a lasting future. Although the parcelation and building lines of most of the urban blocks date back to early times, the urban fabric of many of these blocks has been altered through time, especially where it comes to building heights and volume, yet always contained within the urban grid. Architecture and construction are, not surprisingly, even more variable than the urban fabric and have frequently been changed and altered to suit an ever changing vogue (Corten and Van Dun 2009).

In the execution of the quick scan Pretoria’s urban qualities, state of maintenance and functioning were investigated. The analysis shows that the City’s main failure is not the lack of maintenance, but rather an unbalanced functioning (figure 4). Office buildings dominate the city centre, underlining the City’s identity as capital city and centre of administration. This is not in itself a sign of disfunction. However, a large number of these office buildings stand idle, potentially providing possibilities for expansion of administrative use. Most striking is the lack of residential accommodation, public services, commercial activities and retail space (figure 6). This may be both result and cause of the commonly felt sense of insecurity. With regards urban quality, the quick scan highlighted the centre of the historical core, mainly Church Square and surroundings, as a coherent urban precinct (figure 5). The same is true for the urban blocks East of the central square. Moving North and West of the centre however, coherence diminishes (Corten and Van Dun 2009) and the City presents a haphazard nature.

![Figure 4. Technical conditions mapping. (Corten and Van Dun 2010)](image-url)
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Figure 5. Historical identity mapping. (Corten and Van Dun 2010)

Figure 6. Functions map. (Corten and Van Dun 2010)
5. Future perspectives

Along with the quick scan, the Field Academy executed a SWOT-analyses. Combined with the before mentioned quick scan, this generated insight into the potential Pretoria’s historical features offer. Resulting form this, development opportunities of Pretoria’s historical core are expected to lie in its identity as capital city of the country and centre of administration. Pretoria’s cultural diversity could be exploited and enhanced, as could the tourism potential of the City. By adding missing commercial functions and entertainment to the administrative functions, the city centre could become a lively place for 24-hours a day and gain attractiveness as residential area. Several spots in the city centre offer opportunities for brownfield developments; transforming marginal industrial and commercial sites, as well as vacant plots and idle office buildings into cultural precincts. Marabastad, a rather isolated precinct North of the city centre, too offers opportunities to be linked to the emergent vibrant urban culture. The natural resources in the periphery of the city centre, like the Apies River and Steenhovenspruit, could be exploited and capitalised, thus improving urban quality. One aspect requiring urgent investment is the City’s public transport system to improve ease of access to the centre (Corten and Van Dun 2009).

The Field Academy also identified threats to the historical identity of Pretoria’s historical core. They mainly result from a lack of coherent vision on Pretoria’s future leading to ad hoc developments and investments. There exists a tendency towards ghetto formation, this catering to specific groups and activities of which Marabastad is an example. This is an omnipresent trend in Pretoria’s historical core. Inner-city residential areas have of late also taken on slum characteristics. Corten and Van Dun (2009) also argue that the inverse of this, a danger of gentrification of residential areas, potentially resultant from inner-city redevelopment, were this to take place. The participants of the Field Academy managed to translate the mentioned development opportunities and risks of Pretoria’s historical features onto a map, thus providing the Metropolitan Municipality with input data for a master plan. In addition the Field Academy suggested the establishment of a Regeneration Authority and an Independent Implementation Body. The first could deal with the legal and political issues concerning the revitalisation, and thus should operate within the municipal organisation. Corten and Van Dun (2009) argue that the implementation of a revitalisation scheme, on the other hand, should rather be mandated to an independent body. This body could implement the results of the political approved renovation and multiyear implementation scheme. Its independence would have to be guaranteed in order to secure the continuity of implementation of the whole programme and it should preferably be commercially based. A benefit to it being an NGO would be an ability to raise external funding for the renovations (Corten and Van Dun 2009).

6. Attempts at urban regeneration to date in Pretoria

In 2005, eleven years after the transition to Democracy in South Africa, the National Department of Public Works, along with the Department of Public Service and Administration and the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality launched the ‘Re Kgabisa Tshwane’ program. This program aimed at ensuring the viability of the historic centre of Pretoria through investment by National Government in public-private partnerships. This was a direct reaction to a disinvestment in property in the historic city centre with the associated decay, leading to urban sprawl in areas of lower density. Government itself contributed to this with individual government departments removing themselves from aging city buildings to commercial gated office developments in wealthy neighborhoods rather than reinvesting in the building stock of the city centre. Added to this Provincial Government relocated from Pretoria to Johannesburg in 1994, leaving large landmark buildings vacant. The Re Kgabisa program developed a Spatial Development Framework (SDF) with seven development nodes where the Department of Public Works would invest through the allocation of Government functions. With regards the SDF the Re Kgabisa project had: «... determined a series of precincts within which departments and agencies are to be consolidated and clustered. There are seven precincts in the inner-city along the two corridors of development investment being Paul Kruger and Church Streets. These precincts are currently the Presidency Precinct, Mandela Corridor Precinct, Sammy Marks Square Precinct, Paul Kruger North Precinct, Church Square Precinct, Museum Park Precinct and Salvokop Precinct. Each of the precincts are intended to develop their own character and are linked by the proposed dedicated pedestrian and public transport route along Paul Kruger and Church Streets, from Freedom Park to the Union Buildings.» (Re Kgabisa 2011)

Six of the seven precincts (figure 7) have a strong historical identity. Six years into the programme only one of these nodes has seen large scale development with one government department being allocated there: the Department of Trade and Industry campus development as part of the

1 The official website of the Re Kgabisa Tshwane programme lists the purpose of the programme as: “The main purpose of Re Kgabisa Tshwane is to ensure a long term accommodation solution for national Government department head offices and agencies within the inner city of Tshwane.” (Re Kgabisa 2011)
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Mandela Corridor. This new campus, while altering the urban character of its immediate precinct, is located on a site of lesser historical significance and has not greatly contributed to inner-city renewal for the core. Tellingly the new campus for the Department of Foreign affairs is located far outside the core in a suburban neighbourhood and is removed from the City by a mountain. The drain of government departments from the historic urban centre thus continued. The project did lead to investment in the inner-city with single new-build projects and re-use of extant building stock, but did not reach its main goal of precinct redevelopment or spatial improvement. This is due to a lack of political will in both City governance and Government, and is not the first of a long list of master plans and development frameworks prepared for the City, but never executed. The Re Kgabisa project itself is case in point, it being submerged in to another programme in 2007, the so-called City Improvement Development Framework (Damstra, 2011), which itself has brought about even less visible investment.

Until now identity seems to have remained a low priority for the City of Tshwane. The City of Tshwane Integrated Development Plan for 2011-2016 does not even list the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) as policy or legislation relevant to the City and the management thereof, despite obvious legal obligations contained therein. This apparent inability of local government to take control effectively has lead to a vacuum in managing the inner-city and its heritage values. Individual property owners have identified this void and have taken it upon themselves to restore and reuse heritage buildings in the city as commercial ventures, often buying buildings from Government itself. As case we can investigate one specific local real-estate owner and manager City Property (Pty) Ltd. In 2004 this company started investing in the city centre when others were disinvesting and saw commercial opportunity in the changing demographic brought about by the transition to democracy in South Africa. Being in need of ensuring a profit for its stakeholders the company capitalized on the lack of residential opportunity in the City by starting to transform much of the empty office space in its portfolio into residential accommodation marketed at emergent middle-class urbanites. In doing so it was inadvertently addressing a need which ideally should have been provided for through a spatial development framework, a need identified in the Field Academy. Today the company manage 700 buildings in both Johannesburg and Pretoria containing 1,4 million m2 which houses 10 000 apartments and 8 000 office units, servicing 18 000 tenants (City Property 2011). Their strategy has been to acquire buildings which had been abandoned, vandalized or not invested in with low or no return and redevelop these to provide a good return on investment.

The new inhabitants of the City of course require amenities and services making the renovation and upgrade of other buildings, specifically those with street-side retail accommodation, viable. The flagship restoration project of the company is undoubtedly the restoration of a building on the central square of the city named Tudor Chambers (Architect John Ellis, 1906) at a

1 Currently two more projects are being planned on the periphery, but within the bounds of the original Re Kgabisa Tshwane programme, both sites containing structures of significance. The programme was planned to come to an end in 2014 but has already been abandoned
cost of 20mil ZAR (Approximately 2 million Euro at the time) (Property24 2009; Clarke 2011). The restoration of this turn of the twentieth-century building became feasible due to the increased rental that could be realized from the retail accommodation on the street, but was also undertaken in an attempt to re-brand the identity of the city centre (figure 8). The building is a prominent landmark building located on Church Square, the heart of the city. Its restoration was undertaken in order to revitalize the core of the city, thereby safeguarding the value of other property investments in the area. However, due to unfavorable conditions and lacking support from authority in planning for parking the office floors have stood vacant for two years. Additionally the City won’t issue an occupation certificate because the building now is not deemed to comply to current fire regulations, thereby disqualifying the project from benefitting from tax reductions in lieu of inner city investment. Still City Property is continuing to renew the building stock under its control in the City based on financial feasibility. This process is helping to ensure the viability of the historic inner-city. As a large part of the building stock the company manages is historically significant, it has evolved a strong heritage ethos and employs heritage consultants as a matter of course. These historical structures have been turned into economically viable structures. City Property believe that the “revitalization of city buildings and the rehabilitation of city centers is plain good business” (City Property 2011).

However they too have been frustrated by the lack on information on heritage structures, the understaffing of local heritage authorities and lack of formalized frameworks within which to plan their redevelopments. At the same time as that they were engaged in the restoration of early C20 structures in the City, the same company undertook the demolition of another of their properties, Marchie Mansions (1937). At the time they were not aware that this structure was an important Modern Movement icon in the City, designed by an architect of great importance, Itten-Schulle trained Hellmut Stauch (figure 9).

While ignorance is no excuse for demolition, it must be mentioned that the City to this day have no register of heritage structures, nor do the Provincial or National heritage bodies. This is direct contravention of national legislation, the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) requiring local, provincial and national authorities to have compiled heritage registers by 2009 (Republic of South Africa 1999). The demolition of Marchie Mansions was halted, but not after irreparable damage.
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had been done. To address this vacuum the Department of Architecture at the University of Pretoria has initiated an open source wiki-based documentation and information dissemination project on the portal www.ableup.org which now contains information on structures of significance in the city and hopes to be able to generate heritage registers in the near future.¹

7. The here and now

Not all is doom and gloom. In 2009 the City issued a call for tenders to develop macro and micro precinct plans, informed, the authors believe, in part by the results of the Field Academy which were presented to the City in 2009. An interdisciplinary consortium of consultants, including heritage architects and cultural historians have now been appointed to develop these plans. Echoing the proposals of Corten and Van Dun (2009) this consortium are now proposing an independent development agency be tasked with implementing these frameworks. The Municipality itself has also now issued a call for nominations to a heritage committee, located within the Department of Sports Recreation Arts and Culture.

Even more promising is the recently issued regeneration policy paper issued by Tshwane’s municipality in 2011. This enables the City’s planning board to execute a long desired improvement programme. The City’s officers leading the programme showed their rising awareness of Pretoria’s historical features. The participation of two of the City’s planning officials in a course on Urban Heritage Strategies, presented by the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency in collaboration with the IHS, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, in June 2011 was a direct outcome of the Field Academy of 2009 and was executed within the same framework concerning cooperation on mutual heritage between South Africa and the Netherlands (Hanekom et al, 2012). As in interesting aside the project office of the consortium of consultants tasked with developing the new macro and micro precinct plant have, in a move to show their commitment to both the City and public transport systems, establish their project office in Tudor Chambers on 1 November 2011, the office component of this building having stood vacant since restoration due to a lack of parking provision as discussed above.

8. Conclusion

We may conclude that history and development have a reciprocal interest. History serves development by providing spatial quality. Development in its turn serves history by providing it with a base of existence. Regenerating historical city centres thus is a public-private enterprise. The public sector should provide favourable conditions for developments through ensuring legal security and continuity in policy, the last a quality lacking in Tshwane up to the present, but hopefully now set to change. This has not deterred intrepid investors from venturing into the City when others have been seen abandoning it. This investment, we have seen,
has lead to economic gain, capitalising on the iconic qualities and visibilities of heritage structures and areas. However for large scale, precinct wide regeneration of historic urban landscapes it is imperative that the authority take the lead in partnership with the private sector which, from the reading of the current situation, are all to happy to invest in heritage, if the frameworks within which this can happen are formalised. Sporadic investment in heritage can be brought about by both iconic value as well as financial gain. Where this is done at a large scale and with a clear strategy this can serve as second rate replacement for a clear development framework but will always be frustrated by the disparity which will in time emerge between the individual building and larger urban environmental issues such as adequate transport, streetscape maintenance and so forth.
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Abstract. It is generally accepted that the conservation of cultural heritage requires the involvement of multiple players across the public, private and nongovernment sectors, not only to initiate and carry out conservation but also to sustain the place. However, the practical means and mechanisms to achieving this are only recently becoming the subject of literature. The conservation of the historic urban environment poses specific and urgent challenges that require a multidisciplinary approach, where conservation actions are embedded within economic, social and environmental development strategies. The private and third sectors are increasingly playing a pivotal role in these processes.

As part of the Historic Cities and Urban Settlements Initiative, the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) has recently undertaken a small research project leading to a literature review examining the role and use of public-private partnerships in achieving conservation outcomes. The review drawings together the available literature and provides a bibliography that will provide much needed information and assist in advancing the field through enhanced understanding of the concepts behind public-private partnerships and how they have been used in achieving sustainable conservation outcomes.

Public, private and non-profit sectors are already working together in a multitude of ways to secure economically viable outcomes for heritage places, however there is potential to enhance this with improved knowledge of what constitutes successful partnerships and what other factors need to be in place to facilitate their success.

1. Introduction

It is generally accepted that the conservation of cultural heritage requires an interdisciplinary approach with the involvement of multiple players across the public, private and nongovernment sectors, not only to initiate and carry out conservation but also to sustain the place. It is also widely recognized that conservation actions need to be embedded within social, environmental and economic development strategies that include financial mechanisms to encourage and facilitate public-private and third-sector contributions. However, there is a dearth of information on how to practically achieve this.

Most governments face significant challenges in their efforts to conserve and manage their cultural heritage assets and few have the necessary resources (money and skills) required to fully achieve their conservation goals. In many places government has been seen as the primary guardian of the nation’s heritage, but increasing pressure to fulfill other public demands, requires community commitment and private engagement in order to help governments retain these assets for future generations. Therefore the private and third-sectors are increasingly involved in conservation efforts that have traditionally been delivered by government. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) began to be used for heritage conservation in the late 1960s within the context of urban regeneration schemes. Their use has slowly expanded to the conservation and management of archeological sites, buildings, landscapes, urban areas, collections and natural areas of heritage significance. However, PPPs are not always the best means of achieving quality conservation outcomes nor are they necessarily the most efficient way to fund a project. Thus there is some concern and skepticism about their use. Therefore a better understanding of PPPs and when and how they may be used to assist in achieving conservation aims is needed.

As part of the Historic Cities and Urban Settlements Initiative, the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) undertook a literature review that examined the role and use of public-private partnerships in achieving conservation outcomes. The GCI’s work seeks to fill the information gap, drawing together the available literature and compiling a bibliography that will assist in advancing the field through enhanced understanding of the concepts behind public-private partnerships and how they have been used in
achieving sustainable conservation outcomes. The work also examined various case studies that exemplified the ways that PPPs have been used to conserve historic buildings and historic urban areas.

2. What is a public private partnership and who is involved?

Public-private partnerships can be defined as; “[A] contractual agreement between a public agency (federal, state or local) and a private sector entity. Through this agreement, the skills and assets of each sector (public and private) are shared in delivering a service or facility for the use of the general public. In addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards potential in the delivery of the service and/or facility.” (NCPPP 2010)

PPPs are transactional; they involve risk and responsibility sharing between partners, distinguishing them from collaborations or service contracts. For example, a contract in which the public-sector building owner contracts a private company to conserve a building that the public institution continues to occupy and/or operate is not a PPP, it is a straightforward public-procurement project. PPPs are not the same as privatization. PPP’s avoid privatization by ensuring that the public sector maintains bottom-line accountability for the asset and by committing the private or third sector to such long-term commitments as operating the asset over an extended period of time, charging fees and assuming primary management and maintenance responsibilities.

The use of public-private partnerships has increased over the last 20 years as a means for governments to manage the rising costs and responsibilities of services traditionally delivered by the public sector. They are a common means to deliver public services and core infrastructure needs such as energy, water, transportation and telecommunications. These partnerships are context-specific and are tailored to meet the needs of the specific partners and produce the desired outcomes. Despite better understanding of PPPs’ successes and failures, and some controversy about their use they continue to be proposed as the answer to filling the gap between the demand for public services and governments’ willingness or ability to pay for them.

The sectors involved in PPPs include the public sector, which may include one or all levels of government, the private sector, which includes business and investor organizations and, of increasing importance and particular relevance to PPPs used for heritage conservation, is the third sector. In this paper the third sector is described as nongovernment, social and community-based institutions and may also include local people (Fox, Brakarz, Cruz 2005). The skills of these sectors are often complimentary. The private sector usually provides capital or fundraising skills, technical expertise and efficient delivery. The third sector will bring local knowledge, concerns and interests. In exchange, the public sector usually, but not always, provides the asset, the regulatory framework and financial incentives such as a one-time subsidy, grants, or tax incentives that attract private investment. Key features ideally include long-term service provisions, a transfer or sharing of risk to the private sector and different types of long-term contracts in which both parties agree to an explicit set of rules and goals beforehand (United Nations Economic Commission 2008).

3. Change and sustaining heritage values

Sustaining heritage places requires that they are valued and to have some use or purpose. Only a small percentage of the world’s heritage places are public monuments that can be preserved for purely interpretive purposes. A huge number remain in their original use, which may also contribute to their heritage significance. All heritage places inevitably change over time either due to the physical effect of the environment or adaptation in order to remain viable and receive necessary care from their owners. Conservation is about the careful management of the place in ways that preserve, sustain and interpret heritage significance.

In many parts of the world government has historically been the largest single business enterprise with a substantial number of sites, buildings and structures that service its business, many of which have been identified as being of heritage significance. Privatization or change in delivery methods for government-managed services has led to a surfeit of heritage places in need of new and contemporary uses. Post offices, defense sites, schools and hospitals have been subject to rationalization of government services over the last decades and either sold outright or revitalized by schemes that find new uses or operational models. This issue is not confined to the former government-owned heritage places and many other heritage places whose uses have been rationalized or are obsolete face the same problems, from single building types such as churches, to large complexes such as industrial sites. The larger complexes confront different dilemmas that usually demand a response at the urban scale as part of wider regeneration initiatives. Creative new approaches and sustainable economic solutions are needed at both ends of the scale to secure ongoing use and the necessary care of the heritage asset.

In historic urban areas where there is multiple ownership, finding viable economic solutions is more complex. Individual buildings, monuments, landscapes, setting, use, traditions and other social and spiritual values that together contribute to heritage significance, will be closely tied to the community that occupies or uses the place. Conservation efforts therefore need to identify the various values present and must involve local owners.
and communities who contribute to these values. Multi-
actor engagement is vital and partnerships of some
sort or another are inevitable. Simply put reliance on
the public sector to finance conservation is unviable
and unsustainable. Likewise the private sector will be
unwilling or unable to take on the risks and costs of
urban conservation alone. Incentives and/or public-
private partnerships will therefore be essential to long
term success. In some cases, these partnerships will
be transactional or formalized in the form of a PPP. In
some urban areas and large-scale sites, conservation has
played an integral role in urban regeneration schemes.
There are positive synergies between conservation and
urban regeneration. Conserving urban heritage secures
the success of urban regeneration projects while at the
same time the economic and social benefits of urban
regeneration (such as the reuse of valuable physical
and cultural assets and transport efficiencies) support
conservation expenditures (Rojas 1999).

4. Roles and Responsibilities in the conservation process

Increased pressure on the public purse has triggered
reviews of government budget allocations worldwide.
Heritage agencies in many countries are experiencing
decreasing budgets and are at the same time faced with
expanding responsibilities and demands. The public sector
has had to find new creative ways to work in partnership
with the other sectors to deliver conservation needs. The
recent economic downturn has further fuelled interest in
this area and generated new discussion.

4.1 THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR

Recent studies have sought to evaluate the economic
value of cultural heritage to local economies and
demonstrate when, where and why government
intervention is necessary and how it is most effectively
provided to incentivize the other sectors to conserve
heritage places (Environment Protection and Heritage
Council 2004). Within these reports, it is explicit that
the withdrawal of government money to carry out
conservation is accompanied by the need for sound and
transparent regulatory planning and heritage frameworks
to protect heritage places, sound policy, standards and
guidance on how to conserve them, public education and
information on heritage that helps people understand it.
Financial incentives to supplement conservation where
the market alone cannot deliver are also necessary. In
urban area conservation, the public sector’s role may be
to encourage private-sector investment by committing
to infrastructure and community upgrading of the
surrounding neighborhood and by conserving important
public monuments and spaces. Government intervention
may also be needed to address issues such as low-income
housing, financial and other incentives to catalyze private
action, institutional capacity to manage the interface
between public, private and third sector organizations
including mechanisms for stakeholder engagement.
Regardless of the scale, governments’ role is to create
fertile ground for conservation, to ensure places are
adequately protected and conserved according to clearly
defined and agreed standards and to lead by example in
the management of their own sites. As with infrastructure
PPPs, the government can provide financial and regulatory
incentives to attract private partners via grants, tax credits
or deductions, or upfront financial contributions towards
conservation. In the developing world, multilateral
development banks have typically supported some of
these government actions through grants, loans or
technical support. These organizations have their own
criteria that must be met before they will finance these
activities (Steinberg 2008, Rojas and Casatro 1999).
Whilst governments’ motivation for engaging in PPPs
may initially be financial, there is also an opportunity
for governments to use PPPs as a means of harnessing
community commitment, engagement and empowerment
in conserving heritage places. There is a trend in local
governance towards community management of local
public assets to enhance their use (Quirk, Robinson, and
Thake 2007). Clearly this motivation has synergies with
the call by heritage conservationists and communities
for greater participation in the care and conservation of
heritage places.

Depending on the country’s governance structure and role
and responsibility for heritage and urban planning, a public
partner can be the local, state or national government or a
combination. The public partner in a PPP for conservation
of a single building is generally, but not always, the owner
of the building or has legal responsibility for overseeing
its continued care. Some governments have dedicated
development or asset disposal departments that engage
in PPPs. In urban regeneration projects a combination of
government agencies may be involved.

4.2 THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The private sector has long played a vital role in cultural
heritage conservation. As direct government funding for
heritage decreases, the private sector’s role is increasing.
The private sector’s motivation for engaging in public-
private partnerships may be primarily profit, but may
also include the potential to meet socially responsible
corporate business goals and targets.

Private sector involvement in delivering conservation
outcomes traditionally funded by government can take
a number of forms that are much the same as in other
infrastructure partnerships, providing financial capital or
the ability to raise and negotiate funds, skills and long-
term obligations. The private sector also has a nimbleness
government does not always possess. The private
partner is expected to possess a detailed knowledge of the development sector and construction and have knowledge of the legislative tools and restrictions involved in working with historic places. Additionally, in many PPPs for conservation, the private partner is tasked with the long-term management of the asset according to the terms of the contract, unless the building or buildings are rehabilitated solely for continuous public use or immediate private ownership. Triple-bottom line reporting both in the public and private sectors has triggered an expectation for the private sector to take on greater social responsibility. PPPs that deliver conservation outcomes can assist socially-entrepreneurial, private-sector developers to achieve this aim. Another result of this shift is the acceptance within some parts of the private sector to accept stretching profits over the longer term often making conservation projects more viable. Similarly, government assurances of long-term involvement can boost private sector confidence to engage in such an endeavor. Given that conservation generally aspires to the long view, this is where a PPP can provide real benefits. Heritage conservation is a specific market within the development sector. When coupled with regeneration projects it moves to a potentially more profitable sector, particularly where financial risk can be shared. In places where PPPs are more common such as the UK, projects involving heritage components remain profitable during periods of economic downturn. This has spurred more interest in the historic building development market. In some instances the private and third sectors are working together without public sector input. Multinational companies have played a role in conservation both as a means of demonstrating corporate responsibility and as a means of engaging in the conservation process to protect or improve their own interests (Eirinber 1998). This is often in the form of straightforward philanthropy, which is not a PPP. There are only rare examples of PPPs involving multinational corporations for heritage sites and none specifically documented for cultural sites including urban conservation (UNESCO, 2008). Corporations involved in tourism seem likely potential partners for PPPs related to cultural heritage sites. Given the potential conflicts between the need to protect their own business interests and the need to meet conservation needs, PPPs involving corporations require very clear shared objectives and criteria to avoid compromising the heritage site and to avoid overexploitation of the heritage resource for short term profit. 

4.3 THE THIRD SECTOR

The third sector, sometimes also known as the voluntary or community sector has also had a long involvement in the delivery of conservation outcomes. The third sector are generally nonprofit organizations that represent social interests and may include local residents (Fox, Brakarz and Cruz, 2005). The growing awareness of the role of communities in cultural heritage conservation means that there is recognition that it is not solely the responsibility of government to secure conservation outcomes. The community role therefore, may extend beyond consultation on what should be protected by legislation to include playing a role in economic means of achieving conservation and sustaining the place. At their simplest, many local museums and historic houses are run on a day-to-day basis by local communities on behalf of their government owners. In some conservation projects the third partner can play a role in its own right, essentially acting like a private partner. However, unlike typical infrastructure PPPs in which the motivation is profit, the third sector’s primary motivation is conserving the heritage place. While the organization does need to cover its costs, its actions and decisions are not driven by a motivation for profit. In Britain, building preservation trusts (BPTs) have been in widespread use for decades as vehicles for conserving individual structures, managing publically accessible heritage assets, improving high streets and delivering components of regeneration schemes (Beckett, 2010). There are now numerous trusts specifically devoted to conserving cultural heritage places in many parts of the world. Local conservation organizations and coalitions have a vested interest in an historic building or area and its role in the neighborhood and sometimes catalyze the partnership process by exerting pressure on government to act. In environments where government lacks the capacity to manage such a partnership, the third sector may act in the interest of the public. As project advocates, they can assist in the project’s marketing and public education efforts. Public consultation with the larger community is also a considerable part of the PPP process. Third-sector organizations can facilitate the predevelopment period, providing valuable insight for the public and private partners in identifying the aspects of the building that contribute to neighborhood identity as well as community needs that could present potential alternative uses for the buildings. In the Netherlands, a country with a reputation for engaging in PPPs across a number of areas, Monumentenwatch is an example of a third-sector organization that participates in the day-to-day care and conservation of historic buildings. Started in 1973, it has spawned many similar organizations across Europe (Monumentenwacht 2011). As a subscription-membership-based organization for owners of listed or recognized historic buildings, owners can request an annual condition inspection by a team of experienced conservation practitioners (an architect and a crafts person). In some cases emergency repairs are undertaken. Monumentenwatch is funded by a
combination of different levels of government and owner’s subscription fees. The condition reports are used by the authorities in targeting maintenance grants.

Another type of third-sector organization involved in heritage conservation projects is professional, international or local civil-society entities that are dedicated to conservation as an end goal. These organizations play another important role in places where the regulatory and policy framework for heritage is weak. They essentially establish standards for conservation based on international best practice. The international development banks such as the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank also perform this role in their significant role in urban regeneration efforts in developing countries and the establishment of such standards is often a prerequisite for funding. In the case of the nonprofit sector they often play a role in capacity building through training of in-country professionals as a means of embedding and sustaining conservation standards in the places they work.

Local or nationally based nonprofit organizations that work on heritage-regeneration projects include the Prince’s Regeneration Trust in Britain. This is an example of a third-sector organization specifically dedicated to working with local authorities and the private sector in order to find viable solutions and conserve at-risk, historic places in ways that benefits the wider community. The Trust has acted as a third sector partner in many projects and has produced a number of useful documents that assist in delivering conservation outcomes (The Prince’s Regeneration Trust 2009).

Given the increasing recognition of heritage as a community asset and collective interest in its conservation, there is considerable interest in the role of the third sector in PPPs, an area likely to expand. The third sector’s role is not however, confined to partnerships between the public and private sector. The relationship between the private and third sector is poised to grow as an emerging mechanism for achieving conservation, particularly for urban sites and less monumental heritage places.

5. Types of PPPs

PPPs have been used for heritage conservation at the simplest to the most complex levels. Notional rents of publically-owned heritage buildings by third-sector organizations who manage them as house museums or publically accessible heritage properties, are common in many places. At the other end of the scale, complex urban regeneration projects with conservation at the core involving various levels of government, private and third-sector partners constitute the bulk of the documented case studies on PPPs for heritage conservation.

PPPs have been used to deliver a number of components of typical infrastructure projects including design, construction, service operation, ongoing maintenance and finance and this is also true for PPPs involving conservation. PPP contracts cover different forms and are categorized according to the roles (design, construct, operate, maintain, finance) the partners play in delivering these components. Table 1 illustrates the recognized PPP types and how they relate to typical heritage projects.
### Table 1. PPP Types for Heritage Conservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP type as adapted to conservation*</th>
<th>Description/characteristics of the PPP type</th>
<th>Examples of type applied for conservation projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Buy-Build Operate (BBO) or Buy-Conserve-Operate (BCO) | - Closest to privatization.  
- Private or third sector purchases the heritage asset outright with strict requirements such as easements or maintenance standards.  
- Single transaction or gradual.  
- Ownership may be direct or 3rd party acquisition.  
- Government protects heritage asset to make it subject to legislation and mandates standards of conservation and maintenance. | In the UK and Australia, government sells known heritage buildings encumbered with conservation requirements obligating new owner to meet specific conservation standards upheld via legislation. Neighborhood scale regeneration projects of government properties are typically in this category. An example of a BCO partnership is San Francisco’s Presidio, a National Park that involves a long-term process of privatization through a Special Purpose Vehicle. The Presidio Trust was created by the US Congress to oversee and manage the park and its nearly 800 historic buildings and is mandated to become self-sufficient by 2012 when it will cease receiving federal money. Buildings are owned by the Trust who pays for the parks’ maintenance and preservation largely through revenues generated through commercial and noncommercial leases (The Presidio Trust 2010). Though the Trust is a federal agency, the Trust functions as an independent owner, operator and manager of the historic structures. |
| Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) and Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) or Build/Conserve-Operate-Transfer (B/COT) Build-Lease-Operate-Transfer (BLOT) or Build/Conserve-Lease-Operate-Transfer (B/CLOT) | - Private sector or third-party is responsible for conserving the historic structure, its operation and management through a long-term lease.  
- In regeneration schemes government remains highly involved in the project’s design and development to ensure that the structures’ historic attributes remain available to the public.  
- The long-term lease usually addresses the conservation expectations of the project, clearly specifying who has responsibility for maintaining the building’s cultural significance, and detailing the approval process for any changes and allowance for public inspection of the building.  
- After the terms of the lease have been fulfilled, ownership and all responsibilities are transferred back to the public sector. | There are many examples of governments providing long-term leases, often minimal, to third-sector organizations to look after heritage assets open to the public.  
The UK Vivat Trust is a building preservation trust that typically enters into 25-250 leases with private owners of small, unused buildings on private or local government, larger estates. Vivat conserves the buildings then manages them as short-term holiday rentals through their marketing arm, Vivat Trust Holidays. |

* PPP type column includes name of typical PPP types used in the literature in italics. The plain text is the type adapted to conservation projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO) or Conserve-Build-Finance-Operate (CBFO)</th>
<th>The private sector is responsible for the conservation of historic assets, the construction or addition of new structures and the financing and operation of both. This typology is applicable to large-scale projects that extend beyond a single building or to buildings that require extensive renovations.</th>
<th>At the Quarantine Station the New South Wales government, Australia, entered into a 21-year lease, with options to extend for 15 and 9 years, with Mawland Quarantine Station Pty Ltd, who is experienced in the management of heritage tourism projects. Mawland is responsible for the adaptive reuse and conservation of the Station’s cultural and natural sites and has converted many of the structures for use as a hotel, restaurant, visitor center and museum, successfully retaining public access while finding new revenue-generating uses for the historic buildings (New South Wales Government 2010).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Only</td>
<td>Project funded directly by private sector or uses long-term leases or bonds.</td>
<td>In Italy, one mechanism for funding for both private and government conservation projects is through a special scheme with banking institutions. A bank may choose to finance a conservation project to a listed building, monument or artwork due to the publicity it receives, tax breaks or reduced tax exposure, or statutory requirements. For example the Monte dei Paschi di Siena is required to donate a certain percentage of its profits to philanthropic initiatives which can include such conservation projects. Other arrangements include straightforward funding of conservation projects by organizations such as World Monuments Fund, in which the organization provides not only funding but expertise or other kinds of technical capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational License</td>
<td>Private or third sector operates a service under contract or license at the heritage asset for a fixed term. The heritage asset remains in government ownership.</td>
<td>The operation of the Angkor Wat archeological site by the private Sol Kong Import Export Company for tourism purposes. The private company pays the Cambodian government a fee, operates tourism entry and receives the revenue from entry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the PPP types detailed in Table 1, ownership between the public, private or third sectors generally falls under one of four arrangements: long-term leases (which retain the asset in public ownership), sale with repurchase provisions, sale to the private owner which is then leased back to government and lease-leaseback options. All allow for the eventual reversion of the asset back to the public sector (Rypkema 2005). As with any partnership, shared vision and clarity of roles and responsibilities is critical from the outset.
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Figure 1: The National Trust of N.S.W. leases Old Government House in Parramatta (now a World Heritage Site) from the NSW State Government for $1 (Au) p.a. and is responsible for the care, conservation and operation of the historic house museum. Photo: Jacqueline Goddard

Figure 2: Walsh Bay, Sydney in Australia was converted from a dilapidated wharf area to a thriving mixed-use area of retail, residences and artist spaces. This occurred through the creation of an SPV, Walsh Bay Partnership, composed of public and private officials, who was charged with overseeing financing, conservation and management of the site. Photo: Susan Macdonald
6. Risks and challenges

There are a number of texts by intergovernmental and government bodies that articulate the risks in PPPs. Despite the fact that none of these specifically address PPPs used for heritage conservation, many of the risks identified also apply to conservation projects (United Nations Economic Commission 2008). Projects involving individual buildings are obviously much simpler, as the risks are more easily identified and quantified. There are also specific risks related to conservation PPPs. The private sector is generally looking for four key factors (the 4 Cs) to assist in reducing risks when redeveloping heritage buildings, sites or areas:

1. clarity about what elements are important and need conservation, the standards for conservation and what level of change is appropriate and which areas are able to be redeveloped and how;
2. certainty about the regulatory framework, how it will operate and the time it will take to deal with the authorities;
3. consistency in how regulations will be applied;
4. consultation and open communication between the public, private and third sectors.

These same criteria will also be applicable to encourage PPPs for heritage conservation. Reducing risks in all the above areas provides predictable processes and assists the private sector to secure finances for PPP projects.

Formally approved master plans are a common tool for providing certainty for the private sector and the community on how an area or site will be conserved or regenerated — thereby meeting the first C (clarity). When the public sector commits to specific infrastructure or public property investment to contribute to the implementation of a master plan this serves to attract private investment.

Policy documents that clearly outline conservation standards for adaptive reuse of individual buildings, the insertion of new buildings within the historic urban environment, public domain conservation standards, signage and so on, will all assist in achieving a shared understanding of appropriate conservation and development and meeting number 1 (clarity) and 3 (consistency) of the four Cs listed above.

Regeneration projects where this has been achieved have demonstrated higher returns for sector partners through the enhanced outcomes achieved in relation to the quality of the built environment. At the Prince Henry Hospital site in Sydney (Figure 3) purchasers of the vacant blocks of land were bound by design guidelines developed to respond to the heritage and environmental needs of the site. Rather than seeing these as restrictive and lowering the financial value of the blocks, the purchasers were prepared to pay a premium as the design quality of the surrounding development was guaranteed to start and remain high.

Figure 3: The rehabilitation of Australia’s Prince Henry Hospital was included in the Little Bay master plan, facilitating its redevelopment. Photo ©: Landcom, N.S.W. Government
Despite the premise that risk will be shared, the private sector generally seeks to minimize risk and therefore frequently demands input from the public sector in the form of grants, subsidies or guarantees (United Nations Economic Commission 2008). Critics of PPPs have argued that in many cases the risk for the private sector is quite low and disproportionately held by the public sector and therefore potentially inefficient. Private-sector risk is not necessarily purely financial, but includes risks that complex government regulation will slow down or makes achieving the project difficult. The private sector is usually reliant on lenders to initiate projects and lending bodies look for certainty that their loan will be repaid; reducing the private-sector risk unlocks funds from lenders.

One of the ways the public sector assists in reducing this risk is by providing greater regulatory certainty (numbers 2 and 3 of the Cs listed above). The creation of special purpose vehicle (SPV) corporations helps as the SVP takes on some of the risks. An SVP can also acquire and package lands for redevelopment in ways that are much more difficult for the private sector (Rojas, 1999). In Australia for example, government will sometimes deal with large-scale PPP projects by creating special regulatory frameworks to manage the project, thereby removing or simplifying some of the regulatory processes and further coordinating complex process across different government departments. The redevelopment of Redfern Waterloo area of Sydney, a large-scale urban renewal project, is such an example. Here a new statutory body – The Redfern Waterloo Authority – was created with its own dedicated legislation to facilitate the redevelopment of this publically-owned former industrial land with the authority to make planning decisions under the relevant planning, heritage and housing regulations. The legislation provided for the involvement of the private sector to work in partnership with the Authority and other public bodies. Communities are sometimes skeptical of these approaches as they effectively short-circuit existing planning or heritage approval processes that may include community consultation. The third sector can play a role in securing local participation in these instances.

Stakeholder engagement is essential in securing public support for PPPs involving government-owned, heritage assets and in historic urban areas. The third sector can play a role in securing local participation. Building in mechanisms for community consultation and involvement early in the PPP process will lower the risk of controversy, reduce the risk of delay and benefit the project in the longer-term in many ways. Open communication by government from early in the process is also important and can prevent conflict and public outcry. Stakeholder scans early in the development of PPP proposals can assist in identifying expectations then managing these through the process. Processes that facilitate community engagement need to be designed to meet the needs of the specific community, and to be well articulated with a shared understanding of the roles of the participants and their opportunities for when and how they will be engaged. When dealing with traditional and indigenous communities, cultural sensitivity is vital and partnerships should be designed that are compatible with any cultural needs. All of the above go to meeting the fourth C (consultation) from the above list.

As with any cultural heritage project, the starting point is gaining an agreed understanding of the significance of the place and of its constituent parts and what level of change can be accommodated without compromising significance. Clarity about where new development can occur, how significant buildings and other elements will be conserved, which new uses are appropriate and so on, need to be based on the usual assessment processes.

Within the PPP process securing mechanisms that protect unifying features such as streetscapes, significant views and archaeological sites that contribute to overall heritage significance is a challenge that must also be addressed.

7. Moving forward

The current economic climate and patterns of government investment in heritage conservation in many parts of the world demonstrate a downward trend in direct funding by government. This means that creative ways to leverage private and third-sector involvement is crucial to maintain even current levels of conservation. It is recognized that sustainable conservation outcomes require the engagement of all sectors; therefore partnerships that facilitate participation in all aspects of the conservation process are of increasing importance. PPPs can provide a way to address these issues and formalize shared responsibility for heritage resources across all the sectors that engage, enjoy and use these resources and achieve both financial and cultural goals.

The use of PPPs for infrastructure development and other services has been established for many years and they have proven successful in a number of countries for conservation. There is improved knowledge about their risks, problems and what is needed to make them successful. However, in countries lacking the necessary expertise required for their successful implementation, PPPs may not be the best alternative. As balancing risk and responsibility represents an integral element of the PPP dynamic, it is crucial when applied to heritage places that governments first develop the necessary policy framework and marketplace incentives necessary to attract private investment and ensure adequate public governance to secure appropriate conservation outcomes. It is also important that it is understood that PPPs do not necessarily absolve the public sector completely from financial commitment or provide cheaper solutions to dealing with the costs.
Explicit in the literature on PPPs is the need for sound and transparent governance by a knowledgeable public sector. If PPPs are seen as a panacea to fill the heritage deficit without the necessary governance structure in place, inevitably results will be poor. This will erode confidence in the process, further the skepticism that already exists by some communities that PPPs equate to privatization and compound distrust between the public and private sectors and ultimately limit their use. If these mechanisms are in place, however, PPPs present significant opportunities to facilitate the provision of public goods and services, particularly in developing countries where government financing for public services is often extremely limited and urban public services are in high demand. In these countries, well-supported PPPs offer a vehicle for the private sector to provide much-needed financing, skills and innovation to upgrade culturally significant but degraded urban areas or low-income downtown housing stock that has resulted from historic patterns of city migration. If supported by the combination of an able government and a strong NGO presence, such projects would have the dual effect of buoying emerging market economies and providing much needed public services and goods. A number of multilateral and regional development banks that have recognized the role of heritage conservation in economic and social development and have supported projects specifically including conservation measures. These organizations have also initiated research and developed their own guidance on financial mechanisms including PPPs for heritage.

Measuring the success of PPPs involving conservation is therefore important and needs to encapsulate the different measures that each sector will hold important. For third sector organizations where conservation is the goal, projects whose outcomes financially safeguard the building to identified conservation standards are considered a success. For urban regeneration projects, other social indicators related to quality of life and other social issues identified at the project’s outset will be deemed important indicators. For the private sector, profit, is usually an indicator and any “triple-bottom line” indicators included as motivators for their initial involvement. Public sector metrics will include a wider range of indicators encompassing economic, social, environmental and cultural values. Reducing the commitment by the public sector to deliver the service and a decrease in public costs, whilst maintaining government mandated conservation standards will also be indicators of success for the public sector. Simple indicators such as the number of historic buildings conserved, appropriately reused and meeting defined maintenance standards, can provide indicators for meeting conservation goals. Rising property values is a typical measure of economic success, but in instances where this increase drives out traditional residents or renders uses that contribute to heritage significance unviable, they can be an indicator of failure in conservation terms. Identifying goals and indicators for success at the outset of the project is therefore important and can also assist in clarifying objectives and roles and responsibilities of the partners.

To fully realize the potential of PPPs to achieve conservation outcomes in a way that takes account of current knowledge and experience from other areas, it is important for governments to invest in developing the governance structure for heritage such as legislation, policy and financial incentives to provide the suitable environment to encourage the private sector to participate in a way that meets community expectations for appropriate conservation that sustains the heritage places they cherish.
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**Abstract.** Similar to bids for the Olympic Games or the Football World Cup, it is extremely difficult to establish the long-term financial advantages and disadvantages of listed buildings. But the findings of long-term economic studies are surprisingly positive. A whole series of real-estate studies conducted and published over the last ten to twenty years in Germany revealed positive developments. This was true in the case of listed buildings ensembles in major cities such as Hamburg or Berlin, as well as listed properties in small and medium-sized towns or in rural areas. The positive standing of these cities also has an impact on the areas surrounding listed buildings and neighbouring properties.

1. Economic benefits of the cultural heritage
   Listed addresses have a very singular appeal. Unlike the mass-produced goods on the property market, they have a very distinct character, are tailor-made for life’s individualist and offer incomparable solutions in terms of space. They are part of our historical and cultural heritage, and possess a history which newer buildings will only acquire over generations. Nowadays, listed properties are no longer simply regarded as cultural assets. Historical, especially listed buildings, are increasingly seen as solid economic goods. In the next few decades, more than 75% of all building projects will be carried out on existing housing stock, automatically including listed stocks.

2. Economic incentives for private owners of the built heritage
   In Germany there are mainly two instruments of financial aids and economic incentives for private owners or developers of listed buildings, that have to be mentioned: The amount of public aids for preservation and restoration of monuments has been generally and rapidly decreasing since 2000. An growing number of Foundations only partly compensates the obvious decline of public funding. German tax legislation rewards private engagement in monument preservation in the form of reduced taxation. Financial support in form of tax relief for private investments in listed buildings has been introduced not solely for conservation, but also for economic and urban reasons. Tax benefits have become the most important economic management tool and financial incentive for heritage conservation and renewal.

The European Heritage Days, originally launched in 1991 by the Council of Europe, have met with a steadily growing response from organisers and visitors over the last twenty years. Media interest in, and the number of visitors to, the annual *Journées portes ouvertes monuments historiques* – *European Heritage Days* have long exceded that triggered by the annual 18th April International Day for Monuments and Sites initiated by ICOMOS and supported by UNESCO. The record numbers of visitors to monuments in September every year are an indicator of the general public’s continuing, enthusiastic support of cultural heritage.

It should be considered, though, that monuments and heritage – besides bearing cultural significance and being cultural treasures – are important assets and, as such, major locational factors for the economy. Heritage and architecture represent a significant intersection with the cultural and creative industries, the support of which is an important objective at European, national, and regional levels. Five assumptions concerning the economic aspects of heritage reflect this:

- Heritage promotion is economic development
- Heritage conservation and restoration is city and location marketing
- The architectural heritage is a stimulus to the tourist industry
- Investment in the architectural heritage creates and safeguards jobs
- Heritage preservation contributes to sustainable economic development
1. Protecting the built heritage – supporting the economy

“The upkeep and preservation of our architectural cultural heritage are crucial economic factors.” Relevante economic surveys in the last few years have consistently shown that state funding to support Germany’s architectural heritage has a large economic multiplier effect. Every public subsidy made by the German government to private landlords and developers led on average to an investment four to twelve times as great. Every Euro from support funding resulted in four or more Euros of additionally investment, the public investment functioning merely as an initiator. The Rhineland-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research in Essen, for example, concluded that one Euro of support for the promotion of urban renewal resulted in 6.30 Euros of private investment.

A similar effect can be observed where tax relieves targeted on built heritage encourage investment. For example, it has been shown that in North-Rhine-Westphalia a one Euro tax reduction released nine Euros of private investment. In the State of Hesse the state office issued tax certificates – i.e. acknowledged tax income – to the value of between 150 and 200 million Euros every year for reasons involving built heritage, compared with tax revenue losses of approximately 30 million Euros. The German Centre for Crafts and Heritage Preservation in Fulda found that “the loss of tax revenue is, though, far less than the added revenue arising from investment in other areas (such as personal income taxes, business taxes, VAT, and so on)”

Long-term studies elsewhere in Europe – in Luxembourg, for example – where government support for the built heritage has also been evaluated, have shown similar results. Public support or subsidy for the built heritage does not just motivate private investment in maintenance and modernisation, but also serves to demonstrate how all parties involved can benefit: the thrifty landlord or developer as much as the industrious tradesman, who conscientiously pays his taxes and levies to the benefit of the tax office, the social security and health insurance systems, and the employment office. Even a low level of government support results in government monitoring, thereby contributing to the reduction of illegal work.

It is obvious that government heritage support, with its grants and tax relieves, has an impact on employment. Its direct and indirect effects contribute to keeping existing jobs and creating new ones. Extrapolations on the basis of an average income for a skilled tradesman in Germany being in the region of 50,000 Euros a year show that some 100,000 jobs in the heritage restoration and maintenance industry are created and secured by government support programs every year. These calculations just consider the labour-market effect of heritage-specific support programmes, nothing to say of the huge urban renewal and refurbishment labour market.

A few years ago the Leibniz-Institut für Regionalentwicklung und Strukturplanung (IRS) presented an evaluation of the German Federal and 16 State Construction and Building Ministries’ urban heritage promotion programme (Städtebaulicher Denkmalschutz), for the first time making available material that had been collected over a longer period for a scientific analysis of the effects of public urban renewal programmes. The empirical survey of the economic impacts and medium-term structural consequences of urban heritage activity showed that it is leading to positive economic results as well as making significant contributions to social stability.

2. Listed buildings as a soft location factor

The stock of built and garden heritage and old buildings is an important goodwill value when businesses are making decisions on location, whether against international competition or domestically, between cities. Saving and finding new uses for desirable heritage addresses is particularly important in raising the quality of life of a locality and in city marketing. The qualities of the built and green heritage are characteristic of a region’s image, and are one of the soft location factors that also play a role for businesses moving into an area. Regional studies by chambers of trade and commerce show that it is particularly among businesses with highly-qualified staff and future-oriented industries that decisions on location involve image quality in addition to conventional criteria (availability of labour, transport links, local taxes, etc.). To put it simply, it is not so much that culture today follows the economy, but that intelligent business focuses on the city as an attractive area and its built heritage as an element of housing supply and leisure activities.

In general, special properties from the built, artistic, or horticultural heritage, or national sites are not off-the-peg architecture, but unique originals that are also an ex-clusive business address. That the National Association of Independent Property and Housing Businesses (Bundesverband Freier Immobilien- und Wohnungsunternehmen e.V.) has established a built heritage work group, or that the same association has commissioned and published a study ‘Subsidies for Protected Buildings or Economic Development’ – are just the latest examples of the ongoing reassessment that is taking place within the German real estate industry.

The 1996 study of commercially-used listed buildings in Hamburg produced by the internationally respected real estate services company Jones Lang Wootton (now: Jones...
Lang & Lassalle) in cooperation with heritage conservation experts shows that it is listed properties that are sought-after, particularly for commercial purposes, and have proved to be profitable investments. The results of a poll conducted among businesses in Hamburg showed that:

- listed buildings are characterised by above-average infrastructure and transport connections and/or central location,
- the standard to which listed buildings are equipped is generally assessed as being good,
- the architecture, image and/or corporate identity of listed buildings is rated as having been an important criterion in making the decision to move in,
- more than half of those polled found that the workplace atmosphere improved after their business had moved to a listed building (87% of those polled stated that staff felt comfortable in listed buildings),
- nearly 73% of the businesses polled registered a positive response to the listed property among their customers.

The Berlin State Monument Office (LDA Berlin) and the Berlin Chamber of Industry and Commerce (IHK Berlin), in what could be called a joint operation with potential developers, investors, and real-estate brokers, architects, and urban planners, conducted a series of meetings and presentations in 1998/99 on the continued use of listed commercial properties which pointed out the great potentials of unoccupied industrial and technical heritage properties. The events were also able to highlight many examples that had already been realised and demonstrated that investment in listed commercial buildings could be profitable.

The 2002 survey *Built Heritage as Property. A Study of Built Heritage in Berlin (Das Denkmal als Immobilie. Denkmalstudie Berlin)* attempted to show the wide range of investments that has been made in commercial built heritage properties in Berlin from the both the conservation and the property management points of view. The study was produced by the Berlin State Monument Office, with support from the Senate Department for Economics, the Berlin Chamber of Industry and Commerce, and the Economy Promotion Agency Berlin (Wirtschaftsförderung Berlin GmbH), together with the international real estate services company Jones Lang LaSalle and Nicola Halder-Hass, and was funded by the European Union.

The study confirmed trends that were both expected and unexpected: although Berlin was reckoned to be a difficult property market where, compared with other large cities in Germany such as Hamburg, Munich, Frankfurt, or Düsseldorf, the property market was said to be undynamic, investments in listed industrial and commercial properties were profitable. They were shown to result in significant property value increases, to produce higher, or above-average rental incomes when compared with newly built properties in the same or comparable areas, and to have longer than average tenancies. Listed properties also have a better image and are particularly favoured by businesses providing high added-value services (including businesses in the advertising, media, communications, and software industries). Another unexpected result was that historic listed buildings are felt to be more flexible and more adaptable to changing user requirements or such fundamental changes of use as may be necessary so that they can be used by manufacturing businesses, or for service, office, or housing purposes, for example.

In the meantime, even the big landlords among the owners of Berlin’s built heritage now realise that the cultural value of industrial and technological heritage is a valuable non-material incentive for potential purchasers and tenants of the properties in which they have invested. Some years ago the Berlin State Monument Office (LDA Berlin) and Siemens/Siemens Real Estate, a global company, had already developed a three-tier conservation plan for the built heritage of some 50 of the company’s historical production sites and housing estates as a conceptual framework defining the corporate conservation and development potentials. During the past ten years there has been a similar cooperation with Vattenfall Europe (former BEWAG), the Berlin power company, involving buildings no longer required for power generation (power stations) and the power system (transformer substations) which have shown themselves to be attractive niche properties, and have ushered in a renaissance of the city’s heritage as Electropolis Berlin.

The development of a “heritage stock exchange” similar to the biannual built heritage fair which can now be accessed through the Internet and is held as part of the Leipzig Trade Fair for the sale of properties, or the inclusion of the addresses of listed buildings for sale which are now shown on historical buildings authorities’ websites, or the systematic preparation of listed special properties by trustees such as the Liegenschaftsfonds Berlin, which offers interested parties the built heritage-related tax benefits that accompany a unique property all demonstrate the eco-nomic dimensions of our heritage, quite apart from the significance of individual sites or buildings.

### 3. Conservation and tourism

Figures compiled by the European Tourism Institute at Trier University show that city and cultural tourism have grown rapidly in recent years. Even countries like Austria that are typical tourist destinations show a continuing upward
trend in the number of visitors and overnight stays in the city and cultural tourism segment. Indeed, with Berlin and Munich, Germany has (like Spain, with Madrid and Barcelona) two of Europe’s ten most-visited cities. Last year Berlin recorded, for the first time, more overnight stays than Rome, and in Europe only London and Paris had more visitors. Having three world cultural heritage sites in a relatively small area, the city offers an unusually rich choice of world-famous and very diverse sights.\\n
Above all, the popularity of city neighbourhoods with their own traditions, and ensembles of listed buildings is increasing, even in comparison with artificial and newly created leisure and shopping worlds. In 1989 approximately ten million Germans chose cities as destinations. The percentage of tourists who describe their main holiday as being a study trip, an excursion, or a cultural tour is steadily increasing. The European Commission assumes that the number of heritage visitors (museums and listed monuments) all over Europe has more than doubled in the last twenty years. A study by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and the forecasts of the World Tourism Organisation see the expansion of cultural tourism as being an important growth market.

As long ago as 1999 a symposium in Berlin on The Function and Importance of the Horticultural Heritage as an Identification and Economic Factor in central and eastern Europe’s major cities had already confirmed the increasing popularity – even in our chilly latitudes – of garden and landscape tourism, and it underlined the fact that in addition to recreational aspects (day trips and weekend trips), there were economic potentials for long-range tourism. Newly established garden routes like Gartenträume Sachsen-Anhalt, which combines about forty of the most beautiful and important sites into a single excursion of a touristic horticultural heritage network, or the cross-border route Straße der Gartenkunst zwischen Rhein und Maas which links nearly fifty notable public and private parks in Germany and the Netherlands, are examples of garden tourism’s economic growth potentials.

Germany’s tourist successes abroad are predominantly based on its old city centres and its historic sites as a whole. Almost one-third of all foreign travellers in Germany make classical city tours. Empirical analyses of cultural tourism confirm that while spectacular events featuring current contemporary architecture usually lose their attractiveness before long, this is not the case with tourist attractions that have grown over time such as historical buildings, parks, and ensembles of monuments. In Berlin and in many other of Europe’s great cities the tourist industry is among the most important branches of a city’s economy. Every tenth European lives from tourism, and globally tourism is held to be one of the three industries that will provide an economic stimulus during the next ten years. All studies predict that cultural tourism will occupy a steady and growing area in the European market.

The European Tourism Institute of Trier University has published a study on the opportunities and risks of marketing the cultural heritage for tourism which identified the following economic advantages for the target regions concerned:

- cultural tourism, being a labour-intensive sector, offers tour guides employment,
- cultural tourists, because of their above-average purchasing power, contribute to the creation of value in a region,
- cultural tourism requires little investment in new buildings, exploiting instead the cultural potential of the existing historical stock,
- cultural tourism makes a positive contribution to the development of a region’s image.

It is not only the internationally well-known sites and those with a rich of heritage that are sought out and visited but also, and expressly, the urbanity and products of modern metropolitan culture; specialist tourists are attracted by the great monuments of modernism and industrial architecture. Indeed, it could be said that for travellers fascinated by contemporary history, Berlin is what the ancient Athens or Rome are for art tourists. The surviving remnants of the Berlin Wall, the authentic sites and testimonials to persecution and resistance during the German dictatorships of the twentieth century, even propaganda buildings, such as the Nazi Olympic Ground (Reichssportfeld) and or the Karl-Marx-Allee (former Stalin Alley) are popular, although they have not been completely opened up and made accessible, and demand a quantum of an explorer’s spirit, or indeed effort, from interested visitors. Shared inheritances - including the post war heritage of socialist realistic architecture and urbanism - that have, with the passing of time, become politically embarrassing, play a role in forming our historical and aesthetic education, and can be activated as a resource accessible to tourism,

4. Built heritage conservation and regional craft trades

In October 2011 the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology presented the current study on culture and creative industry and craftsmanship emphasising the important economic role of craftsmen and restaurers. According to the German Con-federation of Skilled Craftsmen (Zentralverband des Deutschen Handwerks), Ger-many spends more than five billion Euros every year on the conservation of its built heritage and refurbishment of its old buildings. It is difficult to overestimate the effects of these investments on the economy and employment.
Built heritage conservation is an important source of orders for many craft trade businesses. More than 60% of the master craftsmen who have been trained as restorers (Restaurator im Handwerk) have worked on heritage conservation contracts on the basis of this supplementary qualification.\(^{29}\) Probably more than 90% of restorers in a narrower sense who are members of professional associations, or who have received special qualifications from a university of applied sciences, are employed almost exclusively on contracts in the built or cultural heritage conservation sector.

Empirical studies show that orders involving heritage conservation are particularly labour-intensive. The relevant reports assume that between 70% and 80% of restoration work costs are labour costs, while on average material costs make up no more than 30% of the total. In comparison, the German building industry reckons with 50% labour costs and 50% material costs for general building work, and in the case of new buildings, an even higher percentage for materials. The results of an international pilot study published by the European Association of Craft, Small, and Medium Enterprises (UEAPME) with the support of the European Commission confirm that the effect of the refurbishment of old buildings and heritage conservation work on employment can be taken as being at least twice as great (employment multiplier: 2.5) as for new building activity. This employment multiplier must be increased by at least 50% per workplace, because, on average, for every five permanent jobs in the building sector there are three other indirect ones. To this extent heritage conservation helps the craft trades and small and medium-sized building firms, and makes a noticeable contribution to easing the unemployment situation.\(^{30}\)

During times of economic difficulties and cyclical unemployment the economic ef-fects of built heritage conservation are particularly important, as they allow the great-est effect on employment to be achieved with the least investment in resources. Work in the heritage conservation sector is relatively independent of cyclical varia-tions, and it thus contributes towards stabilising the building industry and its employ-ment potentials.\(^{31}\)

Whoever thinks in terms of the national economy and labour market policy will also invest in the built heritage, particularly during periods of crisis. All the more so, because investments in the built heritage largely benefit the country’s building industry and the regional labour market. Approximately 90% of the invoices the payment of which was co-funded by the Berlin State Monument Office were from craft trade firms, building firms, self-employed architects, engineers or restorers from Berlin and the surrounding areas of Brandenburg. Thus, public spending for the built heritage promotes not only the cultural treasures of the Berlin-Brandenburg metropolitan region, but to a large extent also the region’s economy and workforce.\(^{22}\)

Paying increased attention to growth strategies for the local and regional economy will make this market more independent from the turbulent and unstable developments taking place in the globalised economy. An empirical survey of sub-economies\(^{33}\) in the Hamburg big city/port city region – an economic region that has been traditionally oriented towards exports and the global market – showed that, for example, neighbourhood and urban area businesses which are one of the city’s few growth sectors, and which provide almost one-sixth of all jobs, are an urban policy blind spot. Summing up, the study recommended the abandonment of economic and funding strategies that benefit global businesses and their short-term location decisions, in favour of a targeted strengthening of the more flexible regional business environment. In this spirit, support and employment measures benefitting built heritage conservation should also be seen as contributing to neighbourhood management and as being a motor for regional development.

Whoever intends to mobilise built heritage conservation as a motor for regional de-velopment – and keep this motor running – must pay particular attention to the pro-fessional and further training in the context of built heritage science and craftsman-ship. Craftsmen’s specialist knowledge is required for the use of tried and tested materials, and the application of local and regional building techniques in renovation that are appropriate to the built heritage.\(^{34}\) The sensitive refurbishment of historic building following local traditions gives local craftsmen and small or medium-sized firms an important location advantage when competing with supraregional suppliers in a globalised world.\(^{35}\) The built heritage conservation job is not a mobile one, and is one of the last that cannot be moved abroad.

5. Conservation of built heritage and sustainability

The global debate on sustainable city and regional planning sees built heritage in its essence not as an economic or developmental stumbling block, but as a cultural value and an important material and/or energy resource. Even today, an overall bal-ance that compares the production, use, maintenance, demolition and disposal of old buildings

---

\(^{29}\) European Commission’s cultural statistics show that the same applies elsewhere in Europe. The main contractors are the craft trades that carry out more than 90% of built and horticultural heritage renovation work. The craft trade organisations accordingly refer to a “specialist heritage conservation market”.

\(^{30}\) Built heritage as a positive location factor – economic potentials of listed properties

\(^{31}\) Heritages, Driver of Development
with conservation management, continued use and site recycling of built-up areas, seldom favours the permanent replacement of buildings. It is a fact that nearly 60% of the waste generated in Germany is building waste. For every tonne of building refuse there are approximately seven tonnes of new building material, the disposal of which, in the next demolition and rebuilding cycle, is already pre-programmed. From the standpoint of environmentally friendly building a shift towards the repair of old buildings and maintenance of the built and horticultural heritage inventory is overdue. Indeed, ecological criteria would see built heritage conservation as being a “minimal intervention procedure” and having a vanguard function in demonstrating a type of development that is sustainable and sparing of resources. It is particularly in conurbations that economic management and building methods designed to reduce waste and protect landscape, air, and water resources are essential. The continued and changed use of the built heritage and old buildings always involves a reduction in building material consumption. It contributes to the sparing use of non-renewable cultural and historical resources, protects non-renewable resources of raw materials against over-exploitation, and avoids future building waste. At the same time many heritage building materials (wood, loam, etc.) are recognised as being ecological insofar as they are “renewable” materials and can be recycled. The appropriate built heritage renovation materials and crafts generally use local or regional building materials, and thus contribute to reducing global material tourism.

Acting according to the principles of sustainable inventory maintenance should open up the route to giving the renovation of old buildings and built heritage priority over new building projects. Bearing in mind the fact that there are more than one hundred and fifty disused and imperilled listed churches in a country as prosperous as Germany, in view of the fact that there are several hundred thousand square metres of publicly- and privately-owned listed buildings in Berlin alone, and considering the frequently demonstrated high multiplier and labour market effect of old building and built heritage modernisation, a programme aiming at the use of built heritage would be advantageous for conservation and employment policy reasons. That is why a self-commitment of public developers and the dispensers of government support (grant providers) that gives priority to a revitalisation of the inventory would be wise, not just under ecological, but also under economic aspects.

**Summing up**

Built and horticultural heritage conservation is not a business restricted to balmy periods in the economic cycle, but a permanent task, even during crises. Heritage conservation is an essential cultural factor; it is also an economic factor. Heritage conservation is what is known as a soft location advantage for the establishment of businesses; it also has important potentials for the tourism industry. Heritage contracts benefit small and medium-sized businesses, and above all, the building trades. Built and horticultural heritage conservation avoids poor investments, and encourages thinking in terms of a thriftiness that turns away from the throwaway society towards an ecologically sustainable make and mend society.
1. Listed property „Haus der Schweiz“ Unter den Linden has become a good heritage address in top city location in Berlin after a careful renewal in the 1990s. Photograph: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Wolfgang Bittner

2. Berlin’s Osthafen (eastern harbour) and the so-called „Oberbaum City“ (former OSRAM light bulb factory) at the Spree river became one of the first transformation projects after the Fall of the Berlin Wall; serves today as media and fashion centre – and received the MIPIM Special Jury Award 1997 (MIPIM = Marché International des Professionnels de l’Immobilier, Cannes). Photograph: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Wolfgang Bittner
3. A) Statistics of heritage linked tax reductions in Berlin
Source: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin

B) Manual for private owners of listed properties: promotion by heritage linked tax reliefs, front cover 2012
Reproduction: Deutsches Nationalkomitee für Denkmalschutz

C) Creative and culture industry Berlin – construction sector and heritage preservation (green) represent about 15% up to 25% of that important branch of economy
Diagram: Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Arbeit und Frauen Berlin
4. Kulturbrauerei – Culture Brewery*: the former site of the Schultheiß-Brauerei Prenzlauer Berg developed into a popular private centre of culture, leisure and gastronomy within the last two decades.
Photograph: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Wolfgang Bittner

5. Siemensstadt - Protection concept of listed industrial plants – front cover of the documentation, published in 1994
Reproduction: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Archive

Reproduction: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Archive
7. Berlin Modernisms – the abandoned transformer station „E-Werk Buchhändlerhof“ temporarily became an insider tip as event location after 1990 – in the last decade the electrical supply stations was revitalised as business, residential and artistic space and has been awarded of the Berlin Heritage Conservation Medal (Ferdinand von Quast Medaille, 2003) and the German Memorial Prize (DNK-Denkmalschutzpreis, 2005)

Photograph: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Wolfgang Bittner
8. Representatives of ITB Berlin and BTM (Berlin’s International Travel Trade Fair and Berlin Tourismus Marketing) believe in the “Travel & Tourism Sector” as key driver for investment and economic growth, even larger than the automotive industry at 8% GDP.
Photograph: ITB 2011 - Copyright © 2012 Messe Berlin GmbH

9. World Heritage Site Museumsinsel Berlin: an international visitor magnet and a varied long term construction site (here in 2005)
Aerial View: Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt Berlin
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0. “Checkpoint Charlie” in Berlin – even monuments and sites of the contemporary history, such as the heritage of the Cold War and the Iron Curtain have become a well visited place in the city
Photograph: © Berlin Partner/FTB-Werbefotografie

11. Restoration of the so-called “Schinkel-Veranda” in Berlin-Pankow – received the German federal award arts and crafts in heritage conservation 2011 (“Bundespreis Handwerk in der Denkmalpflege” 2010)
Photograph: Landesdenkmalamt Berlin / Wolfgang Bittner
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INTEGRATING THE CONSERVATION OF THE BUILT HERITAGE URBAN* SITE INTO THE LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (LED) POLICY & MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

Outline for an Interface Program
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Abstract. This paper outlines a possible framework for integrating the conservation of the built heritage urban site into the local sustainable economic management and development policy, which constitutes an integral part of the conservation program, where the local authority and community constitute strategic partners throughout the entire process. This interface program is based on urban-strategic planning and local economic development processes and includes: analyzing the conservation factors in the local context, identifying the various stakeholders and interests, predicting possible conflicts, building consensus between the community, organizations and local government, performing economic analysis of the conservation and studying the legal tools needed to manage and maintain the conservation process, both in the short and long-term timeframes.

The primary objective of conservation is to establish a high-quality experiential place that provides a physical manifestation of the “Genius loci” and local identity, through an approach offering – in addition to the actual conservation – long-term economic benefits to all interested parties. In other words, site conservation should generate such benefits as local economic development, employment and revenue-generating opportunities and public and social services to the urban and regional communities and beyond. This explains the emphasis, placed in recent years on the architectural-cultural approach and on the status of the local community, and the various population groups it includes, in the conservation process. This recognition has dictated an attitude and course of action based on an urban strategic planning approach, which physically contains the urban fabric and its various sites, as opposed to the narrow approach that focuses on the conservation of individual buildings or sites. This on-going course of action incorporates the political and professional leadership of the settlement and the local community as strategic partners in all stages of the conservation process and in the management and monitoring mechanisms, as opposed to the narrow approach that regards them merely as providers of services or as beneficiaries of the products of the tourism-economic activity.

In the core of LED (Local Economic Development) lies the notion of encouraging the public, private and civic society sectors to establish partnerships and cooperatively find local solutions to common economic challenges. Any attempt to accomplish these goals produces a complex work process that addresses planning, social and economic issues, and consequently should include long-term interdisciplinary activity of various professionals with regard to the following aspects (Shamir-Shinan, Shchory 2011):

- The strategic aspect of integrating into the urban fabric, whose implication is the long-term contribution of the conservation process to the development of the local settlement, community and economy.
- The architectural, design and scientific aspect which physically means fitting into the residential space and the public areas and about preparing the infrastructure and utility systems required in order to access the site, while adhering to the accepted standards and work processes of the prevailing conservation practice.
- The administrative aspect, which means maintenance, day-to-day operation and long-term monitoring of the site for the purpose of ensuring adequate and sustainable conservation through a cooperative effort of all parties.

This gives rise to the commitment to an action plan for managing conservation sites where the local authority and community assume a part of the over-all responsibility, along with the other conservation authorities in charge of the site. This approach has had a declarative manifestation in the international conservation charters* that began to evolve following World War I.

In view of the massive damage inflicted on the Parthenon at the Acropolis in Athens as a result of the detonation of ammunition stored there, the nations of the world convened in Athens in 1931 to discuss the importance of

* "Urban" relates to all settlement types, urban and rural.
international responsibility for monuments, techniques and materials for conservation and the need for international cooperation. The conclusive document of this conference, known as the General Conclusions of the Athens Conference (1931), provided the foundation and guidelines for subsequent international conferences and conservation charters. Those conservation charters evolved gradually through broad international consensus, and embody the principles of conservation and accepted courses of action for intervention at sites of historic and cultural value.

The Venice Charter (1964) stressed the importance of historic values and the environmental context of the monument, provided intervention methods for historic sites and stressed the importance of properly recording the intervention activities.

The Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (1990), prepared by the International Committee for the Management of Archaeological Heritage (ICAHM) and approved by the 9th General Assembly in Lausanne in 1990, set the guidelines for heritage management at the regional and national levels. Managing the archaeological heritage is a complex undertaking, requiring efficient cooperation between professionals from numerous disciplines such as research, conservation, development, maintenance, presentation, education, et al.

The Nara Document on Authenticity (1994) elaborated on the subject of authenticity that depends on the local tangible and intangible culture and on the importance of the "Genius loci". In fact, this document addressed the status of the local community in the conservation processes for the first time.

The Burra Charter (1999) presents a concept for identifying heritage and landscape values and for expressing these values through the conservation activities, and points to the fact that the conservation process does not stop on the day when the physical conservation activities have been completed or when the site has been opened to visitors. On the contrary: according to this charter, the process continues indefinitely through the day-to-day management of the site.

For this purpose, the Charter proposes a conservation process that follows a predetermined working pattern that includes the following stages: identification of the place and the tangible and intangible associations, recording all relevant information, assessing the cultural significance and preparing a statement regarding that significance, identifying the obligations arising from the stated significance and studying other factors that may have an impact on the future of the place, including such future factors as resources, stakeholders’ needs, possible restrictions and adequate physical conditions.

The Charter also addresses the development of the conservation policy and reviewing the possible impact this policy may have on the cultural significance and on the management, supervision and assessment strategy. Additionally, the Charter stresses the importance of maintaining the place as a mandatory, on-going activity, of assuming responsibility for management and decision making, specifying the organizations or individuals in charge, including the local authority and community, along with the actual responsibilities, guidance, supervision and professional implementation mechanisms, all while assigning a high degree of importance to proper recording of the decision-making processes.

An in-depth review of international conservation charters over the years suggests a trend of growing recognition of the need to combine the three aspects (the architectural-design aspect, the urban-community aspect and the economic-management aspect) and to include them in the theoretical and professional agenda of conservation.

In Israel, as the approach followed thus far addressed each aspect separately, the conservation authorities have not yet consolidated a theoretical and practical guidance model that prescribes the implementation of a combined approach on the basis of strategic partnerships and mechanisms and on-going cooperation. Moreover, it has even been found that in many places where conservation was carried out according to the pin-point, narrow method, with no holistic approach and particularly with no involvement on the part of the local authority and community, the conservation effort encountered severe problems, delays in the implementation of the conservation process or poor maintenance later on (according to the State Comptroller’s Report, 2005).

In preparation for the year 2012 that marks the 40th anniversary of the Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage (1972), we emphasize the need for reviewing the role of the local community in the process of being nominated for recognition, the ongoing management of the place and the development of public awareness among decision makers at the local level. It is a process that stresses the involvement of the local authority and community and advances the conservation process according to the "bottom-up" approach, which is essentially different from the common trend that begins at the state level and implemented in a "top-down" fashion.

As stated, contrary to the cooperative approach, most Israeli conservation sites are located within the municipal
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As a result of the State Comptroller’s report and the growing awareness of conservation in recent years, the conservation site development and management issue has become an item on the agenda of the local authorities, without in any way underrating the role played by state organizations and external interested parties that are also responsible for conservation in certain localities according to law. At the same time, on the ground, the local authorities find it difficult to cope with the actual implementation of the conservation process, the management of the conservation sites, and local economic development. The situation is particularly severe at local authorities located in peripheral areas, which find it difficult to advance local development and municipal economy to begin with.

Accordingly, this paper proposes an outline for an interface program—a management action plan—which constitutes an integral part of the conservation program, where the local authority and community constitute strategic partners throughout the entire process. The interface program is based on urban-strategic planning and local economic development processes. The joint work and action processes are carried out while assuming the overall local responsibility for the process, through joint management with elements external to the local authority that are also responsible for conservation.

The outline for the action plan is based on strategic management processes for local economic development (Klausner & Shamir-Shinan [1987]; Shchory [2002]; United Nations Human Settlements Programme [2005]; Israel Ministry of the Interior [2008]) and includes five fundamental issues, as presented briefly below:

- Identifying the existing situation: identification of the “Genius loci” as conceived by the local community, followed by identification of sites for conservation in the area, their present state, their importance in the local and regional context and the threats and dangers they face. The identification process includes such other local knowledge (Shamir-Shinan, L. 2006) issues as identifying trends, the planning policy and statutory programs from the physical aspect, as well as programs and anchors that promote economic and social development. Subsequently, the identification process includes identification and specification of the various stakeholders, including the local community, coordination of activities with the stakeholders, including identification of interests, agreements and possible conflicts and development of a priority system for the various sites within the settlement.

- Specifying the accepted goals, objectives and projects: a mandatory prerequisite for success is specifying objectives that are agreed upon by and acceptable to all interested parties, while improving the interrelations between them. These interested parties include the local authority and community, interested parties within the government and the business sector and interested parties that have a statutory function with regard to the conservation of sites. This pertains to the long-term structuring of the conservation processes, including agreements regarding the shared interests identified and dealing with points of conflict, planning of the conservation implementation process, physical and economic development of the sites, development of social and community projects and the integration thereof in the urban fabric. In the long run, an accepted mechanism should be specified for managing conflicts, promoting agreements and updating the program as part of the process of dealing with the tension between development and conservation and dividing the authority and responsibility among all of the parties involved.

- Preparing work plans, budget-linked to the local authorities, for long-term development and maintenance: development of the tools (including municipal legislation) and mechanisms required for management and community participation. The plans should be made on the basis of an analysis of the economic cost of applying and implementing the plans and projects for conserving and operating the site, and mainly for long-term maintenance, and on the basis of agreement regarding priorities and financing sources, including budget matching and pooling of resources with other organizations.

- Assessment, monitoring and control: preparing a long-term monitoring and control plan for the site, allocating a budget for the plan and obtaining commitment for product assimilation junction points. The monitoring of the sites must be done in cooperation with the local community, which is to serve as the “eyes on the ground” and enable continuous, instant supervision of the site and its state.
● **Management mechanisms**: specifying the managing body and the elements participating in it, including a clear distinction between the policy-making echelon and the executive echelon. Developing action procedures and a mechanism for long-term updating and managing conflicts. **This mechanism should ensure the local partnership and the built-in connections between all of the elements involved in the decision-making process and in the implementation of those decisions, as well as the actual implementation of the comprehensive action plan for the long-term conservation, development and maintenance of the site.**

### Conclusion

The management action plan based on strategic management for local economic development is a powerful tool for practical work, enabling effective coping with local problems of simultaneous conservation and local economic development. Outlining a plan along these lines proposes, as part of the urban planning and development process, that the local authority assume responsibility for processes taking place within its jurisdiction through a methodical process of making consensual, joint decisions, focusing on the long-term process of conservation, maintenance, monitoring and conservation management and on solving the problems through a cooperative alliance of all of the elements involved, including, primarily, a continuous, long-term participation of the local community in all stages of the conservation process, with the community serving as a strategic partner rather than a mere provider of services, as part of intensifying the economic and/or tourism activity. In this way, a practical implementation process takes place which enables the making of creative decisions and the allocation of resources even when such resources (e.g. time, funds, manpower, etc.) are in short supply, including such precious resources as supervision and monitoring by the community and a method for creating competitive advantages that contribute to the local economic development while improving the efficiency of the conservation process.

Leading organizations in the field of conserving heritage sites in Israel have come to recognize the urgent need for expanding the pin-point, individualized conservation site management approach and for adopting a strategic management approach that would ensure sustainable conservation. Several feasibility studies are currently under way to determine the applicability of the system approach proposed herein at several sites that differ in their characteristics in terms of site location, the local community, the local authority, heritage importance, etc. At the same time, the Society for Preservation of Israel Heritage Sites initiated the preparation (currently under way) of a manual listing the stages of the proposed work plan, for the various professionals involved.
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INTRODUCTION
Il est de plus en plus évident le rôle du patrimoine matériel et immatériel dans le développement d’une communauté. Néanmoins, dans le domaine de l’Économie de la Conservation, la plupart des études et des applications correspondent aux pays industrialisés. À l’exception des cas particuliers, le patrimoine comme moteur du développement soutenable n’a pas été étudié systématiquement dans la majorité des pays en voie de développement ou dans les pays émergents.

Dans le cadre décrit, cette communication vise à discuter le rôle de l’Économie de la Conservation dans un pays émergent comme Argentine. Dans un contexte de croissance économique, les efforts en matière de conservation sont cependant isolés, manquent d’une dimension territoriale et se caractérisent par une faible coordination entre les acteurs sociaux. La croissance accélérée de l’économie se transforme souvent en menace pour le patrimoine : quand on manque d’un système de protection approprié, beaucoup d’immeubles anciens sont condamnés à la démolition.

MENACES AU PATRIMOINE DANS LES PAYS ÉMERGENTS: LE CAS DE L’ARGENTINE
En Amérique Latine, l’Argentine et le Brésil font partie du G 20, groupe établi en 1999, pendant la crise économique de l’Asie, dans le but que les économies les plus avancées et les pays émergents contribuent ensemble à stabiliser le marché financier mondial. La croissance économique, qui a permis à l’Argentine d’être incluse dans ce groupe de pays, a eu cependant une faible influence positive dans le domaine qui nous intéresse, celui de la conservation de patrimoine. Tout au contraire, les exemples suivants semblent montrer un panorama critique.

Dans les grandes villes, on peut reconnaître un procès similaire. La coût de la terre urbaine est devenu très haut, beaucoup plus haut que celui de la maison qui est bâtie dessus; les propriétaires vendent pour maximiser leur bénéfice économique et ces maisons sont rapidement remplacées par des immeubles en copropriété.

Il est très curieux de voir comme une situation semblable a été si bien décrite, non pas par des techniciens, mais par un écrivain, JMG Le Clézio, dans Ville Aurore : « Ils ont pris le terrain pour la route, pour l’école, et puis ils ont loti ce qui était en trop, ils ont construit les immeubles. Mais il y a encore cette maison, c’est cela qu’ils veulent maintenant, ils ne me laisseront pas en repos tant qu’ils n’auront pas eu la maison, pour quoi faire ? Pour construire encore, encore ».

En ce qui concerne le patrimoine et le tourisme, cette activité a provoqué la croissance peut ordonné de certaines villes, spécialement dans la côte maritime de la province de Buenos Aires, détruisant l’attraction du paysage originel. Hors des villes, les terres des établissements ruraux du début du XXe siècle (estancias), caractéristiques de la pampa argentine, ainsi que les biens meubles (sculptures, tableaux, vaisselle), ont été reparties entre les héritiers du propriétaire original. Dans les derniers décades, et avec le but de pouvoir les conserver, un grand nombre d’établissements ont été affectés aussi à la récréation et au tourisme, quelque fois sans tenir compte de la fragilité du territoire, ce qui conduit à une exploitation peut durable.

LE RÔLE DE L’ÉCONOMIE DE LA CONSERVATION
Dans ce contexte, quel est le rôle qui peut jouer le développement et l’application des principes d’une discipline comme l’Économie de la Conservation et les méthodes de valorisation économique?

L’Économie de la Conservation analyse les particuliers...
caractéristiques du patrimoine culturel bâti, considérant son double rôle économique : un bien qui, au même temps, peut rendre potentiellement un service. Ces biens uniques et de haute signification culturelle ne peuvent être étudiés avec les mêmes outils économiques que les autres biens qu’on échange dans le marché. En conséquence, on a développé des méthodes de valorisation économique spécialement applicables au patrimoine naturel et culturel.

Il y a maintenant une bibliographie assez vaste à ce sujet. En résumé, on a développé des méthodes indirectes (prix hédoniques, coûts de voyage) et des méthodes directes (valorisation contingente, qui est particulièrement applicable au patrimoine culturel bâti). Avec eux, il est possible d’introduire dans les estimations quantitatives et qualitatives des facteurs intangibles, propres à la nature d’un bien culturel, que les méthodes économiques traditionnelles ne peuvent pas inclure. En plus, l’analyse multicritère est un outil convenable quand on veut établir des priorités pour des investissements et des interventions architectoniques et urbaines, et trouver une base d’accord entre des intérêts sociaux en conflit.

Les élites culturels des pays émergents (surtout ceux d’origine latin) ont eu toujours une certaine défiance par rapport aux relations entre le patrimoine et économie. Cela se base dans l’idée de impossibilité de donner une valeur économique à « l’art ». Mais, d’un autre côté, le manque de règles pour la conservation du patrimoine bâti permet à la logique du marché d’agir librement : tous les acteurs sociaux du secteur privé tendent à obtenir le plus haut bénéfice économique.

Dans des pays comme l’Argentine, les budgets publics sont toujours insuffisants pour répondre aux besoins de logements, santé et éducation. Par conséquent un thème comme celui de la conservation du patrimoine n’est presque jamais prioritaire du point de vu des possibilités de financement. L’application des principes de l’Économie de la Conservation aiderait à considérer le patrimoine comme un facteur clé, tenant compte de sa véritable valeur au moment d’établir les priorités d’investissement publique.

Il est vrai que, surtout dans des pays émergents, il y a des difficultés pour l’application de méthodes de valorisation économique, surtout celles qui ont besoin des statistiques y de données spécifiques. Même si toute méthode est parfaite et discutable, elles constituent tout de même un outil qui permet de réduire les aspects subjectifs qui fréquemment dominent les décisions publiques.

Nous avons appliqué les méthodes des prix hédoniques, de valorisation contingente et les principes de l’analyse multicritère à des différents problèmes relatifs au patrimoine urbain et rural dans des villes de la province de Buenos Aires, Argentine.

On a étudié la faisabilité de l’exploitation soutenable d’un établissement rural qui présentait les problèmes de conservation qu’on a décrit plus haut. Pour arriver au but fixé, on a fait l’analyse, entre autres, de l’offre de tourisme rural dans la région. Dans ce cas, on a appliqué la méthode des prix hédoniques pour étudier l’influence relative de variables diverses (physiques, de l’environnement, activités offertes, patrimoine) dans le prix de la visite à la estancia. De cette façon, on a pu introduire dans le modèle des facteurs qualitatifs et parfois intangibles comme la valeur historique, architectonique, des biens meubles, etc., qui possède l’établissement.

La méthode de valorisation contingente a été appliqué pour estimer la « disposition à payer » pour la conservation des monuments historiques comme la cathédrale de La Plata, construite en style néogothique à la fin du XIXe siècle, lors de la fondation de cette ville. Les enquêtes qu’on a présentées aux visiteurs on permis d’évaluer le problème posé en relation aux caractéristiques sociales, culturelles et économiques des répondants.

Dans la ville touristique de Chascomús, fondé à la fin du XVIIIe siècle, connue par les valeurs historiques et de son paysage, on a organisé un séminaire pour discuter les priorités de d’investissement en réhabilitation architectonique, considérant cinq cas ou le patrimoine été menacé. Les opinions des différents groupes sociaux qui ont participé (architectes, techniciens de la mairie, professionnels du tourisme, communauté), ont permis d’établir une base d’accord sur le chemin à suivre, nécessaire pour le succès de tout plan o politique future en la matière.

Les exemples cités montrent qu’il est possible d’adapter ces outils économiques aux possibilités des différents pays, tout en respectant les fondements de la méthode choisie.

En résumé, l’adaptation des principes et des outils de cette discipline aux caractéristiques et besoins des pays émergents permettrait de donner un important pas en avant dans la gestion et la préservation du patrimoine, tenant compte de son rôle comme moteur de développement.
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L’ÉCONOMIE POLITIQUE DU PATRIMOINE CULTUREL
De la médaille au rhizome
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Résumé. L’économie du patrimoine est censée éclairer les conditions dans lesquelles le patrimoine culturel doit être distingué, conservé, géré et valorisé. Concernant des ressources qui pour beaucoup d’entre elles sont héritées du passé, prennent des significations variées selon qui et d’où on le regarde, sont souvent d’une grande fragilité, cette économie du patrimoine ne peut être que complexe. Elle a longtemps trouvé son fil directeur dans l’économie des monuments, lesquels ne représentent pourtant qu’une petite partie du patrimoine culturel. Sans doute à une période où le concept de développement durable impose un élargissement des perspectives, et la globalisation un élargissement des opportunités convient-il d’en renouveler l’approche. Le patrimoine culturel n’est plus la médaille que l’on reçoit du passé, c’est une ressource aux ramifications nombreuses et variées dont on doit éclairer la gouvernance à la lumière de nos défis comme de nos aspirations.

Longtemps considéré comme un legs du passé à conserver et transmettre aussi fidèlement que possible, le patrimoine est aujourd’hui considéré comme une ressource produite, devenant à son tour levier d’un développement à venir. Ainsi le regard de nos sociétés sur le patrimoine culturel change-t-il sensiblement. Le défi n’est d’ailleurs pas de reconnaître cette préoccupation mais plutôt de voir dans quelle mesure elle impose de rompre avec des approches traditionnelles. Les économistes sont interpelés, comme d’autres, par ce débat. Reconnaître le patrimoine a longtemps consisté à admettre que des ressources devaient être affectées à sa conservation, les liens entre reconnaissance et financement étant alors plus ou moins automatiques et justifiés au nom de valeur de remémoration, de valeur identitaire ou artistique. Le patrimoine apparaissait alors comme une charge à supporter, inévitablement alors au détriment d’autres choix financiers en faveur d’autres usages. Mais reconnaître aujourd’hui un patrimoine culturel dans la perspective du développement soutenable, c’est aux yeux de beaucoup reconnaître qu’il y a là une ressource commune à faire fructifier, un actif à traiter comme un investissement productif. En tenant compte des limites qu’impose tout point de vue propre à une discipline, peut-on en déduire que l’économie du patrimoine ne fait que se redéployer substituant l’idée d’actif à celle de charge ? Rien n’est moins sûr tant on assiste aujourd’hui à une rupture épistémologique dans un tel traitement. L’économie du patrimoine est censée éclairer les conditions dans lesquelles le patrimoine culturel doit être distingué, conservé, géré et valorisé. Concernant des ressources qui pour beaucoup d’entre elles sont héritées du passé, prennent des significations variées selon qui et d’où on le regarde, sont souvent d’une grande fragilité, cette économie du patrimoine ne peut être que complexe. Elle a longtemps trouvé son fil directeur dans l’économie des monuments, lesquels ne représentent pourtant qu’une petite partie du patrimoine culturel. Sans doute à une période où le concept de développement durable impose un élargissement des perspectives, et la globalisation un élargissement des opportunités convient-il d’en renouveler l’approche. Le patrimoine culturel n’est plus la médaille que l’on reçoit du passé, c’est une ressource aux ramifications nombreuses et variées dont on doit éclairer la gouvernance à la lumière de nos défis comme de nos aspirations.

1. Les valeurs fondateuses du patrimoine
L’économie de la valeur d’existence
Le patrimoine peut valoir du seul fait de son existence, indépendamment de tout usage, particulier ou collectif. Lorsque Riegl utilisait le terme de culte moderne des monuments, il soulignait l’importance que les monuments pouvaient représenter pour des communautés, au titre de leur valeur symbolique, de leur valeur de remémoration et de leur valeur d’ancienneté, cette dernière leur rappelant la durée de leur expérience commune et les garantissant en quelque sorte de sa poursuite [Riegl, (1984)]. Il y voyait une source d’histoire donnant une information aux
peuples sur leur passé ; la manifestation d’une création artistique traduisant des progressions dans l’expression des matériaux, formes et couleurs ; un témoignage du temps écoulé. Ce fondement confère une dimension éminemment politique à la délimitation du patrimoine. Parce que le patrimoine affiche pour l’essentiel une valeur d’existence, valeur collective s’imposant sans passer par une quelconque participation des citoyens, elle a un rôle politique [Léniaud, 1994]. Dans ce contexte :

- La procédure de classement a pour rôle de distinguer dans les legs du passé ceux qui contribuent à la réalisation d’une communauté politique de ceux qui pourraient en déstabiliser les enjeux;
- Le rôle des experts est déterminant et celui des citoyens secondaire. Les experts ont non seulement pour objet de vérifier l’authenticité mais le rôle que ces actifs patrimoniaux ont joué dans l’histoire du pays. Ainsi a-t-on pu parler ici de loi-experte, l’expression synthétisant l’alchimie nécessaire du politique et de l’expertise scientifique. Les mouvements associatifs et la société civile n’ont guère de place dans ce contexte. Mieux, ils n’ont pas à en avoir. Si coalitions pour le patrimoine il y a, ce seront des coalitions entre élus et experts.
- L’expression communément utilisée aujourd’hui de droit au patrimoine n’a guère de sens. Il n’y a pas de droit au patrimoine mais un droit du patrimoine sanctionné par des majorités politiques.

Une conséquence immédiate et a priori positive de la valeur d’existence est de faire bénéficier le patrimoine des efforts de la nation, au travers de politiques d’inventaire, de reconnaissance et de conservation. Des expressions telles que liste d’attente, urgence, extrême urgence, bilan sanitaire du patrimoine, etc., permettent le diagnostic et l’évaluation de la politique publique du patrimoine. Cette manière de définir les enjeux économiques et financiers du patrimoine ne lui est guère favorable aujourd’hui, tant il est difficile de faire des arbitrages financiers complexes au nom de la réalisation de valeurs d’ancienneté, là où d’autres politiques mettent en avant des besoins immédiats, tels l’emploi, la santé ou la lutte contre la pauvreté. [Léniaud, 1994], [Greff & Pfieger, (2010)]

L’économie de la valeur d’usage

Les monuments font aussi l’objet de visites, elles-mêmes à l’origine de voyages souvent longs et onéreux. Le phénomène n’est pas vraiment nouveau mais il a souvent été occulté dans la passé par des motivations religieuses (pèlerinages) ou politiques (anniversaires ou événements), les motivations touristiques étant plutôt l’apanage d’élites à la recherche de connaissances et d’émotions, tel le cas du le grand tour. Cette dernière dimension a considérablement augmenté avec le développement du tourisme contemporain, au point que pour beaucoup d’observateurs ce serait là le véritable fondement économique de la valeur des monuments. Le monument ne vaut donc plus seulement en soi mais parce qu’il attire un certain nombre de visiteurs qui, à cette occasion, effectueront des dépenses et susciteront l’émergence de flux d’emplois et d’activités. De tels flux permettraient un retour financier garantissant la conservation là où la valeur d’existence débouchait au mieux sur des arbitrages politiques positifs : les dépenses de conservation apparaissent désormais comme un investissement à l’égal de toute autre dépense productive.

D’une mise sous tutelle politique, le patrimoine culturel passe sous une mise sous tutelle commerciale. Sans doute les arguments sont-ils d’abord d’ordre économique mais très vite c’est le nombre de touristes et la quantité de leurs dépenses qui deviennent les fondements de cette économie politique du patrimoine culturel. Les frontières, alliances et partenariats changent sensiblement de ce qui se passait dans le cas précédent.

- Les frontières sont désormais mouvantes et suivent tout ce qui suscite, artificiellement ou non, l’attention des visiteurs. Ainsi des métiers d’art qui ne sont plus directement liés à la conservation mais à la production d’objets variés vont-ils rentrer dans le patrimoine. La principale extension concerne cependant la mise en lumière de patrimoines industriels et vernaculaires, d’objets de la culture matérielle ou de la vie courante, etc., puisque le clivage fondamental entre patrimoine national et patrimoine local est désormais submergé par la recherche de valeurs monétaires.
- Si les certifications et labellisations continuent de jouer un rôle, elles n’ont plus le même sens. Dans le cadre de la valeur d’existence, la certification sépare ce qui vaut de ce qui vaut moins ou pas. Dans le cadre de la valeur d’usage, la certification vaut signe ou information sur l’existence de quelque chose qui mérite le voyage, le détour ou l’arrêt. Elle garantit le visiteur qu’il trouvera quelque chose d’intéressant au bout de son chemin, même s’il n’en a pas fait l’expérience jusqu’alors. La certification devient une technique de marketing aux cotés de revues, de blogs, ou de toute autre forme de publicité, ce qui explique d’ailleurs la multiplication des labels. Ils réduisent l’incertitude des consommateurs sur l’objet de leurs dépenses et les garantissent que ce qu’ils vont voir est déjà reconnu par d’autres ; ils garantissent des investisseurs variés de ce que des rendements suivront leurs efforts [Greff & Pfieger, (2010)].
- Les alliances et les partenariats pour le patrimoine sont alors variés et polycentriques, mobilisant notamment tous ceux qui ne se voyaient pas reconnaitre de place par la Loi-experte. On trouve bien sur les collectivités locales, les associations de la société civile liées à l’existence d’un patrimoine matériel ou non, mobile ou non. On trouve aussi
les entreprises et les commerçants qui veulent catalyser l’empire croissant des raisonnements économiques et financiers. La mise en évidence de cette valeur d’usage conduit en effet à multiplier les argumentations économiques en faveur du patrimoine culturel, ou, plutôt, en faveur des re tôbèmes économiques que l’on peut en attendre. Analyse coût-bénéfice, études d’impact, évaluation de multiplicateurs redéplorent dans le champ du patrimoine les critères d’analyse des investissements privés [Greffée, (2004)].

Une telle approche ne va pas sans créer des problèmes et même plonger dans des impasses. Là où l’on voit dans la valeur d’usage du patrimoine culturel une source de croissance pour un milieu local, on constate que des tensions considérables, et l’anticipation de multiplicateurs positifs peut laisser la place à l’apparition de multiplicateurs négatifs. Même face à des exemples réussis on relève l’importance des conditions à réunir pour qu’il en aille bien ainsi, les conditions qui n’ont d’ailleurs pas grand-chose à voir avec l’existence d’un patrimoine culturel (contrôle du prix du sol, production locale des compétences requises, élimination des comportements de recherche de rentes), de telle sorte que l’on peut légitimement se demander si le patrimoine doit être considéré à l’aune de ces seuls critères économiques ! En outre, dans cette approche, le patrimoine culturel peut vite perdre de sa profondeur et devenir un univers plat, prêt à l’accumulation de souvenirs glanés de çi de là, les photos servant alors de quasi-trophées. Les visiteurs ne voient plus ce qu’il y a à voir mais ce qui est donné à voir, et il y a perte de toute réflexivité, substitution d’un inconscient optique à une approche raisonnée, comme l’exprimait Benjamin. Le patrimoine devient flottant, et le touriste flottant entre dans un univers de représentations systématiques, forme de collectivisation de l’esprit. Le patrimoine culturel perd au minimum sa valeur mémorielle.

**L’économie de la valeur de développement**

Les effets du patrimoine culturel dépassent heureusement ceux créés par le tropisme du tourisme culturel. Ses contributions à d’autres formes de développement - économique, social, environnemental ou territorial - ont conduit à y voir un élément essentiel pour toute stratégie du développement durable.

Considérons la contribution des actifs immatériels du patrimoine culturel au développement d’une économie aujourd’hui caractérisée par la globalisation et le rôle stratégique des connaissances. L’économie de la connaissance donne aux facteurs immatériels un rôle déterminant dans la définition et la production des nouveaux biens ; l’économie globale renforce les chances de la diversité en offrant des marchés plus étendus à des produits exprimant ou reflétant des cultures spécifiques. Ainsi de nombreux produits de design ou d’artisanat d’art peuvent-ils trouver plus facilement des marchés que cela n’a pu être le cas par le passé, faisant des savoir-faire intégrés au patrimoine culturel des leviers de développement.

Considérons l’apport du patrimoine culturel, notamment tangible, à notre environnement physique quotidien, dont le cadre bâti. La qualité des villes dépend en grande partie de la manière dont elles ont su placer leur patrimoine en harmonie avec les autres bâtiments et espaces, renforçant mutuellement leur sens. La conservation du patrimoine n’apparaît certainement plus alors comme une dépense, mais plutôt comme un investissement économique social et culturel. Elle suscite en outre des améliorations de la construction ou des techniques de réparation et de maintenance, et elle offre des leviers d’insertion et d’intégration sociale, à travers les entreprises intermédiaires de réinsertion qui travaillent sur des chantiers de rénovation.

De manière plus générale, le patrimoine culturel peut conduire à l’apparition non seulement de valeurs intrinsèques (valeur d’existence et d’usage), mais de valeurs extrinsèques (inclusion sociale à l’aide de pratiques patrimoniales conférant un meilleur confiance en soi ; intégration sociale en aidant à une meilleure connaissance du capital culturel des autres ; formation d’un capital social nécessaire à la cohésion des actions collectives, etc.) Aussi impressionnante soit la liste des bénéfices extrinsèques, elle ne vaut pas preuve en soi. Pour qu’un bénéfice apparaisse, le dialogue ou l’échange de langage inhèrent à toute activité artistique doit bien avoir lieu, et les activités doivent être régulières. En outre, cette nouvelle manière d’aborder le rôle économique de la culture risque d’aviver les conflits entre la logique endogène du champ artistique de la création et les logiques exogènes correspondants aux différentes valeurs extrinsèques, telles des logiques d’accumulation économique, de santé, etc. La liberté de l’artiste peut alors être mise en question du fait de la prééminence des donneurs d’ordre propres à ces champs.

Cette vision d’ensemble permet sans doute de déboucher sur des champs et des gouvernances du patrimoine différents des deux cas précédents. Les images du patrimoine ne correspondent plus à du temps mis en image mais à des images porteu ses d’avenir. Les opérateurs redeviennent alors ceux qui sont à la recherche de perspectives et qui identifieront dans un patrimoine culturel ce qui leur paraît pertinent, là où dans les cas précédents les opérateurs du patrimoine construisaient l’image qu’ils souhaitaient imposer ou faire partager aux autres. Le temps ne confère plus une signification, il ne fait qu’afficher des différences face auxquelles chacun peut y trouver des sources d’enrichissement de lui-même. La notion même de conservation du patrimoine change de...
sens puisque dire que l’on doit conserver quelque chose de précis se heurte au fait que chacun peut souhaiter créer une alchimie entre un témoignage et un devenir. Là où l’on raisonnait en termes de rareté et de métaphysique de l’usage, on raisonne désormais en termes de production à l’infini, de rêves diurnes. Les labellisations ne peuvent guère prétendre imposer des limites durables, et les alliances se démultiplient dans toutes les directions possibles puisque désormais chacun est opérateur de patrimoine et entre en synergie avec d’autres sur cette même base.

2. Retour vers le passé ou regard vers le futur ?
Les approches successives de la valeur du patrimoine témoignent d’une grande variété de fondements, de mode de gouvernance et d’évaluation. L’approche de la valeur d’existence confère au patrimoine une valeur à priori indélébile, et conduit à définir un effort pour sa conservation en dehors de toute autre considération [Léniaud, 1994]. L’approche de la valeur d’usage permet de relever les impasses financières de la précédente et de débarrasser le patrimoine de sa notion de charge pour la collectivité en faisant miroiter les retombées du tourisme culturel. L’approche de la valeur de développement lève les ambiguïtés des retombées souvent excessives qui sont attendues des visiteurs en élargissant sensiblement les rôles possibles du patrimoine et en mettant en place des gardes fous contre toute utilisation excessive. Mais elle n’empêche pas des conflits liés à la concurrence des usages. D’une certaine manière on retrouve une constante dans ces trois approches : le patrimoine se voudrait un jeu à somme positive, mais sa réalité le rend plus proche d’un jeu à somme nulle, avec les conflits et les comportements de destruction que cela entraîne. C’est cette concurrence des usages, la destruction du patrimoine devant elle aussi être considérée comme un « usage alternatif » exprimé par certains, qui fait que l’image d’immuabilité du patrimoine est une idée passablement discutable. Les monuments comme d’autres ressources patrimoniales naissent, vivent et meurent, et leurs cycles économiques ou sociaux sont plus rapides que ceux liés à leur lente érosion physique. Des exemples sont fréquemment donnés de monuments ou de sites dont l’image s’est détériorée, voire dont la réalité matérielle s’est peu à peu estompée. Sans doute des ruines peuvent-elles susciter l’attention en jouant sur des ressorts psychologiques aussi complexes que passagers, mais certainement moins que des monuments en bon état. Dégradation irréversible, dénaturation, destruction sont le lot commun de bien des monuments qui n’ont pas bénéficié de classements ou de protections suffisantes [Greffé, (2004)].

Cette mise en lumière du patrimoine comme ‘pluie d’images’, ‘ressource vivante’ et ‘bien commun’ permet de dépasser l’une des principales tensions auxquels les systèmes culturels contemporains font face, la tension entre création et patrimoine. Au moment où nombre de budgets publics, nationaux ou locaux se resserrent, il est fréquent de voir les défenseurs de la création s’opposer aux arbitrages en faveur des pierres et les défenseurs de ces dernières insister sur le caractère plus durable du patrimoine que de créations certes. Tout devrait au contraire conduire à substituer une vision intégrée de la création et du patrimoine. Il n’y a pas de création sans patrimoine, et seules des visions étroites du patrimoine culturel et purement romantiques de la création empêchent de saisir le caractère structurel d’une telle liaison. Tout artiste exerce son talent à partir de compétences qu’il a acquises, de références à sa disposition, d’expériences auxquelles il a participé, autant d’expressions variées du patrimoine culturel existant à un moment donné. En sens inverse, il n’y a pas de patrimoine sans création et l’image d’un patrimoine catalysant et consolidant des pratiques culturelles est plus vraie que jamais. Plutôt que de patrimoine, mieux vaudrait d’ailleurs parler ici de mise en patrimoine, ce qui ne peut que renforcer sa nature organique.

Si ce lien n’est pas toujours aussi clair qu’il le devrait, c’est sans doute parce que toute l’analyse du patrimoine s’effectue, au moins dans les pays occidentaux, sur la base du seul patrimoine matériel et plus précisément sur celle des monuments. Il n’en va pas de même dans d’autres régions du monde (Asie, Afrique) où l’analyse du patrimoine part le plus souvent du patrimoine immatériel d’une communauté. Peut-être les degrés de destruction plus rapides du patrimoine matériel dans certaines régions que dans d’autres explique-t-il d’ailleurs ce rapport différent au patrimoine.

Toujours est-il que le patrimoine immatériel – à travers des savoir-faire artisanaux comme des expressions artistiques - contribue à définir les espaces bâtis, les articulations entre ces espaces et le milieu naturel, les artefacts des modes de vie. Ce patrimoine immatériel évolue dans le temps, le fil conducteur d’une telle évolution étant en général la volonté de maîtriser le développement de la vie de la communauté sur un territoire donné, en surmontant les difficultés mais aussi en en exploitant les opportunités, techniques et commerciales notamment. L’existence de capacités de discernement leur permet de tirer parti de l’extraordinaire potentiel que représente la globalisation dès lors que les diversités culturelles peuvent s’y faire reconnaître et valoriser.

Mettre l’accent sur un patrimoine immatériel c’est donc élargir le sens et la portée que peut avoir un patrimoine matériel en terme de création face aux opportunités et
aux contraintes de la globalisation. Ces liens peuvent aussi ne plus être plus créatifs, par exemple lorsqu’une communauté s’étoile ou disparaît, ou encore lorsque les communautés qui émergent ne correspondent plus vraiment à celles qui avaient conduit à la production ou la conservation d’un site. On constate aujourd’hui ce phénomène dans des îles où la prise en charge du développement par un pouvoir centralisé a conduit à réduire la culture des autochtones par rapport à des cultures importées qui risquent fort de compromettre le développement durable de tels sites (Galapagos, Île de Pâques).

**Du patrimoine reçu au patrimoine construit : l’écosystème patrimonial**

Encore faut-il imposer la perspective du patrimoine comme celle d’une ressource organique qui entre dans nos agendas comme une ressource vivante et non pas figée. Le patrimoine est vivant, comme le montrent les évolutions mettant en cause le principe d’un monument ou d’un site légué par le passé à l’attention de ses contemporains. Il convient à ce moment-là de le représenter comme un être vivant à partir de ses logiques intrinsèques comme de l’attitude du milieu où il est inséré. L’écosystème patrimonial devient une réalité à identifier et sur la base de laquelle les choix et les partenariats souhaitables pourront être définis. Il attire l’attention sur le fait qu’il existe une interdépendance entre les comportements de chacun de ses membres – conservateurs, gestionnaires, visiteurs et industries du tourisme, habitants et associations à but non lucratifs, propriétaires fonciers et agents immobiliers, etc. – et que la valeurs de l’ensemble dépendra de la manière dont les valeurs de chacune de ces catégories s’accorderont ou non entre elles.

Ce contexte fera apparaître des comportements et des stratégies souvent laissées pour compte parce que considérées comme intolérables. C’est le cas de la demande de destruction de patrimoine, ‘volontaire’ lorsqu’elle est liées à des réutilisations du cadre bâti et plus ‘passive’ lorsqu’elle résulte d’un manque d’intérêt et de soins. La conservation du patrimoine est donc loin d’être spontanée et sa destruction est non seulement rationnelle mais souhaitable aux yeux de certains. La perspective de l’écosystème permet à la fois de mieux intégrer ces dynamiques dans l’analyse et de percevoir que les moyens à mettre en œuvre pour le conserver et le valoriser sont loin de se réduire à quelques subventions publiques. Elle peut englober l’introduction d’un marché des droits de développement car la conservation du patrimoine doit s’associer avec d’autres évolutions ; elle peut comprendre des politiques d’information auprès de publics jeunes, lesquels sont souvent moins intéressés parce que moins avertis alors que l’expérience montre qu’ils peuvent exercer des influences très positives sur la conservation.

**Du patrimoine-médaille au patrimoine-rhizome**

À l’origine du concept moderne de patrimoine, ou du culte moderne des monuments, ce qui est consommé c’est une image-souvenir, une archive virtuelle, censée offrir une résistance au passage du temps, une durabilité. Cette image est insérée dans un support matériel censé lui imposer des caractéristiques de durabilité, et il en résulte une promesse d’éternité. Elle suggère une sorte d’ordre télologique comme les cartouches des pharaons, l’expression SPQR ou encore les symboles de la royauté. De ce point de vue, il n’y a pas tant de différences entre un monument et les premières monnaies émises à l’effigie des potentats, et le patrimoine agit en quelque sorte comme une médaille.

Avec l’avènement des valeurs d’usage et notamment du touriste culturel – consommateur flottant et glanant les images ici et là – on assiste à une dissociation croissante entre le support des images et ces dernières. Ce qui compte pour le demandeur de patrimoine ce n’est plus la permanence mais une différence, un redéploiement. L’image perd de son unicité, sa portée télologique s’émoussée. Elle vaut comme suite de témoignages, d’instantanéité, elle passe de quelque chose à quelque chose d’autre qui peut ressembler au point de départ mais qui en diffère sensiblement. Le patrimoine devient une sorte de film. Bénéficiant d’avancées techniques considérables - en termes de reproductibilité et de portabilité - on peut explorer des patrimoines de plus en plus variés et tenter de faire de ces images du patrimoine la base d’une industrie de la conscience. Au départ les références sont imposées mais il est possible qu’à travers cette collecte d’images on puisse néanmoins retrouver une certaine réflexivité, élaborer une autre citoyenneté.

Avec l’avènement du champ des valeurs de développement, les images viennent désormais de partout et s’entrechoquent. Il n’est plus nécessairement besoin de se déplacer pour recevoir une pluie d’images patrimoniales car celles-ci peuvent venir d’un environnement proche, que ce soit une photo de famille, un séjour de santé, une expérience de réinsertion, un objet, un outil tombé en désuétude. Du coup le mode opératoire de cette pluie patrimoniale change. Il n’est ni révélation ni promesse d’une identité commune, d’ailleurs définie par d’autres. Il est le résultat de notre propre production patrimoniale, le résultat d’un travail de sélection de notre propre mémoire que nous pouvons bien entendu confronter à d’autres. Il relève d’une biopolitique. Le centre de gravité dans le rapport postulé du patrimoine au citoyen change : désormais tout part du citoyen, lequel élabore en quelque
sorte les éléments qui lui serviront le mieux à définir son identité. Les discours essentielistes sur le patrimoine disparaissent qu’ils soient fondés sur la biologie, le sexe, la race, la religion, le territoire, etc. Le patrimoine est un droit ouvert à chacun, dans un âge post-héréditaire. Cela ne signifie pas que nous soyons tous auteurs d’un patrimoine que nous pourrions opposer à d’autres [Deleuze & Guattari, (1976)]. Cela signifie plus simplement que nous participons collectivement à cette production de patrimoine. Cela signifie à coup sûr que le patrimoine est au moins autant reçu que construit. Le patrimoine est rhizome plutôt que médaille.

Les éléments du patrimoine sont ainsi multiples et entrecroisés traduisant une grande variété d’aspirations de la part de ceux qui ont à concevoir un avenir en commun, mais à partir d’histoires et d’expériences non nécessairement les mêmes, ou au minimum vécues ou interprétées de la même manière. A la différence des arbres et de leurs racines, on peut ici connecter un point quelconque à un autre point sans passer être limité par des ensembles qui ne peuvent communiquer entre eux. Les termes de connexion et d’hétérogénéité s’ajoutent alors à ceux d’identité et d’exemplarité, et les enrichissent d’autant [Deleuze & Guattari, (1976)]. Cette mise en perspective du patrimoine comme rhizome plutôt que médaille transmire d’une génération à l’autre mérite d’être précisé :

● Elle ne consiste plus, à partir d’une unité consacrée, à créer des séparations qui valent exclusion, mais au contraire à voir dans la diversité et l’hybridation permanente le moyen d’enrichir notre vision de nous-même, de nos défis et de nos opportunités.

● Elle ne s’arrête pas à figer une mémoire donnée une fois pour toute mais à tenir compte des expériences qui ont pu l’enrichir ou la relativiser.

● Elle ne consiste pas à geler une période ou un espace temporel mais à accepter d’emblée une multiplicité de référence, s’inscrivant dans des temps qui peuvent être hétérogènes, les uns très longs les autres courts.

Le patrimoine n’est donc pas « frappé » une fois pour toutes et ceux qui tentent de le réinterpréter des faux monnayeurs d’une identité culturelle. Le patrimoine est construit à partir de multiples apports du passé pour mieux nous permettre de nous comprendre. C’est ce que la référence aquatique sous-jacente à la notion de rhizome entend faire passer : l’approche du patrimoine doit être ‘flottante’, et le fait que sa compréhension puisse varier d’un temps à l’autre doit être admis comme une source de créativité. Cela n’empêche en rien l’application des critères d’authenticité et de scientifcité. De manière plus épistémologique, cela signifie que la connaissance du patrimoine est en partie une connaissance anti-fondationnaliste, en ce sens qu’on ne peut la réduire à des principes figés une fois pour toute. Elle s’élabora en tout point à partir de de l’influence réciproque de diverses conceptualisations ou expérimentations. Elle peut déboucher sur l’établissement de plaques de connaissances relativement stables. Un concept de plateau ou de plaque traduirait alors une multiplicité stable et connectable avec d’autres tiges. On relativise peut-être une histoire mais au profit d’un nomadisme que l’on peut assimiler à la recherche d’une stratégie.

3. La bonne gouvernance du patrimoine culturel

La mise en attention : A quoi sert un label ?

Quel peut être le champ du patrimoine ? A priori, le passage d’un patrimoine-médaille à un patrimoine-rhizome ouvre la voie à l’émergence de flux continus d’apparition ou de réapparition de patrimoines, chacun de nous devenant en quelque sorte un prescripteur. Mais il existe une distance entre l’affichage potentiel de patrimoines, et des actions collectives de conservation et de mise en valeur. Des arbitrages interviendront tôt ou tard, et cela explique l’existence d’un nombre croissant de labels, appellations ou marques, d’origine publique ou privée, de dimension internationale, nationale ou même régionale. Ces labels ont en général un triple objet. Le principal d’entre eux est de réduire l’incertitude que citoyens, visiteurs et utilisateurs peuvent avoir quant à l’intérêt d’un élément du patrimoine culturel. Le label apparaît d’abord comme un réducteur d’incertitude, la présomption de ce que l’effort en argent et en temps demandé à son utilisateur potentiel débouchera sur sa satisfaction effective. Le second effet du label est plus discuté : la mise à jour de très nombreux éléments patrimoniaux conduit en fait à les mettre en compétition, et l’obtention d’un label devient un moyen de lui survivre. Enfin, le principe du label porte en lui-même le principe du réseau. En s’associant à travers un même label, monuments et sites pourront organiser en commun leur information, des services de gestion, le partage de coûts fixes, etc. ; les porteurs de savoir-faire pourront organiser les actions collectives nécessaires à sa conservation, etc.

Le problème posé n’est pas l’existence en soi du label. Il commence avec la fiabilité qu’on peut leur prêter et il se poursuit avec les recherches de rentes qu’il suscite. La seule valeur - et protection - d’un label est sa qualité intrinsèque, la manière avec laquelle il est accordé et retiré. Or la multitude des labels peut laisser croire à la qualité là où elle n’existe pas et créer ainsi de grands doutes chez ceux qui cherchent une information pertinente. En outre, le fait que dans le temps nombre de ces labels ne soient pas actualisés augmente cette difficulté puisqu’un même label peut recouvrir des situations divergentes et hétérogènes (par exemple en France le label des pays et villes d’art et
d'histoire, ou celui des pôles de patrimoine). En outre, l'existence d'un label peut susciter une recherche de rentes qui se retourne contre la protection du patrimoine culturel. Cette recherche de rentes n'est généralement pas le résultat des actions des détenteurs ou médiateurs du patrimoine mais plutôt d'offreurs de services périphériques. Certains agents économiques, tels des hôteliers ou des restaurateurs, connaissant l'effet d'appel exercé par un label, escomptent tirer de ces marchés potentiels des rentes importantes en offrant leurs services à des prix anormalement élevés ou encore en imposant de mauvais rapports qualité prix. Ils n'en craignent guère la sanction à court terme et même à moyen terme : les visiteurs sont peu avertis au départ, l'utilisation de tels services leur est nécessaire et seule une petite partie d'entre eux reviendra. Mais la sanction s'imposera peu à peu dans le temps car ces mauvais rapports entre la qualité et le prix de l'accueil déteindront finalement sur l'image du site. Le label n'est pas responsable en soi de tels effets, mais les conditions de se son attribution, ou plus rarement, de sa révocation, peuvent y contribuer. Comment corriger ces effets pervers de la labellisation ? La première solution est de plaider pour le caractère nécessairement temporaire de tels labels, de telle sorte que la manière dont les conditions requises soient régulièrement réexaminées. La seconde est de faire coexister plusieurs labels possibles, les uns insistant par exemple sur la qualité intrinsèque d'un actif patrimonial, les autres sur la contribution de son utilisation pour le développement durable. On peut donc concevoir que même si le premier label est conféré, le second ne le soit pas, ce qui permet de s'interroger sur un manque à gagner en terme de développement.

**La mise en affaires**

La conservation et la mise en valeur de tout patrimoine suppose un modèle d’affaires. Dès lors qu’un patrimoine vaut à travers la pluralité de ses valeurs, le modèle d’affaires le plus simple consiste à dire que le financement de la production des valeurs d’existence (conservation, maintenance) doit être assuré par les organismes représentatifs des collectivités territoriales correspondantes, par exemple en termes d’impôts nationaux ou locaux (voire de don) ; celui des valeurs d’usage doit être assumé par ses bénéficiaires directs, donc en termes de prix ; et celui des valeurs de développement par des mécanismes plus hybrides (cotisations, contributions, prix, etc.) À supposer cette architecture financière possible, encore faut-il que les parties prenantes jouent ce jeu comme attendu, ce qui est de moins en moins vrai face aux tensions financières. Les États comme les collectivités locales sont sollicitées de toute part, et les usagers sont loin d’apporter les palliatifs souhaités. Quant au mécénat, souvent considéré ici comme la solution miracle, force est de constater que son montant ne suit pas les facilités ouvertes pas la législation, sans doute parce que d’autres domaines entrent ici en concurrence (santé, environnement) mais aussi parce que les entreprises n’affectent leurs ressources qu’à concurrence de leurs propres intérêts culturels. L’impasse financière est donc importante. Mais peut être convient-il aussi d’admettre que les modèles d’affaires puissent changer avec l’approche même que l’on a du patrimoine.

L’approche d’un patrimoine-médaille ou d’un patrimoine organisé à partir de la valeur d’existence débouchait sur une économie de la rareté : on y jouait sur l’existence de certains actifs dont la conservation était pour l’essentiel financée par un système de contribution obligatoire, indépendamment du degré d’utilisation réelle des patrimoines. Ce système de financement fiscal apparaissait alors supportable parce qu’il était limité à quelques éléments de ceux hérités du passé, même s’il pouvait donner lieu aussi à contentieux.

Avec la mise en place d’un tourisme culturel générateur de valeur d’usage, un modèle d’abondance succède au modèle de rareté. On assiste à une sorte de déferlement des patrimoines dont l’utilisation visuelle donne lieu à des collections de souvenirs cette fois-ci individualisés. A une économie de rareté succède donc une économie d’abondance, ce qui devrait permettre de fonder la soutenabilité de la conservation sur un système de prix. La richesse ne vient plus d’un échange isolé entre un site et des citoyens hypothétiques, matérialisée par des contributions obligatoires, mais de l’existence d’un flux continu et entretenu de services payés par ceux-là même qui en bénéficient directement.

Avec le patrimoine-rhizome, les patrimoines ne sont plus offerts mais suscités par ceux là même qui entendent les utiliser ou les promouvoir. La pluie patrimoniale conduit ici à démultiplier différents types de patrimoine dans différentes configurations possibles. Le citoyen est tour à tour opérateur et utilisateur, ses fonctions pouvant s’inverser d’un type de patrimoine à l’autre, d’un instant à l’autre. Par analogie on pourrait parler de e-patrimoine, non pas pour signifier que son essence est virtuelle mais pour souligner que sa production et sa viabilité renvoient à des processus qui ne sont pas si éloignés de la production et de l’utilisation des informations sur le Web. A ce moment-là, les modèles d’affaires aujourd’hui développés par le web gagneraient en pertinence : micro-paiement, micro-mécénat, etc. Le ressourcement des modèles d’affaires à partir du web n’est pas artificiel.

Faute de pouvoir mobiliser un mécénat local ou d’entreprise, ne peut-on pas jouer sur l’attachement que des millions
d’internautes peuvent exprimer à l’occasion de la reconnaissance d’un monument ou d’un site sur Internet ? Dans les approches classiques de l’économie du patrimoine, on est censé visiter un site à partir d’un minimum d’informations dont certaines existent sur Internet comme sur d’autres médias. Il existe donc une visite réelle précédée en amont d’informations virtuelles et suivies éventuellement d’une remobilisation de réseaux virtuels. Aujourd’hui, des visites réelles sont de plus en plus précédées de visites virtuelles, voire d’un dialogue entre les internautes et les acteurs de sites, en général sous la forme de blogs. La visite virtuelle devient au mieux le portail de la visite réelle, et ceci vaut particulièrement pour les jeunes. Le risque est évidemment élevé de voir ces visites virtuelles « à domicile » ou ambulantes (sur téléphones portables) non suivies de visites effectives. C’est exact et les études en cours (plutôt effectuées sur le rapport téléchargement de musique/assistance à un concert) montrent en effet que la proportion de ceux qui ne concrétiseront pas un acte virtuel serait de près de 60% ! Mais un bon tiers vaut mieux que deux tiers très aléatoires, et les retombées du trafic sur Internet sont loin d’être négligeables. Le développement de micro-paiement qui touche souvent au micro-mécénat n’est surtout pas à négliger. En outre, il serait anormal de ne pas jouer sur les atouts qu’ils peuvent aussi offrir, notamment dans le cas des pays en développement, la valeur d’existence « universelle » de leur patrimoine culturel pouvant alors être prise en charge par tous.

**La mise en mesure**

Dans ce concert, les économistes proposent en général des instruments plutôt frustrés pour évaluer les effets possibles de la conservation et de la mise en valeur [Greffe, (2004)].

- Ainsi a-t-on vu de nombreuses utilisations possibles d’outils tels que les méthodes dites des coûts de transport (Stirling), de la valeur contingente (Marrakech, Naples, Petra, Torun) ou des prix hésidiques (Uzès). Il s’agit en général de montrer que les valeurs attribuées à l’utilisation d’un site par les visiteurs - et donc les prix possibles qui peuvent leur être demandés – sont susceptibles de compenser les coûts de leur aménagement ; et au cas où ce ne serait pas le cas, de combien il serait souhaitable d’augmenter les prix des services rendus.

- Ainsi a-t-on vu se développer des analyses d’impact (Avignon, Bilbao) ayant pour objet de démonter l’ampleur des mouvements de revenus et d’emplois qui accompagneront la mise en valeur des m.e.s ; On additionne alors des flux directs et indirects auxquels on ajoute des flux induits, en utilisant en général pour cette phase précise un concept dit du multiplicateur.

- Ces analyses ne sont pas inutiles. Elles permettent de mobiliser et sérer des informations et éventuellement de faire apparaître des points d’appui stratégiques pour l’élaboration d’un projet de monument, et aussi des failles. En résumé, elles nourrissent des démarches de type SWOT et entendent même leur donner une rigueur qui se veut scientifique.

Ces analyses ont pourtant à l’épreuve des faits une portée limitée. Si les analyses de la valeur sont marquées souvent par un ton assez pessimiste faute de pouvoir s’adapter facilement aux réalités, les analyses d’impact versent pour leur part dans un optimisme qui peut toucher à la béatitude ou comme le dit le Président du Louvre à la version moderne du miracle de la multiplication des pains ! Loin de déboucher sur une présentation équilibrée, cette conjonction d’éléments pessimistes et optimistes laisse plutôt penser que les économistes ne sont guère fiables. L’apport des économistes peut pourtant être pertinent, dès lors que l’on ne substitue pas d’emblée une approche « gestionnaire » à une approche « de développement économique ». Avant même de mesurer des valeurs et des impacts, l’enjeu est en effet de savoir en quoi il existe ou non une base pour le développement et quelles dynamiques peuvent résulter de la mobilisation de cette base. Autrement, l’analyse du potentiel de développement doit précéder celle de l’évaluation des prix, coûts et impacts. Mais une fois ces dimensions mises à jour, l’enjeu est de démultiplier des indicateurs pour assumer la pluralité des logiques à l’action. Par exemple, en associant des indicateurs de santé de la population locale à des stratégies patrimoniales. Cela apparaîtra étrange à bien des acteurs, mais ne s’agit-il pas à travers de telles stratégies de changer un rapport au territoire et aux autres, d’enrichir l’utilisation de son temps, de renforcer un potentiel d’information et d’attention ?

De ce point de vue l’économiste devrait être au moins autant un architecte qu’un ingénieur. Il peut suivre une démarche technique et montrer comment doit s’organiser la fonction de production des biens et services attendus (définition des services rendus par le monument ; définition des utilisateurs possibles ; définition des combinaisons productive appropriées). Mais il doit aussi suivre la démarche sociale ou organisationnelle qui montre comment les liens entre les parties prenantes doivent être définis, les processus de décision et de révision des décisions organisés, etc. Il contribue alors à travers l’architecture d’un site ou d’une ressource à l’architecture souhaitable de la société) [Greffe & Pfieger, (2010), pp. 54-66].

Le principal biais des approches économiques a souvent été ici de se polariser sur la seule première approche. En outre, comme les instruments de l’analyse économique ont été pour l’essentiel conçus par rapport au marché, on inférera du caractère privatif des ressorts du marché,
la nature a priori privative et décomposable des intrants, voire la privatisation des ressources.

**Conclusion**

Les ressources patrimoniales importent, mais il ne faut les percevoir ni comme le simple héritage du passé ni les considérer comme des éléments dont la vie « vivante » est achevée et auxquels seul notre regard donne encore un sens ! Ce sont des ressources qui prennent aussi leur sens et leur valeur par rapport à un développement considéré comme soutenable et souhaitable. Cet élargissement des perspectives, qui dépasse la vision traditionnelle héritée d'une réflexion monumentale débouche sur un concept de mise en patrimoine plutôt que de patrimoine. Le patrimoine ce n’est pas la charge reçue du passé mais ce que nous souhaitons mettre en évidence pour éclairer les choix du futur. Par là même ce sont des choix ouverts à un dialogue généralisé, avec tous les acteurs constitutifs d’une communauté et d’un territoire. L’expression de patrimoine-rhizome en décalage de celle de patrimoine-médaille n’a aucunement pour objet de mettre en cause le respect et la prise en considération de témoignages transmis du passé. Elle a pour objet de souligner que dans cette mise en patrimoine, les racines peuvent être à la fois anciennes ou plus récentes, qu’elles s’entremêlent les unes aux autres.
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Abstract. In 1950 Melbourne, Australia was physically a nineteenth century city and socially and economically clinging to its past glories as the largest and richest city in the country. By the 1970s it realised that it needed to reassert its position over its rival, Sydney. After a short flirtation with American modernism and attempting to turn itself into an antipodean version of Los Angeles it struck out in a new direction which built on its prodigious architectural and social heritage. The paper will describe this journey, but in particular highlight the role that heritage conservation played in establishing Melbourne as an attractive, vibrant, economically dynamic and cultural city. How Melbourne moved from seeing its history and heritage as an economic impediment to embracing it as a valuable asset.

It will point to several lessons, including:
1. the role of the past in determining the future of a place,
2. the need to search for new social and economic opportunities,
3. maintaining a broad view of what is important about a place and the limitations of simply preserving monuments, and
4. the importance of activism in establishing a political agenda.

The paper will not be a hard edged economic paper, but rather a descriptive piece focussed on the adoption of different planning strategies and their impact in terms of population, economic activity and social outcomes.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

In 1950 Melbourne, Australia was physically a nineteenth century city and socially and economically clinging to its past glories as the largest and richest city in the country.

The land on which Melbourne is located was occupied by the Wurrundjeri, an Australian Aboriginal people for 50,000 years prior to the arrival of white settlers in 1835. For the initial years of settlement it was a convenient port and service town for the pastoral industry that had quickly occupied the surrounding lands. During these years the centre of Melbourne was surveyed and laid out and the first land sales took place. Melbourne suffered an economic recession in 1842 and according to Lewis it was during this time that the economic functions of the central area crystallised. This lead to mercantile and warehousing activity near the Yarra River, banking and commercial activities in central Collins Street, retailing between Swanston and Elizabeth Streets and a medical precinct at the eastern end of Collins Street. This pattern of land use remained largely intact through the twentieth century.

Melbourne’s country town character was to change dramatically during the 1850s when gold was discovered in areas around Melbourne.

It was in September, 1852 that the real revolution began – that the population began to multiply inordinately, that the economy came to depend more upon gold than upon pastoralism, and that new ideas and political stirrings were released. To a population of 77,000 was added more than 270,000 immigrants by the end of 1854, and by the end of the decade the population reached half a million.1

With the increase in population came an increase in the demand for goods and services, which until that time were largely supplied through imports. As the gold industry developed there also grew a great demand for engineering services and equipment (pumps, boilers, crushers, etc.). It was this demand that saw the beginnings of Melbourne’s status as the manufacturing and industrial capital of Australia. Along with this came a rapid increase in the need for finance and professional and commercial services. Equally there was plenty of money in the pockets of many miners, both individuals and newly founded corporations which were able to sustain this new found commerciality.

In 1861 Melbourne’s population was 126,000, five times what it had been in 1851. 37,000 of these were living in the city and its immediate residential suburbs.2 Over the next thirty years Melbourne’s population further quadrupled and resulted in great suburban expansion.

1 Lewis 1995.
In his book *Victorian Cities* the well known British historian Asa Briggs described Melbourne in the following terms:

The rateable value of Melbourne in 1891 was surpassed in the Empire only by London and, only just ahead, by Glasgow. During the great urban boom of the 1880’s, Melbourne was described by a distinguished visitor, G. A. Sala, as ‘marvellous Melbourne’. Other people called it ‘the Paris of the Antipodes’ or ‘the Chicago of the South’. He pointed out that Melbourne in 1850 had 23,000 people and was essentially a service town for the surrounding pastoral and agricultural lands. By 1902 it had more than 500,000 people.

Briggs quoted the British economist who had noted that by 1858 Melbourne had acquired a ‘metropolitan’ character.

“It was a commercial centre with ‘two or more primary productive operations’, ………..The city centre included well-stocked and well-lit shops, ‘equal to the best in London’, bank buildings described in 1856 as ‘of considerable architectural pretensions’; a Theatre Royal, built in 1842, where you could see ‘Italian opera in a style worthy of the English metropolis itself’; and a new Melbourne Club opened in 1858, which ‘though it has not the Corinthian pillars and fine architectural proportions of the Conservative at home …… would not at all disgrace St Jame’s Street’.”

“The origins of the boom were complex. Gold-mining, which had accounted for the great boom of the 1850s, had lost its importance in the 1870s. By that time, however, Melbourne had become the greatest centre of trade and finance. A huge International Exhibition, which was held in 1880 and 1881, put Melbourne ‘on the map’.”

The 1880s, in particular were a period of boom for Melbourne. In 1850 it had 68 factories, by 1900 there were 3,097. Between 1861 and 1891 Melbourne’s population quadrupled. It had quickly become an industrial metropolis with all of the associated commerce that made for a truly Marvellous Melbourne.

Melbourne sustained its role as the dominant Australian city through the early years of the twentieth century. With the federation of the colonies, creating a Commonwealth Government in 1901, Melbourne became the home of the new federal Parliament and retained that role until 1927 when it was moved to the relatively new capital, Canberra. By that time Sydney had started to usurp Melbourne as the largest and most economically important city in the country. Despite this Melbourne retained the largest port in the country and continued as the centre of Australia’s manufacturing industry. The political authority provided by the presence of the federal Parliament waned with its departure for Canberra. After all Sydney was much closer.

---

2 Lewis, 1995, p59
3 Briggs, 1968, p278.
4 Briggs, 1968 p280
5 Briggs, 1968 p287.
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to Canberra than Melbourne in an era when transport was by road or rail.

The gradual growth of international air travel also did nothing for Melbourne's economic role. It may have maintained Australia's largest shipping port, but it was Sydney that became the centre of air transport. So by the time the Second World War came around and, particularly with the war in the Pacific it was Sydney that provided the best airport and naval repair and maintenance facilities.

Throughout the Second World War Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne became bases for US servicemen and they introduced a totally different cultural construct to the city. The US was well known to Australians before the war. Professionals such as architects and town planners had been visiting the brave new cities of New York and Chicago throughout the twentieth century and the general populace had been entranced by American movies and film stars since the 1920s. However, it was the presence of these servicemen, their money and different approach to life that brought this new world home to Melburnians.

Melbourne had a sound nineteenth century base to its built fabric. It had also protected the form of its city with building regulations, the most notable of which was a height limit of 132 feet. Throughout the early years of the twentieth century Melbourne's architects and buildings embraced the new technologies of steel framing and lifts, so that this limit was able to be easily reached. However, the architectural form of the city remained relatively conservative, the pattern of streets and lanes remained intact, the retail arcades stayed, the theatres were retained and continued to be used, many of the old hotels were retained and the old mix of uses was sustained and of course the grand public institutions such as the Public Library, National Gallery and Science and Natural History Museums were central features of the city. It was these features that were to become one of Melbourne's greatest strengths in the later years of the twentieth century.

Aside from the presence of American servicemen in the 1940s there were two other big events which made Melburnians rethink their position in the world during the 50s. In 1954 the newly crowned Queen Elizabeth of the then British Empire visited Australia. She was the first ruling monarch to find their way to Melbourne. In 1956 Melbourne hosted the Olympic Games. The first of these events resulted in a massive wave of British patriotism. However, this was not a monarch in the nineteenth century mould of her great grandmother, Queen Victoria, after whom the State had been named. Queen Elizabeth was a young and modern monarch and Melbourne set out to impress her as a modern British city in the south, in part by painting its buildings white. The Olympics certainly provided an opportunity to parade Melbourne on the world stage and it did so with aplomb and along with the Olympics came the introduction of television—perhaps the most significant driver of change in social attitudes.

By the 1950s the commercial centre of Australia had not only statistically moved to Sydney, but this was generally
accepted throughout the country and of course the political capital was Canberra. Melbourne found this disturbing and realised that it needed to reassert its position over its rival to the north. The immediate response was to promote the demolition of the old nineteenth century buildings and replace them with modern steel, concrete and glass edifices. It was American modernism a la Los Angeles that was going to set the new direction for Melbourne.

The Conversion of Melbourne

The first of this wave was the Imperial Chemical Industries new offices at the top of the city. It was able to break through the 132 foot height limit and set a pattern for further development.

In the city centre itself. These new developments not only lead to the destruction of many of the grand nineteenth century buildings, but undermined the traditional use patterns of the central city. It was destined to become a centre of commerce, with the population, now living in the suburbs, commuting to and from by a new network of roads. There was even an ordinance which optimistically set out to destroy the traditional pattern of streets so that cars could move around the city to new multi-level car parks with greater ease.

The 1969 Melbourne Transportation Plan was a road and rail transport plan for Melbourne. It outlined most prominently an extensive freeway network recommending 510 kilometres of freeway for metropolitan Melbourne, as well as extensive rail works, including the city underground loop and two new lines to Doncaster and Monash University (now Clayton Campus)[1] which were however - never built. Despite the majority of the printed material being devoted to non-car transport, 86 per cent of the projected budget was devoted to roads and parking, with only 14 per cent to other forms of transport.[7]

This meant that much of Melbourne’s nineteenth century inner suburbs would be destroyed. Necessary if Melbourne was to become the southern hemisphere’s equivalent of Los Angeles. What parts that were left would be demolished to make way for multi-storey blocks of public housing.

The mass of nineteenth century housing in inner Melbourne was seen to be un-healthy and slum like. The ultimate result was to emulate the great public housing estates of south central LA and Chicago. Melbourne converted the old Commonwealth Tank (military) factory into a prefabricated concrete housing factory to make the production of this housing efficient and economic. In turn this lead to Melbourne having the world’s tallest prefabricated concrete housing block, thirty floors in South Melbourne. Just like the American authorities Melbourne’s leaders, planners and engineers didn’t consider the social problems that would arise through the housing of already disadvantaged people in these concrete towers.

Ironically the waves of post war migrants from Europe quickly became attached to the old inner suburbs and their nineteenth century housing. After all this was the sort of housing that they were familiar with in Europe and in Melbourne its reputation as constituting slums had made it an inexpensive form of housing. The old Australians were pursuing their housing dreams in new outer suburbs. Places that could only be accessed by the motor car.

Not surprisingly these actions did not lead to Melbourne usurping Sydney as the commercial capital of Australia.

---

By the mid 1970s there was considerable community disquiet about the destruction of the city that its residents were so familiar with. It was also becoming apparent that this new direction was not likely to return Melbourne to its position as Australia’s pre-eminent commercial and political centre.

Unfortunately much had been destroyed, but the reversal of development policy came swiftly and within 10 years Melbourne was capitalising on its prodigious architectural and social heritage, making it the cultural capital of Australia. This change of direction not only saw the preservation and re-use of commercial buildings in the central city, but saw the truncation of grand plans by the roads and public housing authorities to replace the vast areas of nineteenth and early twentieth century suburban housing stock with freeways and multi-storey public housing.

A key to this change was the adoption of a strong urban design program. This was launched as a formal policy and program as part of the *City of Melbourne Strategy Plan* in 1985.

The vision of this program is to retain the city’s most authentic characteristics and simultaneously enhance its capacity to function as an integrated social, cultural and economic entity, and meet the demands of economic growth.\(^8\)

One of its fur objectives was:

*To preserve the physical characteristics that are distinctive to Melbourne, building on the strengths that reflect its local character and retaining a desirable quality of lifestyle.*\(^9\)

This strategy was supported by a document *Grids and Greenery*, which laid down generic urban design principles, and defined elements and relationships that characterise central Melbourne.

*It showed how streets and boulevards, waterways, parks, transport infrastructure, the city centre and heritage built form interact to create familiar yet distinctive city features.*\(^10\)

The City of Melbourne has been subject to a number of boundary and administrative changes since the 1970s. In 1994 it underwent significant boundary changes and its resident population was reduced to 33,000. In the intervening years it has grown the population to almost 90,000. This has been achieved by making the central city a desirable place to live and encouraging the development of new residential apartment blocks and significantly the conversion of many older office and warehouse buildings into residential units. The occupants of these new residential units have in turn sought to ensure that the environment in which they live retains its historic character and offers cultural and entertainment facilities which make it a pleasant place to live.

This has not lead to a fall in the number of people travelling to the central city for employment on a daily basis. The broader municipality attracts around 770,000 visitors per day.\(^11\) This includes workers for city offices, tourists, shoppers, diners and students. The central city alone attracts 550,000 of these visitors.

The pressure for improved cultural heritage conservation was key factor in establishing Melbourne as an attractive, vibrant, economically dynamic and cultural city. Melbourne more than any other Australian city moved quickly and decisively from seeing its history and heritage as an economic impediment to embracing it as a valuable asset which should be capitalised on. Consequences of this are that Sydney remains envious of the new found cultural capital of the south and it is projected that greater Melbourne’s population

---

\(^8\) City of Melbourne, 2010, p39  
\(^9\) City of Melbourne, 2010, p39
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will usurp Sydney’s in the not too distant future

KEY FACTORS IN ACHIEVING CHANGE

1. The role of the past in determining the future of a place
Melbourne was not only a city built on the wealth of the
gold rushes, with substantial and significant nineteenth
century buildings, but had also established itself as an
important cultural centre in the southern hemisphere.
It still has the largest public art gallery in Australia; it has
a grand public library which is claimed to have collected
every book published in the world in the last half of the
nineteenth century. It has a museum with 3 campuses,
one of which includes the World Heritage listed Royal
Exhibition Building which has been accommodating
exhibitions since its construction for the Great Exhibition
of 1880. Melbourne also has grand nineteenth and early
twentieth century theatres which have maintained a
tradition of live theatre over more than 100 years.

The central city was laid out on a classic grid with large, wide
thoroughfares interspersed with intermediate smaller service
streets. These in turn were serviced by laneways which
provided access to businesses and allowed free pedestrian
movement through the city. Equally a network of arcades
supplemented this street pattern and enabled pedestrians
to move across the city, under cover and protected from
Melbourne’s changeable weather patterns. These arcades
and laneways are a distinctive feature of the city and
have become sought after locations for retail and food
businesses. New developments have moved to introduce
new arcades and walkways. In fact it would be difficult to
envision Melbourne’s coffee culture surviving without
these spaces and locations.

2. The need to search for new social and economic
opportunities
The period 1945 to 1975 saw Melbourne competing for
the largest slice of Australia’s economic fortunes. Whilst
it had been the manufacturing capital of the country and
supported the largest port (it still does) it was clear that
manufacturing in Australia was in decline and this could
not be relied upon as the basis for the city’s prosperity.
No longer did international visitors arrive by sea and
Sydney had captured the international business market, in
part because it offered a better international air terminal.
Melbourne’s new terminal did not open until 1970 and
the national airline Qantas was well established in Sydney.
Gradually as the banks rationalised themselves Melbourne
lost its dominant role as the centre of banking in the
country. By 1980 it hosted the headquarters of two of

Degroves Street, Melbourne

10 City of Melbourne, 2010, p39
11 City of Melbourne, 2010, p27
the four major banks.
But what were its strengths? Well it had an accessible city centre, a good network of trains and trams, a set of cultural institutions, second to none in the country and one of the largest collections of late nineteenth and early twentieth century housing in the world.
It also had a sound basis for a vibrant education industry with internationally recognised tertiary institutions and a strong trade training sector.
The development of a strong tourism industry was to be a challenge, since Melbourne lacked the dramatic harbour landscape and beaches of its northern sister and the dramatic natural attractions of Queensland and the Northern Territory, it also had a variable climate and was well known for presenting four seasons in one day. Ultimately it was to be the coffee culture, bars and nightlife that became attractive for young international travellers, it was the cultural institutions and vibrant theatre and festival life that attracted local and international tourists. Equally Melbourne’s strong sporting tradition and the development of world class sporting facilities close to the inner city that became a great attraction and it was the development of the city and its surrounding older suburbs as a shopping mecca that attracted visitors from across the country.
A key part of the City’s urban design program was to promote the development of the city as a residential location. The immediate post war period had seen the outer suburbs become the preferred residential locations of the greater metropolitan area. The City of Melbourne’s Postcode 3000 program was designed to pursue new opportunities. It did so, in part by providing local tax incentives to building owners to convert their former commercial buildings into residential apartment blocks. In 1992 the central city had 736 residential units. By 2002 it had 9,721 units. These units, in turn placed demands on the city to provide supporting retail and cultural opportunities. The City also saw the opportunities to provide for an increased overseas student population.

Students make a strong contribution to the city’s vitality and cultural diversity, engaging overtly with the street scene. This growth in the student population has been fuelled by the development of student accommodation in former office buildings in the city.\(^{12}\)

Melbourne’s urban design strategies were in many ways modest, and achievable. However it has demonstrated that a ‘grand plan’ could be achieved without ‘grand gestures’ and that by utilising existing assets vast changes can be made to the economic fortunes of the city.

3. Maintaining a broad view of what is important about a place and the limitations of simply preserving monuments.

In the 1950s and 60s Melbourne’s nascent heritage preservation movement adopted a European approach to its objectives. It assumed that preservation should be limited to grand pieces of architecture and preferably of places in public ownership.
As the 1980s dawned it had become apparent that such an approach was not only impractical, but economically impossible. It was also not the reality of European heritage preservation. No government in Australia or for that matter any non government organisation was ever going to be able to own and conserve everything that was seen to be important.
Hence the move was made to acknowledge the importance of whole neighbourhoods and precincts and to adopt a philosophy that historic buildings should be adapted to new uses and be able to play a useful role in the community. Underpinning this philosophy was the view that individuals and corporations had a responsibility to care for the important historic infrastructure of the city. This required a change of attitude from the city fathers and the support of the State Government. In 1982 Victorians elected a reforming Labor government, after 27 years of conservative rule. This new government not only arrived with strong heritage conservation policies but with a broad urban development agenda. The new Minister responsible for these policies was an architect from a prominent Melbourne firm. Evan Walker (formerly of Jackson Walker) was to prove one of the most imaginative and successful politicians in the country. Part of the policy was to support local government in its heritage conservation efforts. One of the first things that Walker did was to designate a series of neighbourhoods, precincts and boulevards as urban conservation areas and require development approvals to be obtained for demolition and redevelopment of sites in those locations.
These moves coincided with the election of a new and reforming Melbourne City Council, which in turn moved to adopt the City of Melbourne Strategy Plan\(^ {13} \) with its strong emphasis on the development of the city’s existing assets. So the public policies surrounding heritage conservation moved from the single building or monument approach inherent in the old heritage legislation to broad conservation objectives outlined in the town planning statutes.

4. The importance of activism in establishing a political agenda.
The earliest heritage preservation organisation Melbourne was the National Trust (established in 1956). It looked to its UK equivalent for inspiration and adopted the model of ownership, restoration and the establishment of house museums. This worked for some time, but ultimately created

\(^{12}\) City of Melbourne, 2010, p45.
discontent when the Trust was unable to successfully defend the preservation of a much greater range of places than the grand houses and public edifices that they either owned or could convince the government that it needed to keep. This approach was also financially and politically dependent on an ongoing strong interest by the broader public in experiencing static house museums.

The formation of new advocacy groups became important in promoting a new political agenda and when the new government was elected in 1982 it took office with a far more broad ranging preservation agenda. An agenda in part written by young activist architects, planners and historians. A new group the Collins Street Defence Movement was established as a reaction to the continued destruction of remaining older buildings in Melbourne’s iconic commercial street. This group attracted many of the young activists who had developed their views under the tutelage of a few far sighted academics. This group also provided a platform for Evan Walker and future Melbourne City councillors to test and spruik their views and policies.

Equally the engagement with the broader community was important in giving individuals with a view, the opportunity to express that view in a formal way and not have to rely on opposing the institutions of government and decision making.

From around 1975 the City of Melbourne adopted its Future Melbourne Community Plan and as a result focussed on a bottom-up, community based planning approach. This meant that Council officers were expected to engage in wide ranging consultation with resident action groups, other community organisations and partnerships covering precincts, businesses and other interests.14 In turn this lead to the development of strong resident action groups in the inner residential areas. These groups have developed as very effective voices in the urban development of not only their neighbourhoods, but the broader city area. They have learnt how to access the media and be strong participants in planning forums and judicial proceedings.

MELBOURNE IN 2011

The Melbourne of 2011 is a far more vibrant and active place than it was in 1980. Not only does it have a significant resident population, but they have brought with them all the support services they require. There are now supermarkets in the central area, there has been a demand to create parks and green spaces, public transport around the city (primarily trams) is well used and there is a far greater emphasis on making the city pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Melbourne has developed along a European city model.

The City of Melbourne maintains its key strategic role in guiding development and using its regulatory and influential capacity to sustain an urbane city with a strong international reputation as liveable, sustainable and dynamic. The current strategic directions document Future Melbourne15 sets six high level goals;

1. To build a city for people
2. to build a creative city
3. to build a prosperous city
4. to build a knowledge city
5. to build an eco-city
6. to build a connected city

Whilst such goals can seem to be glib these ones are supported by 155 underpinning and specific goals which will see the City move toward 2020.

Its vision is that the City of Melbourne, in 2020 will still be amongst the world’s top ten most liveable and sustainable cities. One of its six primary initiatives will be to sustain urban conservation controls. These controls and associated guidelines have been developed to ensure that the cultural significance of buildings and streetscapes are understood.

This ensured the design and scale of new or refurbished developments complement the built context and streetscape as well as preserving heritage assets and patterns.16

CONCLUSION

To many, particularly those from Europe would not see this as an exceptional outcome. As indicated above Melbourne now has more of the characteristics of an urbane European city than those of its earlier mentors in the US. Melbourne was probably lucky in that its ‘stars aligned” at the right time and that it saw its economic future as dependent on its important existing characteristics and form. It was also, following a brief flirtation with grand new visions of the modern city, able to retrieve enough of its past to establish its current strong economic position.

It has been graced with some visionary politicians and persistent and clever administrators, but most importantly it has a population which has embraced its current success and is vigilant about the importance of heritage conservation as a key element of the economic fortunes of the city.

14 City of Melbourne, 2010.
15 City of Melbourne, 2008.
16 City of Melbourne, 2010, p41
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Abstract. The paradigm that heritage could be a driver for development is still being understood in many heritage properties. Some World Heritage properties became economically developed after inscription in the World Heritage List while in others, economic benefits have yet to be realized. In the case of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, development in the property after its international recognition has yet to be appreciated. Prior to inscription, there was high valorization of the property at the national and local level while World Heritage inscription of this cultural landscape has resulted to an increased awareness of its significance as an important heritage of humanity. While development is presently seen in the encroachment of areas in some parts of the property which before were purely used for rice agriculture, irregular development is similarly felt in the form of unregulated infrastructure in some areas within and outside the property. The high significance of the rice terraces, apart from being a living cultural landscape, impels an envisioned type of development that allows for the conservation of both its cultural and natural values yet allowing natural evolutionary processes to continue including the setting in of economic benefits. The idea of sustainable development comes to mind, but this has yet to be defined. The questions are: What is sustainable development in the rice terraces? If there are models to be emulated, what models of sustainable economic development are apt for the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras? Is sustainable development possible in a property where majority of its people understand and relates development with economic progress and infrastructure development? Is it possible in a place where priority of the living communities is to earn a living and to ensure that the basic needs are met first and foremost? Therefore, this paper attempts to understand the issue of sustainable development in the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras World Heritage property.

THE WORLD HERITAGE INSCRIPTION OF THE RICE TERRACES OF THE PHILIPPINE CORDILLERAS

The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras was inscribed in 1995 under criteria (iii), (iv) and (v). The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is seen in its being a dramatic testimony to a community's sustainable and communal system of rice production, based on harvesting water from the forest clad mountain tops that created stone terraces and ponds, a system that has survived for two millennia. The rice terraces are a memorial to the history and labor of more than a thousand generations of small-scale farmers who worked together creating a landscape based on a delicate and sustainable use of natural resources and it is an outstanding example of land-use that resulted from a harmonious interaction between people and its environment which has produced a steep terraced landscape of great aesthetic beauty, now vulnerable to social and economic changes. (Criteria for inscription) The Rice Terraces VH site was placed in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2001 due to many issues related to socio-economic and changes in lifestyles of people. From then on, the State Party of the Philippines and the local community have extended much effort in removing it from the Danger List. A 10 year period was given to ameliorate threats to the property’s OUV which shall be almost over by 2011 yet uncertainty exists on how the cultural and landscape values in this living and organically evolving property will be conserved and sustained for the long term after it has been finally removed of the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In 2006, a list of corrective measures was proposed, approved and adopted by the Committee in its 34th Session. The provincial government of Ifugao has reported significant accomplishment of the corrective measures but questions prevail on the sustainability of the values of the property being a living cultural landscape.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE RICE TERRACES

Sustainable development was defined by the Brundtland Commission as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. 
Being a cultural landscape, sustainable development in the Rice Terraces means providing for the essential development needs of the people without putting much pressure on the natural and cultural environment. It allows continuity of traditional practices and the natural infusion of evolutionary changes. Sustainability is closely related with such terminologies as the ‘conservation of the OUV’ of WH properties but moves on to include ‘regulated economic development’ as consideration of the other peoples’ needs.

In particular as a WH site, sustainable development in the Rice Terraces is maintained when the WH cluster sites are not overly populated and this maybe be seen when rice paddies and forests remain intact. Sustainable development is also about traditions of the Ifugao being continuously practiced, yet allowing for a managed blending of new practices as part of the natural evolutionary processes of living cultural landscapes. It is likewise associated with economic progress within rural environments where people live in economically stable conditions. In more particular terms, it is seen when children achieve good education even within rural settings, in having quality food on the table, in having acceptable shelter conditions which may not necessarily be modern and where traditional housing co-exist with the non-traditional but reflecting an organic evolution of settlements, in the good health and well being of community members, and in meeting the essential infrastructure needs of a community which are designed in harmony with the environment. Economic sustainability for the Rice Terraces may also be achieved through the development of cultural industries envisioned to ultimately boost income for the people. And lastly, sustainable development is also related to meeting the UN Millennium Development Goal within a rural setting where traditional cultures and natural values co-exist.

Therefore, in order to achieve sustainable development, a healthy synergetic relationship between old cultural traditions and the naturally evolved new ones would have to be achieved to allow for a balance between the conservation of cultural and natural values and economic progress.

HERITAGE AS A DRIVER FOR PROGRESS IN THE RICE TERRACES

A systems approach to managing the Rice Terraces
Ifugao traditional system of agriculture, its activities and rituals (hongan di paqe) were based on the regular course of nature and on the lunar cycle which resulted to robust harvests sustaining peoples for generations. People lived simply in the past and solely relied on agriculture and hunting for sustenance, with practically all days made available for the maintenance of the fields.

Present demands however require other means to survive and to address society’s needs related to education, sustenance, health and the other necessities. This impedes the ability of the people to meet the regular maintenance requirements of the rice terraces. And with increasing issues associated with climate change, a tendency for concerns to pile up usually happens. Complexities of the present require a systematic approach that could help address management work. This could be developed by bearing in mind both the traditional model and modern day programmed approaches that consider the many new challenges currently faced by the rice terraces.

In particular, it is to be noted that the rate of undertaking rehabilitation work of collapsed terraced areas is affected by the availability of resources to address the work. Therefore, as more areas are subjected to erosion and landslides, rehabilitation work becomes directly proportional to the resources needed for it. Corollary to this is the ability of farmers to perform traditional agricultural cooperative work such as the ubbu which becomes indirectly proportional to the rate of increase of large-scale damages. This means that as more and more large-scale collapses happen, the ability of the farmers to do their work following traditional cooperative models that are without assistance from government is lessened while government would have to secure more resources to address an increasing rate of damaged areas.

Programs and a prioritization scheme could be designed so that a restoration system will be set in place while allowing for new concerns to come in. Scheduling of activities is therefore critical, now based on a changing environment affected by climatic variations, the available manpower and financial resources. A study of this would have to be conducted so that a systems approach to management that includes resource generation, allocation and mobilization could be applied. A probability study could also be performed to generate knowledge of prevailing environmental conditions as well as to anticipate threats and risks which could set the basis for the provision of resources.

And finally, as more resources are needed to maintain the Rice Terraces, a surge for economic development to come into the Province of Ifugao is also desired to augment resource allocation concerns that at present come from external sources. This could happen outside the buffer areas to be identified for the WH cluster sites but this may take years before it could actually be realized. Present needs of the Rice Terraces could therefore compel development for the Province of Ifugao so that through it, heritage could be conserved and maintained over time. Yet because of the fragility and vulnerability of this heritage to change, an imminent need to identify the
right and appropriate kind development having the least impact on heritage is forthcoming. A balance of both the conservation and lifetime maintenance of heritage and the setting in of development would have to be devised so that all these will synergistically help in sustaining the cultural and natural values of the place.

The traditional ubbu and the present RTOs as drivers for sustainability

The role of farmers in building the rice terraces has been highlighted in the Criteria for inscription (see preceding paragraphs). At present, these farmers who are formally titled by government as Rice Terrace Owners (RTO) have been recognized as essential not only in maintaining the rice terraces but also in attaining a balance between traditional and modern systems currently in place.

In the past, farmers ensure that traditional cooperative activities such as the ubbu, the dang-a, and the baddang thrive. The ubbu is the traditional cooperative way by which the rice terraces are maintained during pre/post-harvest months, while the dang-a, and the baddang are instrumental in ensuring that work is undertaken during harvest season. In all these the community labor together to attain good rice harvest, while working on areas needing immediate rehabilitation.

At present, it is the RTOs that attest to the success of rehabilitation work when collapse occurs. Rehabilitation projects are tendered by local governments where RTOs become implementers and act as laborers for their own land, the exact concept of the ubbu system, except where at present money is exchanged for rendered labor. Farmers supply materials (hewn or cut stone) needed for rehabilitation work. With the present modern concept, the RTOs as a group or organization earn 10% profit from the funds provided to them by the local government. There is transmission and evolution of the traditional concept of work to the present system. It is notable that the RTOs complete the projects by covering an area that is normally bigger than what has been agreed upon in contract. This is due to the workers’ being direct beneficiaries of the project. The 10% profit earned from the proceeds of the project is also being invested in other income generating endeavors that equally benefit the community as a whole.

This current system that works for the advantage of the rice terraces and the people themselves creates a new perspective for the traditional cooperative system – the ubbu. However, unlike the ubbu where no money is exchanged, the sustainability of the present system is assured through Local Government Units’ (LGUs) support or by external funding assistance.

In small areas where collapse, landslide and erosion occur, the same RTOs help restore the damage, the exact way by which the ubbu was performed in the past. However, in large scale landslides where collapsed areas cover as much as tens to hundreds of paddies, LGU aid is sought for rehabilitation work. The challenge comes with the availability of funds to support big project areas and at times, large collapses are normally left to years of neglect due to fund constraints. These are most often left for nature to take over.

Ifugao traditional settlements as model to address demographic changes

Traditional settlements in Ifugao come in two forms – the clustered and the dispersed. Clustering of houses are found in the WH sites of Kiangan, Hungduan and Banaue-in Batad and in Bangaan, while the dispersed type is found in Mayoyao.

Clustered settlements are characterized by a grouping of houses built close to each other. Clusters are found in the periphery of rice terraces which are normally close to

Collapsed rice terraces badly needing rehabilitation (left) and a rehabilitation project (right)
privately owned forests (muyong) and areas for planting vegetables and crops. The houses within were traditionally made of indigenous materials found in the area. Together with these are found accessory structures such as the toilet, the pig pen and other minor outhouses to contain animals. Below housing settlements are the rice paddies covering contiguous terraced areas that follow the slope of the land.

In dispersed settlements, houses are separate from each other and interspersed with the terraces that similarly follow the contours of mountains and hills. The forests, both private and publicly owned are found in the periphery of a clustering of rice terraces. There are advantages to the traditional concept of settlement in Ifugao. Firstly for the clustered, familial relationships were strengthened through the nearness of relatives to each other which equally paved for the flourishing of cultural practices and the different Ifugao cooperative systems. This was essential in the upkeep and expansion of the rice fields as family members helped in its maintenance while their growing needs ensured spread of the terraces to cover formerly untilled areas.

And in the clustered system, the closeness of houses to each other allowed for less impact on the natural environment surrounding the settlements, as well as areas identified for rice and crop planting. There was a clear distinction between the housing and agricultural areas and these did not extend beyond the other’s sphere in terms of use, function and territorial boundaries. Similarly, an interlinked relationship also existed between these where the existence of each component was founded on the sustainable use of
each other’s resources. What was apparent in the past as in the present is the harmonious and balanced co-existing connection between the different land uses which equally paved way to a unified culture based development that was founded on traditional agricultural and forest management practices.

On the other hand in the Mayoyao model, the rice terraces are surrounded by forests yet houses are interspersed within rice paddies, a clear distinction from the clustering found in the other 4 WH sites of Banaue, Hungduan and Mayoyao. The dispersed nature of settlements in Ifugao as exemplified in the Mayoyao rice terraces was thought of as a strategy to address security concerns. Intruders who came close to Mayoyao had difficulty assaulting rice field owners who had their houses constructed close to the fields but dispersedly located from the others. This nearness of the houses to the terraces had another advantage in that it aided ease of maintenance of the rice plants. In the past, very few houses existed in relation to the amount of terraces within Mayoyao and a balanced and harmonious relationship co-existed between the natural and cultural aspects of the landscape. As there were few houses in Mayoyao in those times, the overlapping of land uses did not exist between housing settlements and areas meant for agriculture, and in the same manner, between what was developed and intervened by man and what is of nature.

A present trend in settlement patterns is now being observed in the WH cluster sites. Land owners claim this to be a result of the insufficiency of ‘owned’ land within old settlement sites for the building of new houses. These new trends however, do not follow traditional settlement patterns and a disparity in model can be seen as formerly clustered settlements remain in their former locations while new houses are being constructed within rice terrace paddies which in the past solely remained as areas for rice planting. Specifically, this new trend is occurring in the cluster site of Hapao in the municipality of Hungduan. Here, formerly clustered settlements found at the periphery of the rice terraces remain without much increase in their size and in the number of houses despite an increase in need for new housing. However, new houses have sprouted within the rice terrace paddies which formerly were solely used for rice planting. A conversion from rice terrace to ‘house paddy’ is now observed in this cluster site.

In Mayoyao on the other hand, another trend is happening where the formerly few dispersed houses are now increasing in numbers as new ones are built within the rice terraces. This new trend is apparently gearing towards the formation of clustering as a result of more houses being built nearby existing ones.

To summarize, in the 4 WH cluster sites of Hungduan, Kiangan, Bataad and Bangaan in the municipality of Banaue, clustering of settlements was a tradition that at present is slowly transforming in Hungduan due to demographic changes, while in Mayoyao, its former state of intermittently dispersed housing in the rice terraces is now being altered as more houses are built into the landscape creating unclear forms of clustering. In all these cases, it is clear that the traditional model is much more sustainable in the long term due to an apparent harmonious relationship existing between settlements and the natural and agricultural environment.

Related to settlement patterns is the Ifugao house, an archetypical abode that exemplifies best practice in housing design. The ifugao house is a one-room structure which space acts as a sleeping, gathering and eating place for a small Ifugao family. Within its interior space are pockets of areas

Increasing number of houses within rice fields in Hungduan
for storage and cooking. The different levels of the house manifest the Ifugao’s understanding of his cosmic and earthly world. Each level of the house from the ground to the roof structure signifies a place on earth and of the heavens. This house however, no longer fits a modern day Ifugao. However, its traditional design invites much attention and potential for the present and future needs of the people. The use of indigenous materials for its house construction is in itself a green technology that merits inspiration for present day designers.

The traditional Ifugao house, although much more appreciated in the past for its functional nature as an abode, could now be transformed to a new compatible evolved use, still as a dwelling but of use for tourism. This new use however is subject to discourse in the conservation world as some prefer the continuity of its old function as a residence while discouraging its exploitation for tourism. Nevertheless, while giving much more thought to the present needs of the people, support from the academe and the government has paved way to new design adaptations of Ifugao traditional houses appropriate for the rice terraces (see above illustration). These are seen in guidelines prepared in 2009 for new dwellings in the WH cluster sites.

Traditional settlements as well as Ifugao dwellings clearly show sustainable patterns in building that provide good lessons and models to be followed in new housing and settlement developments. In consideration of addressing demographic changes, these could be emulated and considered in the present by the communities who live in the rice terraces and by the government and other stakeholders as well.

Traditional forest management for heritage sustainability and industry development

As the natural environment surrounding the rice terraces is of much importance as the culture of the people, its sustainability is therefore in equal footing as that of the rice paddies and cultural traditions. This is because water drawn from the forests which are the watersheds sustains the rice terraces. Forests and waterways should therefore be maintained healthy. The planting of indigenous timber species that retain water should be upheld while the introduction of plant species...
that draw water from the ground should be discouraged.

Similarly, traditional forest management is the answer to wood harvesting. One of the ways by which economic progress is foreseen to come into the Province of Ifugao is through the development of its cultural industries. Ifugaos are known wood carvers and trees from surrounding forests are its source for the carving industry. So long as traditional practices in forest resource harvesting are performed, the forests could sustain its resources while equally assisting in providing for the needs of the people.

And as forests provide wood needed to repair houses and for the carving industry, a select number of species could be identified and inventoried so that a systematic approach to wood harvesting could be undertaken. Too much harvesting from privately owned forests could lead to deforestation but the continuous replanting of the same indigenous species would address the concern. UNESCO has identified reforestation as one of the Corrective Measures that would have to be accomplished by the State Party for removal of the property from the Danger List. Reforestation has taken place in some areas in Ifugao but resource mapping would have to be undertaken alongside the constant monitoring of muguongs (privately owned forests) to determine the extent of harvest already done and the areas where reforestation would have to be undertaken. Here, land use management comes into play while the GIS technology could help in resource mapping. With the presence of healthy forests, the Rice Terraces and the communities would end up healthy as well.

A window for intangible cultural heritage in sustainable development

Being an organically evolving cultural landscape, the Rice Terraces and the Ifugao cultural traditions is continuously affected by external pressures but nonetheless there are thriving cultural practices that exist to the present, some of which may have evolved to a different state. These cultural practices are being sustainably maintained through revival efforts initiated by the government in collaboration with the local communities. They come into play and help maneuver the course of action for the future of the place and its people.

One form of cultural practice is the ceremonial rituals which are used as a means of uniting cosmic and ancestor worship with earthly needs. Ifugao people sought the help of the Gods and their ancestors in all aspects of their lives most especially during the agricultural cycle where a good harvest was desired. Ancestor and deity blessings paved way to the conduct of earthly activities as these too had to have their esteem. The baki ritual is performed by mumbakis or native priests who offer butchered animals to the Gods and ancestors while chanting and drinking rice wine in between deliveries. As traditionally done, only the mumbakis and members of the family and those concerned with the activity stay during the ritual.

The baki ritual has been recognized as part of the outstanding universal values of the Rice Terraces because of its being indispensable in the traditional agricultural way of life of the Ifugaos, At present, it has become part of
cultural performances when acted during dances to show to an audience how it was originally performed.

Together with the rituals are the different cultural performances that have become an essential stamp of a trip to the Ifugao mountains. Initially, cultural performances were carried out only during culturally related activities for their own personal or familial purpose. Nowadays however, this has become a must see attraction as one visits the province. Weddings, engagement ceremonies, and everyday activities are depicted in dances and plays which give a colorful glimpse of the traditional Ifugao way of life. Vibrant exchanges in movements, in the use of colorful costumes and in the implements, show the richness of Ifugao traditions. The fascinating tale of the Ifugao way of life as seen in the baki ritual and in Ifugao cultural performances could actually inspire people from different parts of the world to know more about the Rice Terraces. And as a driver for tourism these performances and rituals could become the prime reason for development to set in place.

Traditional building practices as model for new infrastructure

While the present state of the Ifugao WH sites shows the need for the provision of essential infrastructure, a balanced development is desired so that the prime reason for conservation will not be compromised in the process of allowing for the setting in of economic progress.

One infrastructure need is the improvement of traditional roads in the Rice Terraces. Because of the prevalent weather condition of the place, these roads frequently subjected to rainfall constantly deteriorate. With regular use as means for transporting goods and people, these are most often compromised by potholes. And as they cut across mountains with sides naturally unconsolidated, they are forever prone to landslides.

The manner by which these traditional roads were paved allowed for sustainable movement in the WH cluster sites and regulated the flow of impact from external surroundings. This allowed for a self sustaining way by
which local communities lived without much influence from the external.

Local communities however, long for concretely paved roads as these allow convenience of movement of goods and people to and from the area. But concrete roads could lead to uncontrolled development along roadways of the WH cluster sites, which could also be avoided through the formulation and strict implementation of land use and zoning controls. Regulations are most especially needed on land areas adjacent road networks where sporadic building construction could arise.

Similarly within the World Heritage cluster sites are schools established to offer basic education system. In Kiangan and in Batad and Bangaan in Banaue are found elementary schools while Hungduan and Mayoyao have both primary and secondary schools. For Kiangan and the two Banaue cluster sites, secondary education is obtained at the nearest town center – the poblacion and school children travel kilometers to attain secondary education. This system has prevailed for decades and it has in fact achieved resiliency of values where people have realized the hard work associated with attaining education.

Cultural performances as a driver for tourism

Health centers on the other hand are available within the culture sites, but the structures built for them come in modest form. The availability of health facilities becomes a concern when a community member afflicted with illness would have to be brought kilometers to a reliable health center in the nearest poblacion or town.

As provision for these kinds of infrastructure becomes a necessity at the Rice Terraces, the kind and type of construction system is also an important consideration that has to be taken into account. Clearly good reliable road systems, schools and health centres are drivers for development and are most needed in remote rural areas such as the Rice Terraces. Guidelines as to their construction and design should be clearly set to direct governments and the people on what are appropriate for the place. Similarly, controls as to their numbers, size and impact on the site, including the carrying capacity of the place should be greatly considered so that the rural quality of the landscape is maintained and preserved.

Tinawon, the heritage crop and other culturally associated industries as motivators of development

The tinawon rice has been recognized as being essential in preserving the traditional agricultural practices of the Ifugao. It is only with the tinawon rice variety that the rituals of the agricultural cycle (the hongan di page) are performed.
Apart from the outstanding cultural significance of the 
*tinawon*, it has been found to have very high nutritious value 
that makes it attractive to the local and foreign market. 
Its once-a-year cropping makes it more valuable as a rare 
commodity but in a way equally deters economic sustainability 
for the people. Nevertheless, its very high nutritive quality 
makes up for its low quantity harvest when sold as a prime 
and highly priced commodity.

At the Rice Terraces, low lying portions have been planted 
with the high yield (two or three times a year) cropping rice 
varieties. The augmentation of crop revenues from the 
*tinawon* variety could therefore be achieved by encouraging 
its planting in these lower areas.

Relatedly, as the place is rich in a variety of vegetable and plant 
resources, by-products have now been developed as sources 
of revenue for the communities. Available rice and vegetable 
by-products are the rice wine, rice and vegetable cakes and 
others which are continuously being improved and offered 
as highly marketable commodities. These not only encourage 
economic development but bring in cultural development as 
well. Other vegetable and plant by-products related to the 
cosmetic, health and wellness industries could be developed 
and packaged for the local, national and global market as well.

In the same manner culturally associated industries such as 
wood carving and weaving help set economic development.

Ifugao wood carvings and traditional weaves have been 
recognized in the country and are being sold in city centres 
outside the Province such as in Baguio. The need to 
continuously improve these products through the exposure 
of carvers and weavers to trainings and quality development 
workshops is most needed. Making available new trading 
centres for marketing these products will also encourage 
the development and improvement of product lines that are 
acceptable and within standards of the global market.

**Conclusion: The Ifugao heritage trait as driver for 
development**

On the issue of sustainable development in the Rice 
Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, it is apparent from 
the preceding discourse that the model to be emulated 
and considered apt for this WH site is a combination of 
its own traditional model combined with new approaches 
that could boost economic progress for the place. Lessons 
and good examples learned from the rich way of life and 
sustainable living of the Ifugao people could be passed 
on to the present and future generations while regulated 
economic growth through a managed infusion of new 
development and the sustainable use of resources may 
be permitted in consideration of the present needs of 
the people and the natural evolutionary processes taking 
place at the Rice Terraces.

As the site is rich in cultural and natural resources, sustainable
development could only be made possible when majority of the people understand that the richness of their past and their surroundings will have to be conserved and protected while jointly embracing economic progress. And with concerns for impact on the occasion that economic progress is attained, allowing for a regulated type of development would be the answer for the conservation and protection of heritage. Lastly, the possibility of attaining sustainable development is very high at the Rice Terraces despite the present state of living communities where earning a living and ensuring for the provision of their most basic needs comes foremost in their lives. This is because of the amazing inherent trait of the people which it in itself have made possible the construction of their magnificent rice terraces— their resiliency and perseverance to achieve greatness coupled with their pride and high appreciation of their ancestral heritage. This trait would therefore be the prime driver that would achieve good results in heritage conservation and sustainable development.
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La participation de la ville à l'élaboration d'un label européen « Qualicities » s'appuyant sur un référentiel pour la valorisation et l'intégration d'un patrimoine vivant, partagé et levier de développement économique pour la cité, lui permet de mesurer l'impact des moyens techniques qu'elle met en œuvre et de son engagement politique défini selon le plan pluriannuel 2009/2014.

Les investissements financiers exceptionnels réalisés depuis une dizaine d'années, tel que le Plan Patrimoine Antique (100 millions d'euros) ont de réels effets sur le territoire de la Région Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur.

Consciente de cette richesse patrimoniale et culturelle, la Ville d'Arles, en plus des missions de conservation, de gestion et d'animation du patrimoine, s'engage résolument dans un développement touristique, culturel, patrimonial, durable et équitable.

Les études nationales, régionales ou locales ont toutes démontré l'importance des investissements sur le patrimoine. Le bilan de l'étude sur les retombées économiques liées au patrimoine mis en œuvre en partenariat avec le Pôle Industries Culturelles & Patrimoine, la ville d'Arles et l'Office de Tourisme, grâce au soutien de la Région PACA, nous conforte dans le bien-fondé de l'investissement engagé dans ce secteur.

Ainsi, le patrimoine représente pour la ville d'Arles, entre autres, plus de 2 500 emplois directs et indirects, et près de 60 millions d'euros de retombées économiques chaque année. Les investissements publics doivent être poursuivis et renforcés non seulement parce que nous avons la responsabilité de transmettre dignement cet héritage aux générations à venir, mais également parce qu'ils génèrent des retombées économiques indéniables à la vie de notre cité.
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I- LE CENTRE HISTORIQUE DE PRETORIA (TSHWANE) - NICHOLAS CLARKE ET JEAN-PAUL CORTEN

La ville de Pretoria est intéressante en raison de son rôle historique de capitale administrative. La structure de la ville reflète les différentes phases de son développement à travers l’histoire, et toute réhabilitation du centre-ville doit assurer la conservation du tissu urbain historique.

Plusieurs mesures prises dans le passé ont eu un impact sur le centre ville, notamment la ségrégation raciale de l’époque de l’apartheid et les mesures gouvernementales tendant à implanter le quartier administratif hors du centre ville. Cette dernière pratique est toujours en vigueur.


En profitant des incitations fiscales, les acteurs privés ont pu investir dans la conservation du centre-ville, mais la réglementation relative à la construction, très rigide, empêche une réutilisation appropriée des bâtiments restaurés.

II- L’ENQUÊTE DU GETTY CONSERVATION INSTITUTE (GCI) SUR LES PARTENARIATS PUBLIC-PRIVÉ (PPP) - INTERVENTION DE SUSAN MCDONALD

Le GCI présente l’avancement de son enquête destinée à améliorer la gestion des partenariats public-privé (PPP) dans le futur.

Réservés à l’origine aux grands projets d’infrastructures, les PPP sont aujourd’hui déclinés dans un éventail d’opérations de plus en plus large, notamment en matière de sites archéologiques, de collections et de patrimoine naturel. La plupart de ces projets font généralement intervenir trois types de partenaires:

A. Le secteur public
Le gouvernement se préoccupe en premier lieu des aspects financiers. Il est essentiel qu’il fixe des objectifs clairs, mette en place des procédures et des normes, et contrôle les arrangements contractuels. Le secteur public a pour rôle de réduire le risque financier pour les investisseurs, c’est-à-dire de garantir la transparence, la certitude et la cohérence.

B. Le secteur privé
Le secteur privé est intéressé par les bénéfices, mais également par les enjeux sociaux et divers aspects moins chiffrables.

C. Le troisième secteur (ONG)
Enfin, le troisième secteur est intéressé par les aspects sociaux et peut être le catalyseur de l’action gouvernementale. Il peut aussi apporter son concours en matière de consultation publique et d’expertise.
Pour ce partenaire des pouvoirs publics, l’enjeu est de maîtriser efficacement les aspects financiers et contractuels. Dans la plupart des cas, cela requiert le développement de moyens adaptés. Par ailleurs, il est important que le cadre juridique en place soit utilisable pour monter des partenariats public-privé dans le domaine du patrimoine culturel. Le recours à cette forme de coopération est susceptible de se développer vraisemblablement à l’avenir. Par ailleurs, ces partenariats nécessitent des structures de gouvernance rigoureuses afin d’établir un climat de confiance. L’enquête du GCI devrait aider à mettre au jour des informations utiles relatives au concept et à la pratique des PPP.

III- LE DÉVELOPPEMENT ÉCONOMIQUE LOCAL (DEL) EN ISRAËL - INTERVENTION DE LEAH SHAMIR SHINAN ET NILI SHCHORY

L’enjeu principal soulevé par cet exposé réside dans le fait que les administrations nationales imposent trop souvent leur vision du développement aux collectivités locales, ce qui engendre de piètres résultats en matière d’entretien du patrimoine et des occasions manquées pour le DEL.

Les autorités responsables de la conservation du patrimoine doivent partir des besoins locaux pour créer les conditions d’un développement économique local fondé sur une coopération entre les habitants, les collectivités publiques, et les autres partenaires éventuels. L’approche bottom-up est fondée sur le processus en lui-même, elle est multi-disciplinaire et s’inscrit dans la lignée des chartes relatives au patrimoine culturel (ex. La Charte de Burra).

Ce pourrait être l’occasion de mettre en place une meilleure coordination entre les différentes administrations qui permettrait de créer les cadres légaux et juridiques et de consolider les règles théoriques et pratiques de la conservation du patrimoine.

IV- LE NOUVEAU PARADIGME - INTERVENTION DE XAVIER GREFFE

Le patrimoine culturel a connu un changement de perspective : on est passé d’une vision orthodoxe des monuments et sites historiques avec leur potentiel touristique à une vision plus globale qui englobe le patrimoine immatériel et les paysages culturels. Le patrimoine culturel fait partie d’un système complexe qui inclut les diverses valeurs communes. Xavier Greffe propose un nouveau paradigme pour traiter les questions relatives au patrimoine culturel en ayant recours à une approche organique : « les écosystèmes du patrimoine ». Cette approche prend en considération un patrimoine culturel en constante évolution, en étroite liaison avec les industries créatives, ce qui permet de concevoir le patrimoine non comme un fardeau, mais comme un atout.

V- MELBOURNE - RAY TONKIN

La ville de Melbourne a été la plus grande et la plus riche ville d’Australie à la fin du XIXe siècle. Mais depuis les années 1980, la vision grandiose qu’on avait pour Melbourne, comme «ville internationale» sur le mode américain, a été abandonnée au profit d’un modèle plus patrimonial. Aujourd’hui, de nouvelles occasions économiques et sociales se présentent et tirent parti d’un important tissu urbain historique et d’institutions fortes.

La ville a élaboré une stratégie d’aménagement qui se focalise sur des quartiers et un tissu urbain historique denses, et évite les grands aménagements. Les possibilités offertes par le tissu patrimonial jouent aujourd’hui un rôle déterminant dans l’avenir de la ville. Les actions de la société civile ont permis d’influencer sur le calendrier politique et sur les objectifs en matière d’aménagement de la ville.

VI- LES RIZIÈRES EN TERRASSE DES CORDILLÈRES DES PHILIPPINES – JOYCELYN MANANGHAYA

Cet immense bien Patrimoine mondial se trouve dans un endroit isolé, ce qui peut favoriser la sauvegarde des valeurs, mais limite les possibilités économiques. Le développement immobilier non réglementé commence à gagner du terrain dans certaines régions. Ce paysage culturel vivant a besoin d’un développement qui permette la conservation des valeurs mais aussi une évolution des pratiques. Le développement durable doit procéder d’un équilibre entre pratiques nouvelles et traditionnelles ainsi qu’entre valeurs naturelles et culturelles, en adoptant une approche systématique qui permette de favoriser le développement économique et de le gérer, tout en tenant compte de l’interdépendance du système. Il faut mettre en place des programmes éducatifs et d’échange afin de favoriser le développement des compétences des populations et celui des systèmes coopératifs (comme par exemple avec les riziculteurs et le « Ubbu » traditionnels). Enfin, la réponse aux pressions démographiques passe par un plan d’occupation des sols rigoureux. De cette façon, les traditions anciennes seront transmises et la croissance sera régulée, ce qui permettra à l’avenir un développement réellement durable.

VII- L’ÉTUDE DU CAS D’ARLES - CHRISTIAN MOURISARD
Arles présente un modèle de partenariat différent des autres, notamment en ce qui concerne le partage des financements et des bénéfices. Il s’agit d’un partenariat institutionnel entre les différentes instances gouvernementales, les collectivités locales et l’Union Européenne. L’implication d’Arles au sein du label « Qualicities » a permis la valorisation et l’intégration d’un patrimoine vivant et partagé, et a favorisé un développement économique, véritable levier pour la ville. Une étude réalisée en 2008/2009 a mis en lumière le gain économique que représente l’investissement de la ville en faveur son patrimoine, réfutant l’idée que le patrimoine serait un fardeau. Arles est résolument engagé dans le développement d’un tourisme patrimonial et culturel qui soit durable et équitable. Le Plan de Progrès Local, parmi d’autres initiatives, a permis aux communautés de s’approprier leur patrimoine.

La conclusion de cette présentation est que l’investissement public a permis de vrais gains économiques, avec des résultats positifs sur le plan patrimonial. Les investissements doivent être poursuivis et renforcés, entretenus par un dialogue cohérent entre responsables politiques et professionnels.

VIII- QUESTIONS ET DÉBAT

● La discussion qui a suivi les exposés a soulévé les points suivants :
● Le patrimoine est encore très souvent une visée élitaire, et nous avons besoin de mécanismes permettant d’en partager les bénéfices avec les populations locales, en particulier les plus désavantagées, indigènes ou enclavées, comme celles des Philippines et de l’Australie.
● La menace qui pèse sur Gouvernement Hill à Hong Kong, menacée de revente et par d’un redéveloppement immobilier important
● L’implication de la société civile dans le processus de conservation du patrimoine, qui devrait encourager les actions locales et être vigilante pour contrôler l’action des gouvernements.
● La signification et la valeur du patrimoine pour la population locales : partage de la connaissance du patrimoine directement avec les habitants pour améliorer la vie quotidienne (exemple du Glasgow Open Museum)
● Problème de la perte des valeurs patrimoniales lorsque les acteurs privés deviennent gestionnaires de site - Diversification du commerce dans les sites historiques : encourager les petites enseignes plutôt que les habitudes franchises commerciales qu’on retrouve en centre-ville
● Il est nécessaire de disposer d’un soutien politique continu et cohérent pour une meilleure approche de la conservation du patrimoine, mais on constate trop souvent un manque de vision à long terme de la part des politiques.
● Importance de l’éducation
● un aspect qui n’a pas été abordé lors de cette séance
● La nécessité de prendre en compte autant le contexte local que le contexte global

Résumé : Il est nécessaire d’identifier les objectifs des projets patrimoniaux à tous les niveaux. La dimension humaine est au cœur de l’action que nous menons. Il existe presque toujours une diversité d’acteurs dont les compétences, les capacités et les opinions varient, et qui auront en fine une influence sur les projets patrimoniaux. Il est utile de se concentrer sur le « comment », c’est-à-dire les processus de développement économique et les processus de conservation. Nous essayons toujours de répondre au besoin de chiffres pour préciser des valeurs patrimoniales qualitatives, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les valeurs immatérielles, sociales ou culturelles. Les professionnels du patrimoine doivent développer des éléments de langage, des arguments pour faire comprendre aux différents acteurs que le patrimoine est un aout pour le développement.

Nous avons également besoin de ces arguments et de compétences précises pour pouvoir travailler et communiquer avec les promoteurs et les économistes publics.

Quelques nouvelles tendances récentes et qui vont persister :

● Pénurie continue de financements pour la conservation -
● Passage d’un modèle de conservation uniquement statique ou privé à un modèle faisant intervenir plusieurs acteurs
● Priorité à accorder à des résultats durables, sur le plan économique, social et environnemental
● Intégration du patrimoine aux autres problématiques à une étape stratégique de la phase de planification
● Une approche holistique qui doit être effectuée par des équipes multidisciplinaires
● Diversification des «business models»
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I-PRETORIA’S HISTORIC CORE (TSHWANE) – NICHOLAS CLARKE AND JEAN-PAUL CORTEN

Pretoria city is significant due to its historic use as an administrative capital. The city’s structure is evidence of its historic development and any revitalization of the city centre needs to include the conservation of the historic fabric of the centre.

Several past policies have impacted on the city centre, including apartheid-era racial segregation and government policy of locating institutions outside the historic centre. This latter practice continues.

A short-term political focus makes the pursuit of a long-term vision for the city difficult. Spatial analyses of the city centre show a lack of commercial and residential use. The new Integrated Development Plan (2011–2026) discounts heritage.

Taking advantages of national tax incentives, private players have invested in conservation in the city centre but inflexible building regulation prevents adaptive re-use of conserved buildings.

II-GETTY CONSERVATION INSTITUTE (GCI) SURVEYS OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (PPPS) – SUSAN MCDONALD

The GCI reports on the progress of its survey which will inform a better management of the Public Private Partnership process in the future.

The use of Public Private Partnerships, traditionally to deliver large infrastructure projects, is being applied more broadly in recent years, including archeological sites, collections, and natural heritage projects. Most projects involve three types of partners:

A- The public sector
Government is initially motivated by financial considerations. It is essential that government sets clear goals, policies and standards and controls contractual arrangements. The public sector has a role in reducing risk for financial investors (i.e. providing clarity, certainty and consistency).

B- Private sector
The private sector is motivated by profits, but also by social and other ‘softer’ targets in its business plans.

C- ‘The third sector’ (NGOs)
The third sector is motivated by social factors and can be the catalyst for government action. This sector can also assist with consultation and expert advice.

Challenges for the government partner are to control financial and contractual aspects successfully and in many cases this requires capacity building. The legislative framework established by the government is an important factor if
Public Private Partnerships are to be used to preserve heritage. The use of Public Private Partnerships is likely to expand. These partnerships need rigorous governance structures to build trust. The GCI survey should provide useful information regarding the concept and practice of PPPs.

III- LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (LED) ISRAEL – LEAH SHAMIR SHINAN AND NILI SHCHORY

The presentation identified the main challenge as national central government imposing development on local communities resulting in poor outcomes in maintenance but also missed opportunities for LED. Conservation authorities need to create a bottom-up approach to achieve local economic development which would be based on a partnership between local communities and local government and potentially other partners. The bottom-up approach is process oriented, multi-disciplinary and along the lines of the process embodied in heritage charters (e.g. Burra Charter).

There is an opportunity for better integration between levels of government to create the legal and legislative frameworks, and consolidate theoretical and practical guidance for conservation.

IV- NEW PARADIGM – XAVIER GREFFE

There has been a shift in perspective on heritage from the orthodox focus on monuments and sites and their tourist potential to a broad view including intangible heritage and cultural landscape. Heritage is part of a complex system which includes communities’ diverse and shared values.

Greffe proposes a new paradigm for heritage using an organic view of “heritage ecosystems”. This organic view includes the concept of an ever-evolving heritage, linked to creative industries and thus assists us to view heritage, not as a burden but as an asset.

V- MELBOURNE – RAY TONKIN

Melbourne was Australia’s largest and richest city in the late nineteenth century. Since the 1980s, there has been a move away from the grand vision for an “international” city of Melbourne (the American model) towards a conservation model. New social and economic opportunities build on existing strong institutions and the substantial heritage fabric of the city.

The city’s approach to urban design focuses on precincts and neighborhoods and fine grain urban fabric, avoiding grand gestures. Opportunities provided by heritage fabric are now playing an integral role in determining the future of the place. Community activism has played an important role in driving the political agenda and in supporting these planning objectives.

VI- THE RICE TERRACES OF THE CORDILLERAS, PHILIPPINES – JOYCELYN MANANGHAYA

This huge World Heritage property is in an isolated location which protects its values but provides limited economic possibilities. Unregulated development is beginning to encroach in some areas.

This living cultural landscape needs an approach to development which conserves the values and allows an evolution of practices. Sustainable development needs to be achieved through balancing traditional and new practices; balancing natural and cultural values; using a systematic approach to achieve and manage economic development; and recognizing the interdependency of the system. Capacity building in the population needs to be achieved through exchange and educational programs; and developing cooperative systems (e.g. Rice growers and traditional Ubbu). Finally, there is a need to respond to demographic pressures by careful land use planning. The result is that long-standing traditions are passed on and growth is regulated, allowing future development in a sustainable way.

VII- ARLES CASE STUDY – CHRISTIAN MOURISARD

Arles provides a different partnership model from the others presented in terms of the sharing of funding and benefits. The institutional partnership is between various central government bodies and local government and the European Union. Arles’s involvement in the “Qualicities” label involved enhancement and integration of a living and shared heritage, and economic development as leverage for the town. A 2008/2009 economic survey demonstrated the economic success of the city’s investment in its heritage, disproving that heritage is a burden.

Arles is resolutely committed to the development of tourism for heritage and culture which is sustainable and equitable. Among other initiatives, the “Plan de progrès local” empowers the community to ownership their heritage.

The paper concludes that public investment has resulted in clear economic gains as well as good heritage outcomes. Investments should be continued and strengthened, supported by a strong dialogue between policy makers and...
professionals.

VIII- QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Discussion following the papers touched on the following issues:

- Heritage is still very often an elitist pursuit and we need mechanisms for sharing its benefits with local communities, in particular disadvantaged, indigenous and remote communities such as those in the Philippines and Australia.
- The threat to the Government Hill in Hong Kong from sale and massive redevelopment.
- The involvement of civil society in the process of heritage conservation, including advocating for action and as watch-dog over government action.
- Heritage outreach to local communities: sharing heritage knowledge directly with the community and enhancing daily life (for example Glasgow open museum).
- Problem of the loss of heritage values when private players manage a site.
- Diversification of business in a historical site: encouraging more small businesses instead of high street retail.
- Continuity of political support for a conservation approach is critical but there is a lack of long-term vision on the part of politicians.
- The importance of education—an aspect that has not been discussed in this session.
- The need to consider both the local and global contexts.

Summary

There is a need to identify the objectives of heritage projects at all scales. At the core of what we do is the human dimension. There is almost always a diversity of stakeholders with varying capacities, competencies and attitudes which will have an impact on the outcome of a conservation project. It is useful to focus on the ‘how’: the processes of economic development and the processes of conservation.

We are still grappling with the need to provide hard statistics for the soft values of heritage, especially the intangibles of social, aspirational values. Heritage professionals need to develop the language to communicate the benefits of heritage to the various players. We also need the skills and language to engage and communicate with developers and public economists.

Recent and continuing trends include:

- Continuing shortage of funds for conservation
- A shift from state- or privately-driven conservation towards multiple players.
- A focus on sustainable (economic, social and environmental) outcomes.
- An integration of heritage with other considerations at a strategic planning stage - a holistic approach with multidisciplinary teams.
- A diversification of business models.