EUROPEAN SPATIAL RESEARCH AND POLICY
Volume 22 2015 Number 2

PART I

PLANNING SYSTEMS FACING HERITAGE ISSUES IN EUROPE: FROM PROTECTION TO MANAGEMENT, IN THE PLURAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE VALUES OF THE PAST

Guest editor: Anna GEPPERT*

FOREWORD

The present issue of *European Spatial Research and Policy* is the second of two volumes dedicated to 'Planning systems facing heritage issues in Europe: from protection to management, in the plural interpretations of the values of the past'. The concept arose from a meeting held in June 2013 at the conference on 'Changing Cities' in Skiathos, Greece, where a group of planning academics decided to compare the evolution of the relation between heritage protection and spatial planning in a range of European countries.

In the last decades, the definition of and attitude to heritage have changed dramatically. The notion of heritage has been constantly broadening. Progressively, historic monuments and natural sites have been recognized as 'a living witness of age-old traditions' (Venice Charter, ICOMOS, 1964). From single objects, protection has enlarged to whole areas: urban ensembles, historic city centers, historic towns and urban areas (Washington Charter, ICOMOS, 1987), and historic urban landscapes (UNESCO, 2011). This spatial extension of the safeguarded areas made necessary the intervention of planning authorities alongside conservation officers. New planning instruments have been developed to tackle this challenge, conservation plans, buffer zones, etc. Today, the concept of safeguarding encompasses protection, conservation, enhancement, and management (Valletta Principles, ICOMOS, 2011b). This also means that different policies have to be coordinated, e.g. management plans and conservation plans, but also other policies, such as housing, transportation and mobility, economic development, etc.

* Anna GEPPERT, Université Paris-Sorbonne, Institut de Geographie, (9) Rue St Jacques, 75005 Paris, France, e-mail: anna.geppert@paris-sorbonne.fr.

In the course of time, more and more recent elements have become safeguarded. Industrial heritage has been addressed by a large number of projects and policies. In 2011, the ICOMOS tried to define a methodological framework for this heritage consisting of 'sites, structures, complexes, areas and landscapes as well as the related machinery, objects or documents' in the Dublin Principles (ICOMOS, 2011a). More recently the heritage from the modernistic period has captured attention, illustrated by the inscription of Brasilia on the UNECSO World Heritage List in 1987. As a matter of fact, most of this heritage requires adaptation to the evolution of the social and economic environment: new functions for factories which have lost their activity, responses to new life styles in residential areas, etc. The attitude towards heritage has become more and more comprehensive. The Leipzig Charter recognizes the historic dimension as a common value of European cities (Informal Council, 2007). Moreover, heritage is being considered a 'value for society', likely to build common identities (Faro Convention, Council of Europe, 2005).

Finally, the concept has expanded to include intangible heritage, understood as: 'the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage' (UNESCO, 2003). Hence, the recognition of the value of a place, bases its legitimacy on the views of the people and not only the opinion of experts (Florence Convention, Council of Europe, 2000). As a result, heritage policies have to become more participative. Heritage might even become 'a value for promoting peaceful and democratic societies' (ICOMOS, 2014).

As a consequence, heritage protection and management is no longer the sole responsibility of highly specialized State officials. Instead, it has become a competence shared by decision makers of various territorial levels, planning agencies, and the civil society. In most European Member States large parts of historic urban landscapes fall under the care of local governments. They become an element of urban planning and development policies. The integration of heritage issues in other territorial policies requires combining and balancing sometimes conflicting objectives and goals, in the specific setting of a place. While these evolutions take place in all European countries, they have reached different stages. Moreover, they do not follow a single trajectory, but appear as various responses to common drivers. The aim of our range of case studies is to shed light on these responses.

Our first question was whether the values underpinning the definition of, and approach to urban heritage were different from one country to another. Indeed, the growing recognition of heritage as common good is perceived in all our case studies. Not surprisingly, it is more developed in countries which have engaged earlier in heritage policies such as Italy, described by Bertrando Bonfantini or the United Kingdom, depicted by Carol Ludwig and Olivier Sykes. In other cases, the acceptation of the constraints imposed for heritage protection is more difficult,

as illustrated by the cases of post-industrial heritage in Łódź, analyzed by Iwona Pielesiak, or UNESCO sites in Greece, portrayed by Marilena Papageorgiou.

Another explanation lies in the level of wealth of societies, heritage remaining a luxury. This may change when heritage is perceived as a driver of economic development. International organisations foster such approaches (ICOMOS, 2011c; OECD, 2011). However, in many cases, even with ambitious narratives and goals like in Portuguese world heritage cities reported by Elisabete Cidre, implementation remains difficult. Finally, the level of trust in the public administration is another differentiating factor. Yet, perceptions are changing, and sometimes it is the perception of the general public that becomes the driver, as in the wealthy southern fringe of Warsaw analyzed by Adrianna Kupidura.

Our second question was whether the evolution of planning systems was leading to the emergence of institutional frameworks adequate to tackle the challenge of safeguarding heritage. Several European countries have been implementing reforms trying to integrate better heritage protection, spatial planning, and territorial development. Still our cases show a number of hiccups, suggesting that so far, the processes have not reached maturity. The ongoing crises, triggered by the acceleration of economic shortcomings and intensifying society changes (multiculturalism, migrations…) have opened a time of uncertainty, in which further research will be needed.

REFERENCES

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2000), *European Landscape Convention*, adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 19 July 2000 and opened for signature by its Member States in Florence on 20 October 2000.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2005), 'The Faro Convention', *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, adopted in Faro on 27 October 2005.

ICOMOS (1964), 'The Venice Charter', adopted by ICOMOS at the IInd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice 1964.

ICOMOS (1987), 'The Washington Charter', *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas*, adopted by ICOMOS in 1987.

ICOMOS (2011a), 'The Dublin principles', *Joint ICOMOS – TICCIH Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes*, ICOMOS, 28 November 2011.

ICOMOS (2011b), *The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas*, ICOMOS, 28 November 2011.

ICOMOS (2011c), 'The Paris Declaration on Heritage as a Driver of Development', ICOMOS, Paris, 1 December 2011.

ICOMOS (2014), 'The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values', *Declaration of the principles and recommendations on the value of cultural heritage and landscapes for promoting peaceful and democratic societies*, ICOMOS, Florence, 14 November 2014.

INFORMAL COUNCIL OF THE MINISTERS IN CHARGE OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2007), *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities*, adopted by the European ministers responsible for urban policy on 24 May 2007.

OECD (2011), *OECD Regional Outlook 2011, Building Resilient Regions for Stronger Economies*, OECD Publishing, 2011.

UNESCO (2003), *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, 17 October 2003.

UNESCO (2011), *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*, 10 November 2011.