The Needs of New Models of Participatory Governance, in Particular the Role of Economy, Public Authorities and Citizens

Prof. Sergiu Nistor, arch, PhD,
University of Architecture and Urbanism "Ion Mincu" - Bucharest
Chairman of ICOMOS Romania

Since early XIXth century the preservation of the built cultural heritage has been the responsibility of the State. Protecting the built heritage throughout the power of the central administration meant to reinforce the commitment of the public towards the modern state and nation.

Today the protection regime goes beyond the classical ingredients - preservation and conservation - to the education of the public and to the economic and social development of communities through their heritage. In its contemporary meaning heritage preservation also includes the management of the relationship between the heritage, their components and the community that benefits from them, the communication between the institutions and the authorities relevant in the domain, and between them and the citizens. It encompasses even the international cooperation related to the existence of the heritage as a common wealth and field of responsibility. These new approaches - recognized by the EU Commission in its *European agenda for culture in a globalizing world* - determine and require new preservation strategies.

The Council of Europe Faro Convention stipulates "the need to put people and human values at the centre of an enlarged and cross-disciplinary concept of cultural heritage". The Faro Convention therefore gives to the *heritage community*, as well as to the *heritage resource* a central role in defining the heritage and provides the explanation for a relationship of responsibility of the *heritage community* for the management of the *heritage resources*.

In its recent 2014 COMMUNICATION (...): Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe, The EU Commission admits that „many public policies have an impact on heritage, and heritage in turn has many impacts in other policy areas. Therefore a more integrated approach to heritage conservation, promotion and valorisation is needed in order to take into account its manifold contribution to societal and economic objectives, as well as its impact on other public

policies." To address this situation one of the principles suggested by the above mentioned document is to „ continue developing more participative interpretation and governance models that are better suited to contemporary Europe, through greater involvement of the private sector and civil society."

Such a perspective requires a threefold evaluation upon the following:

1. Is built heritage potentially manageable by the private sector and civil society, without risks or direct threats to its cultural values?
2. Are States willing and prepared to step back from their powers and privileges upon the cultural heritage and share responsibilities?
3. Are communities, private sector and civil society willing and prepared to commit to the participative interpretation and preservation governance of their built heritage, at least partly?

Is the built heritage manageable by the private sector and the civil society?

The answer is, in my opinion, definitely YES, on condition that authorities responsible with the built heritage play their role. Examples like the Schoenbrunn Palace – Wien / Austria, a WHS, run by a private enterprise or the more modest Viscri WH Village with Saxon Citadel in Transylvania – Romania witness for the capability of both private bodies or communities to management the built heritage, even its most valuable examples.

We stress that there are numerous cases in which the lack of competences of the private entities running heritage sites, together with the lack of proper control by the authorities, jeopardized the cultural value of the monuments. The Rasnov Citadel, as well as the XXth century architecture in Bucharest (Romania), or the XXth century modernist houses in Balchik (Bulgaria), and beyond the EU borders the House and studio of arch. Melnikov (Moskow/Russia) are just a few of such cases.

Mention shall be made about the fact that public management doesn't exclude the risks and the threats for the built cultural heritage. The recent published ICOMOS Heritage at Risk World Report 2012-2013 highlights several cases of misled restoration and interpretation occurring at important historic sites publicly (or even stately) managed: Austria's Semmering Railway WHS, Bulgaria's Sozopol, Ratiaria historic sites and Nessebar WHS, Gyor Danube Gate archaeological site in Hungary, etc. This means that emphasis shall be given not to the legal status of the curator, but to its expertise and, especially, to the capacity of the relevant authorities to provide advice, enforce it and control the state of conservation and monitor the actual running of the heritage site.

The State and is duties towards built heritage

The second aspect relates to the role that States have to play in the future with respect to their traditional duties towards the built cultural heritage. It calls for a more in depth analysis. Historic monuments in the early statutory lists displayed only the major facts, events, achievements and qualities of the nation as an entirety. In modern times heritage significance shifted from *Mono-cultural* and *Nationally important* towards *Local distinctiveness* expressing *Values of different cultures* so will its management change from *Separate conservation* to *Integrated conservation*, from *Expert led* to *Community led* interpretation, and consequently from *Stately led* to *Communities led* responsibilities.[1] (**Table 1**). With respect to these processes it is necessary to drive the public policies from pure regulation to encouraging participation and sharing responsibilities.

Decentralization as a tool

One of these methods might be the decentralization of the built environment management. When approaching the issue of decentralization in France, the *Bady Report* (2002) convened that the actual french system is „too jacobinian": *« (…) [le patrimoine] constitue une source de l'identité nationale, mais qu'une interprétation trop "jacobine" a été donnée à cette idée jusqu'à présent et **qu'il convient de passer d'une politique étatiste à une politique nationale.** En effet, dans la situation actuelle, l'Etat est omniprésent, même si les collectivités territoriales sont devenues peu à peu des partenaires, si le rôle des associations s'est développé et si, dans leur ensemble, les propriétaires acceptent plus aisément la protection de leurs bâtiments. »[2].* The *Bady Report* stresses upon the set-backs of the current centralized management of the built heritage in France and proposes a transfer to the owner of the responsibility for the carrying out of the restoration works (including the responsibility for the correct use of the State funding); as well the transfer of all public monuments other than the ones of major national importance to the local communities and the seting up of stewardship/management agreements between the State and the local comunities or private entities.

---

[1] Kate CLARK, *From regulation to participation: cultural heritage, sustainable development andcitizenship,* FORWARD PLANNING: THE FUNCTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN A CHANGING EUROPE, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 2001, p. 112, http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Resources/Publications/ECC-PAT%282001%29161_EN.pdf, accessed 25.11.2014

[2] Jean Pierre BADY*, REFLEXIONS ET PROPOSITIONS POUR UNE POLITIQUE NATIONALE DU PATRIMOINE* (Etat, collectivités territoriales et secteur privé), La Documentation Francaise, 2002, pag.3, http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/var/storage/rapports-publics/024000594/0000.pdf, accessed 25.11.2014

	FROM	TO
Definition of Heritage	Monuments	Landscapes
	Buildings	Urban Areas
	Sites	Historic Environment/Cultural heritage
Role of Heritage in Society	National Unity	Respect for cultural diversity
	Generate revenue from visitors	Wider Economic benefits Social Benefits
Decisions	State	Region/locality
	Authoritarian	Democratisation Participation
Professionals	Experts	Facilitators
	Single discipline (e.g. buildings, archaeology)	Multi-skilled professionals
	Historical knowledge	Management Skills
Significance	Old	Industrial heritage Post-war buildings
	Aesthetic	Commemorative value
	National importance	Local Distinctiveness
	Mono-cultural	Values of different cultures
	Narrow range of values	Wide range of values
Interpretation	Expert led	Community led
Responsibilities	State led	Communities The Market/Private sector
	Heritage sector	Environmental sector
Management Practices	Designation	Characterisation
	Separate conservation	Integrated conservation
	Site based	More strategic
	Technical research	Philosophical research

Table 1. Trends in heritage management in Europe. Kate Clark, *From regulation to participation: cultural heritage, sustainable development and citizenship*

The *Bady Report* emphasizes upon a very important issue: decentralization and the taking over of responsibilities by the local authorities is not a withdrewall of the State from its fundamental responsibility: it is the State that guarantees that all future generations will be able to profit from the cultural wealth of the country, and that all citizens have fair acces and are able to enjoy the values of the historic monuments.

Listing powers and statutory lists

The spinal cord, the most powerful instrument of the authorities and the symbolic nucleus in historic buildings preservation rests in the listing procedure. This has been since late XIXth century the attribute of the State. Aparently nothing has changed in the listing philosophy since late XIXth century except for an extremely precise and productive mechanism the national States implement

for the last century. A recent study[3] upon the built heritage stock and density in 18 of EU countries reveal that we have almost 5 historic monuments for each 1000 inhabitants and one can find 1 historic monuments while walking on average half a mile in any direction. This stock increased in the last decade by 8,5% in Netherlands, by 8,3% in Hungary, by8,25% in France, by 7% in the Czech Republic. Aparently the listing instrument is so effective to the point that some people claim that it is too productive, threatening the economic development of the towns and territories thru its spreading and constrains. It is far from being true (as **Table 2** below shows): the GDP has nothing to do with the patrimonial density, on the contrary, one can see that countries with an economic lagging behind don't face this due to an exagerate number of monuments. On the contrary, it is much more evident that economic soundness is accompaniued by a higher patrimonial density.

Country	Surface (kmp)	Population (Mil. inh.)	GDP($) /inh. *IMF	HM	HM/ 1000 kmp	Ranking MI/ 1000sq.km	HM/ 1000 inh.	Ranking MI/ 1000 inh.
Romania	238,391	19.0	17,440	19,880	83.5	13	1.04	15
Norvegia	385,252	5.0	64,363	6,000	15.6	17	1.20	14
Danmark	43,094	5.6	43,080	29,000	672.9	5	5.17	4
Finland	338,432	5.4	40,045	2,982	8.8	18	0.55	17
Germany	357,121	82.0	43,475	747,970	2,094.4	2	9.12	2
England	130,395	53.1	36,208	396,347	3,039.6	1	7.46	3
France	543,965	65.3	39,813	43,720	80.3	14	0.66	16
Austria	83,879	8.5	44,402	41,000	488.8	7	4.82	5
Netherlands	41,543	16.7	46,440	50,048	1,204.7	3	2.99	8
Czech R.	78,866	10.3	27,347	38,700	490.7	6	3.75	7
Portugal	92,391	10.6	25,643	4,264	46.2	16	0.40	18
Slovakia	48,845	5.4	26,616	14,818	303.4	8	2.74	9
Slovenia	20,273	2.0	28,512	23,206	1,144.7	4	11.60	1
Lithuania	65,200	3.2	25,374	8,649	132.6	10	2.70	10
Latvia	64,589	2.2	22,832	3,396	52.6	15	1.54	12
Hungary	93,030	10.0	23,236	12,000	129.0	11	1.20	13
Estonia	45,226	1.3	26,052	5,250	116.1	12	4.03	6
Bulgaria	110,994	7.4	16,518	19,364	174.4	9	2.61	11
TOTAL 18	2,781,486	313.0		1,466,594	527.2		4.68	
TOTAL 28	4,422,773	507.4						

Ranking Ist   Ranking IInd   Ranking IIIrd   Ranking last

Table 2: architectural monuments in the European countries: figures and economic indicators

Listed buildings, protected areas and the state monopoly upon the built heritage management

With respect to the growing number of protected buildings and respectively to the encreased size of the protected areas in towns and villages - according to their planning powers, regulations and

---

[3] Sergiu NISTOR, The Romanian National Register of Historic Monuments: The Heritage Phobia and the Need of an Objective Analysis, CAIETELE ARA 5 (ARA REPORTS), Arhitectura, restaurare, Arheologie Publishing House, Bucuresti, 2014, pp. 211-216

decisions - local authorities are responsibles for far more protected buildings than the State is, due to its listing powers. In Romania's capital only, the decision of the municipality of Bucharest to establish 98 Protected Built Areas lead to almost 10.000 protected building (approximatively 1/2 of the total number of architectural monuments in the National List) whose owners have to ask for the approval of the Ministry of Culture for any repairwork and re-development.

It is reasonable to admit that in Europe, due to the planning system establishing *Zones de Protection du Patrimoine Architectural, Urbanistique et Paysager* (France), *Town and Village reserves* (Czech republic, Slovakia), *Conservation Areas* (UK) or similar, there is already a huge stock of protected built heritage that emerges not from the central authorities but from local decisions. There are also some listing systems that allow to local authorities to have their own contribution to the statutory lists comprising historic monuments. Tasks are decentralized to regional authorities in the Czech Republic and Slovakia as these countries have two classes of listed buildings. Ireland, Hungary and Portugal allow the local authorities to declare protected buildings based on their symbolic role for the local culture, while Spain recognizes this power as well for the State and for both regions and municipalities. In the Netherlands decentralization of the approval competences to municipalities is allowed only if they set up expert consultative commissions, while in Portugal, the local authorities establish the protection regime for the heritage with local importance.

Conclusion is that the European States already started sharing their listing powers, either by splitting their duties with the local communities, or throughout the decentralization of planning powers to local or regional bodies. Since quite a while our historic environment is no longer the product and the monopoly of the central agencies but largely the outcome of local decisions leading to local responsibilities.

New Models of Participatory Governance

The possibility to implement new models of participatory governance relates closely with the legal, administrative, economic and technical capacity of the communities, of the private sector and of the civil society willing to commit themselves, at least partly, in the interpretation and preservation of their built heritage. Very briefely, several cases show what ingredients are necessary in order to encourage theparticipatory governance and make it succesfull.

Complementing the role of the State in monitoring and preventive conservation

The Monument Watch in Scotland, Monumentenwacht in Flanders and Netherlands, extending nowadays in Slovakia and Hungary. The not for profit association established a monitoring and

inspection system for historic buildings inscribed in the association. The succes of the model rely upon the technical capacity of the providers and on the profitable balance between the costs and the gain for the owners of historic buildings.

Volunteering for maintenance or heritage at risk campaigns

Organisations like Rempart are focused upon the volunteer activities. Other organizations with a broader heritage profile initiate volunteer campaigns or programs (Pro Patrimonio, English Heritage, Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz). The succes of this model of management depends on the existance of a local platform of interest for the monument that is saved thru volunteer activities. Despite this the results are not lasting. It means that volunteer activities in the technical field are to be complemented by communication and awareness raising campaigns.

Built heritage management as a sustainable development tool: local trusts

Mihai Eminescu Foundation Viscri initiative *The Sustainable Village* promotes the green, socially inclusive development of a remote WHS village world renouned thru HRH The Prince of Wales frequent trips in the area. The initiative is based upon the ownership of the main heritage assets of the village by the initiators and the power of the comunity to regain control over its development and regeneration capacity throughout traditional skills. It is crucial in such initiatives to bind tangible and intangible heritage togather in a program that stimulates local pride.

Managing local heritage thru local civic heritage associations / foundations.

Rising either from the british model of the Conservation area Advisory Committee, or from the local protest groups against late 1960's redevelopment projects, local heritage associations are common in historic cities centres or in assisting the statutory bodies in managing World Heritage Sites. The merit of such initiatives is that they succed in using many times advise, support or incentives instead of constrains, constant monitoring instead of post-factum legal claims and provide a steady social platform for the heritage community. Such management model is succesful if it doesn't repeat or copy what authorities do or are supposed to do but tackle issues that the State or the local council have little means to solve.

Heritage trusts

The paramount example for this kind of management is the National Trust in England, established early XXth century and succeeding in becoming one of the wealthiest landowner in England. Its succes rely on the fiscal regulation that grants both the former owner as well as to the Trust

advantages that encourages the public access to historic properties as well as sources of income to be used for maintenance. The model has recently spread in countries of the former Eastern block (i.e. Pro Patrimonio in Romania). It is highly dependant upon the legal framework encouraging the transfer of properties to the trust in compensation with tax reliefs.

Managing the built heritage as a clinic for academic or life long learning

The model of Raymond Lemaire's Grand Beguinage of KU Leuven has spread. Many historic buildings and ensembles are the place were students study or young workers practice the traditional building skills. Particularly spread in Germany (thru the work of Handwerkskammers) and low-countries (i.e. Aarenberg Kasteel and Groot Begijnhof in Leuven), the model has followers in Eastern Europe such as the Bontida Castle ran by Transylvania Trust or the Schoenberg Saxon Citadel ran by the Bucharest University of Architecture (Romania). Such models are, unfortunately, difficult to replicate, as they depend upon the existance of universities or training platforms in the vicinity of the historic area.

Conclusions

The examples show that the legal and technical capacity of the non-statal entities engaged into the management of the built heritage is a critical issue. In their management approach, the non statal entities rely sometimes upon their ownership of the historic buildings or, more often, upon a publicly recognized management capacity. The scarcity of public budgets and technical staff within the public authorities made the supply of know-how the NGO's can bring even more valuable.

A second important ingredient is the background of social or corporate awareness about the built heritage playing an important role in the local or corporate identity. The social capital of the heritage communities is one of their assets, as built heritage can foster communication between social strata, between different generations and cultural backgrounds. The involvement of the non-statal entities in the management of built cultural heritage increases the contribution and the participation of the marginalized cathegories of citizens.[4]

The built heritage has an important economic dimension. According to the European Construction Industry Federation, in 2013 renovation and maintenance represented 27.5 billion Euros. In 2007-

---

[4] Paul Drury and Sarah Wolferston describe 8 levels of public involvement, from passive to active: reactive intervention, no formal participation, information, consultation-improving access, consultation-taking into account community values, participation – encouraging the role of communities as constructive critics, cooperation – joint action, cooperation – community responsibility. Paul Drury , Sarah Wolferstan, *Monitoring the Granada Convention*, CoE (2010)

2013, the European Regional Development Fund allocated €3.2 billion for protecting and preserving cultural heritage, €2.2 billion to develop cultural infrastructure and €553 million for cultural services, which also benefited cultural heritage.[5] Out of this funds countries like Romania spend for heritage 1,3% of the structural funds allocated, Poland and Austria 1,8%, Hungary and Bulgaria 2,0%, Slovakia 2,3%, Greece 3,1%. In the case of Romania the almost 200 Mil Euros meant 3 times more the national budget for restoration in the same period.

The social and economic importance of the built cultural heritage might lead to the conclusion that such a fragile domain and in the same time with such a consistent social and economic impact is not safe to be run thru participatory governance. We have to acknowledge the limits of the participatory models, esspecially the need for a specialized advice and control upon the actions of the private entities or the local authorities taking care of their heritage.We have nevertheless to admit that participatory governance is already a positive reality of the cultural heritage preservation. Developing the partnership with the private sector is for years one of the strategic lines of action in UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Working thru arms length bodies or thru charitable trusts is a practice for decades in UK. Germany encourages trade chambers in re-descovering and promoting the traditional building skills. The new EU membders are proud of their customary systems of conservation and management of the vernacular architecture.

Is then participatory governance a solution or a cause for a retreat of the State from its traditional duties? In my oppinnion it will never be the case of a state-free preservation and management of the built heritage. As the State is the platform where present day interests are harmonized with the ones of future generations, as long as we believe that our grand-children have the right to enjoy at least the same cultural and natural resources we have inherited from our ancestors, the State institutions will have a role to play in this bussines.

---

[5] COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS: Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe, p.10