

Learning from a Legacy : Venice to Valletta

Citation for published version (APA):

Veldpaus, L., & Pereira Roders, A. R. (2014). Learning from a Legacy : Venice to Valletta. *Change over Time*, 4(2), 244-263. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cot.2014.0022>

DOI:

[10.1353/cot.2014.0022](https://doi.org/10.1353/cot.2014.0022)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2014

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.



PROJECT MUSE®

Learning from a Legacy: Venice to Valletta

Loes Veldpaus, Ana Pereira Roders

Change Over Time, Volume 4, Number 2, Fall 2014, pp. 244-263 (Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press

DOI: [10.1353/cot.2014.0022](https://doi.org/10.1353/cot.2014.0022)



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cot/summary/v004/4.2.veldpaus.html>



LEARNING FROM A LEGACY

Venice to Valletta

LOES VELDPAUS

Eindhoven University of Technology

ANA PEREIRA RODERS

Eindhoven University of Technology

Figure 1. Historic urban landscapes across the globe (from left to right, top to bottom): the roofscape of Florence, Italy; the sightline in Philadelphia, United States; people at Coney Island, New York; people in Guanzhou, China; traditional ensembles in Tavira, Portugal; the modern urban grid of Santiago de Chile; fading details in Palermo, Sicily; the magical urban setting of Durham, United Kingdom, 2007-14. (Loes Veldpaus)

Experts have been gathering for decades to discuss their ideals and experiences in heritage management. One of their objectives is the search for common ground and the clarification of best practice guidelines, to be endorsed and applied worldwide. However, in the past half-century, the reality and ideals of cultural heritage management have shifted significantly. This paper will reveal and discuss how this shift is evident in the field's professional guidelines.

What triggered this shift in heritage theory? And how did the concept of heritage evolve over the past decades? First, a literature review will discuss current theory on this topic. This is complemented by a comparative analysis of seven key doctrinal documents. The selection ranges from the Venice Charter (ICOMOS, 1964) to the Valletta Principles (ICOMOS, 2011). The content will be systematically analyzed using a descriptive-analytical method from the narrative tradition in evidence-based policy evaluation research (Pawson 2002 [see reference 26]). Results are presented in a summary matrix, tracing and comparing the evolution of what is considered heritage and why.

A correlation of the results will reveal triggers and ideologies behind this shift in the heritage concept over time. It will also provide some recommendations to shape the agendas for research in heritage theory, policy, and practice in relation to heritage management and sustainable development.

Changing Principles on and Approaches to Heritage

What is now called “cultural heritage management” has in the past primarily focused on the protection of monuments and areas designated as cultural heritage.¹ Cultural heritage has seen a shift in theory, leading to changed principles and approaches. From an approach that avoided changes at all costs, protection is now defined as an approach in which changes are managed rather than prevented; preferably, in relation to the connected communities and their sustainable future.² As a result, cultural heritage management has been moving toward a more inclusive approach, especially when it comes to managing heritage located in urban areas, which are constantly evolving and changing to meet the needs of their communities.

The earlier approach was focused on the protection of the tangible dimension of cultural heritage assets, for example, building materials, façades, or (groups) of buildings. Although this approach unquestionably helped to retain the cultural significance conveyed by those tangible remains, cultural heritage management was mostly defined by an intolerance to change. This positioned protection opposite development, given that one of the few constants in urban management is that cities will change over time. To overcome this dichotomic relation between urban (or even human) development and heritage management, the global discourse on heritage management has evolved considerably over the past

decades. Notions such as the intangible, setting and context, and urban and sustainable development are included in current theory, as is a greater consideration of the socio-economic needs of (historic) cities and their communities.³ This so-called landscape-based approach aims to manage change and integrates heritage management into the larger framework of urban development.

The origins of such a landscape-based approach can be traced back in theories to at least the beginning of the twentieth century, when the link between urban development and urban heritage was first discussed.⁴ It was only some thirty years ago that urban management started to be intentionally explored in parallel with heritage theory and practices.⁵ At the same time, cities became strategic in their urban management.⁶ This resulted in a widening of expertise and a more trans-disciplinary interest in the city, culminating in the promotion of an independent field of urban sciences.⁷ Sassen argues that cities in the 1980s became “a lens into the larger economic and political struggles of an emergent new global epoch” and relates this tendency to the increased urge to rebuild entire urban centers, and prepare them to become platforms for the current urban century.⁸ The subsequent development pressures in urban areas reinvigorated the need for understanding and protecting the urban landscape as a social construct that is an important part of (inter)national, regional, and local identity, as well as morphology, history, and memory.⁹ In short, this is what experts would now call a landscape-based approach, an approach that reconsiders, reuses, and retains heritage not only from an object perspective, but also from a cultural, socioeconomic, ecological, and urban perspective. In this process, preservation became a driver for sustainable development.¹⁰ Thus, departing from a strong intolerance to change, change is now being managed using heritage as a driver for urban development. A common way to stimulate and support the implementation of this approach in subnational policy is to simulate the integration of heritage management into the larger framework of urban development through its socioeconomic and urban policies.

This landscape-based approach is expected to be positioned even more centrally in cultural heritage management, as a key approach that fosters sustainable development.¹¹ Such expectations are largely built on theory, although they have already proven to be successful in a few case studies.¹² Moreover, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations have recently defined strategies to address it, for example Council of Europe, UNESCO, and ICOMOS.¹³ Nonetheless, the implementation of the landscape-based approach in sub-national policy remains a challenge to be solved.¹⁴ The steps to be taken to introduce the landscape-based approach into sub-national policy is a process of adapting existing policy or developing new policy; therefore, it is important to know where the specific policy currently stands.

Happaerts and Van Den Brande show that the international discourse plays a significant role in triggering sustainable development policies at the sub-national level.¹⁵ Global summits and events in particular are important, although their influence is not uniform. In addition, Waterton, Smith, and Campbell state that heritage policy documents developed at (sub) national and transnational levels are often related in a significant—though complex—way.¹⁶ For the purpose of this research, it is assumed that the influence of

international discourse on subnational heritage policy is indeed significant and traceable in subnational policy. As such, local policies are expected to reflect (fragments of) one or more international documents and potentially reveal the rationale for such relations.

Over the past century, governments and heritage experts began to organize themselves in organizations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS. One of these organizations' endeavors was to organize global events, in order to discuss and adopt best-practice guidelines and doctrines by means of conventions and charters. The aim of this paper is to systematically reveal and discuss differences in concepts and definitions, as used throughout this half-century in such documents, and classify them as a first attempt to build a domain-dependent descriptive taxonomy for heritage management. Such evolution can, for example, be used to analyze subnational policies, so that differences (intentional or not) and outmoded fragments in subnational policies can be revealed. Such results can be used as a trigger for further discussion, research, and (if necessary) a revision of those policies. It can also reveal gaps in the doctrinal documents, such as when the local concepts of heritage are not easily reflected on or positioned within such a taxonomy.

Several authors have discussed the shift in principles and approaches in heritage management theory, especially in relation to the past half-century. However, most studies compare the "old concept" to the "new concept" or even propose to highlight one over the other.¹⁷ In this perspective, new ideas may seem revolutionary and rootless. In this research, the assumption is that there is an evolution, and thus a relation, between old and new concepts. This relation is seldom discussed, let alone revealed in a systematic way. There are some instructive topical studies, for example, on values, on the (in)tangible dimension of heritage, or on specific approaches such as urban conservation, cultural landscape, and cultural diversity.¹⁸ It was only in the work of Van Oers and Pereira Roders that more encompassing attempts were made to understand and discuss the evolution of concepts in heritage management.¹⁹ This research evolves from their work.

Methodological Approach

To reveal the concepts—and related taxonomy—in heritage management theory, a systematic analysis of the doctrinal documents has been conducted using a descriptive-analytical method from the narrative tradition. It is a method often used in comparative literature studies, as it provides for a systematic, objective method for synthesizing research on a given topic.²⁰ All documents are examined in relation to an analytical framework, applying the same template of features to each document scrutinized.²¹

To do so, such an analytical framework must first be developed. This was done by deriving the common denominators in existing frameworks, with the similar aim of analyzing heritage management-related documents. Three analytical frameworks from Van Oers, Pereira Roders, and Landorf were found relevant.²² Van Oers suggests a template that determines (1) the definition of heritage, (2) the general principles, (3) the identified threats, and (4) the strategies and tools.²³ This analysis was set up as more an indicative overview than a comprehensive analysis; it is a template for analysis with yet little actual application. Pereira Roders built a framework for analysis that reveals the relation between

Table 1. Comparative analysis of theoretical frameworks of the transnational cultural heritage policy. (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders)

Pereira Roders (2007)	Van Oers (2007)	Landorf (2009)	Common denominators
Object + Site (what and where)	Definition (What is heritage)	Situation analysis (What is in situ)	WHAT (What is heritage)
Aims + Values (Why intervene, what values)	General principles, threats (Why do we protect)	Community values and attitudes (Why are things considered heritage)	WHY (Why do we protect) (Why is something considered heritage)
Actions + Tools + Time (What, when, and how)	Strategies + tools (How)	Strategic Orientation, objectives (How)	HOW (How is it managed, process) (How is it managed, tools)
Actors (Who is involved)	–	Stakeholder participation (Who is involved when)	WHO (Who is involved in heritage management)

eight fundamental factors: (1) objects (of cult), (2) values, (3) tools, (4) aims, (5) actors, (6) actions, (7) time, and (8) site.²⁴ This in turn relates the role of cultural resources in sustainable urban development beyond its own tangible existence and context, including the stakeholders, the values they convey, their aims, tools, and actions toward cultural resources. A systematic analysis on international policy between 1877 and 2005 was performed on the factors of objects (of cult), values, and actions. Landorf built a theoretical framework to assess management plans for world heritage, based on theory and doctrinal documents.²⁵ However, she presents the results of that assessment without detailing or discussing the methods behind the assessment framework itself. She uses the following subdivisions: (1) situation analysis, with sub-questions relating to “what is heritage”; (2) strategic orientation, with sub-questions relating to the identification of the goals and objectives; (3) community values and attitudes with sub-questions relating to the identification of local values; and (4) stakeholder participation, with sub-questions relating to who is involved.

Common denominators are summarized in the following four main questions:

1. What is defined as heritage?
2. Why is something considered to be heritage?
3. How is heritage being managed?
4. Who is involved in heritage management?

Those four questions led to the systematic analysis of the doctrinal documents (Table 1). Therefore, the results presented in this article are a contribution to raise understanding

Table 2. Used conventions and charters. (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders)

	Full name	Author	Date	Shortened name
1	International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites	ICOMOS	1964	Venice Charter
2	Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage	UNESCO	1972	WH-Convention
3	Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas	ICOMOS	1987	Washington Charter
4	Charter for Places of Cultural Significance	ICOMOS (AU)	1999	Burra Charter
5	Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage	UNESCO	2003	Intangible Heritage
6	The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas	ICOMOS	2011	Valletta Principles
7	Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape	UNESCO	2011	HUL Recommendation

of the application of the fundamental factors, going one step further toward the development of an assessment framework to enable an overview of where subnational policies stand in their implementation of the landscape-based approach.

Analyzing and comparing a set of seven international policy documents (Table 2) using the analytical framework (Table 1), this study synthesized the evolution of the answers to the four main questions (Table 3). This analysis focuses on seven of the most relevant international documents on heritage. They were selected as follows: first, the two most recent documents were selected to include the most recent concepts and develop as far as possible the evolution on theory on heritage in an urban context. Those documents comprise UNESCO's *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape* and ICOMOS' *The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns, and Urban Areas*.²⁶ In addition, this analysis included each decade's most representative standard-setting document on cultural heritage management in an urban context. For this, only the *Conventions* by UNESCO and *Charters* by ICOMOS were considered as a pre-selection (Table 2). The UNESCO Conventions are legally binding, and as such, are expected to exert greater influence in (sub)national policy than other standard-setting documents.²⁷ The two relevant Conventions in this case are the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* and the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, which is also the most ratified global treaty for cultural and natural heritage protection.²⁸

In addition, three ICOMOS charters were selected: *The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (the Venice Charter); the *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas* (the Washington Charter); and the

Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter).²⁹ The Venice Charter is considered a very, if not the most, influential charter on heritage preservation.³⁰ The Washington Charter holds influence as a document drafted by ICOMOS and as the first international charter that specifically addresses the value of heritage on an urban scale. The Burra Charter is a regional document, yet it continues to hold international importance due to its global recognition of the role of cultural significance in heritage management.³¹

The analysis of the documents was conducted in two steps. First, the doctrinal documents were analyzed individually by pre-coding using the four questions, leading to a summary addressing the four questions for each document. Second, those summaries were combined into the analytical framework (Table 3) using the leading questions; building a set of categories and subcategories as found in the analysis, this led to a classification (see Tables 4, 5, and 6). The synthesis of the doctrinal documents into the matrix facilitates comparative analysis between the doctrinal documents.

This paper compares the outcomes of the first and second question: *What is defined as heritage?* and *Why is something considered to be heritage?* For both questions, the main definition has been extracted, followed by a classification of the related notions into specific categories. Those are revealed and discussed. Further, the systematic comparison of the questions on *what* and *why* will be positioned in the wider context of heritage management theory.

What Is Heritage and Why?

The **Venice Charter** defines heritage as a historic monument, which can either be a single architectural work or an urban or rural setting that has “acquired cultural significance with the passing of time.”³² The aim of heritage management is to safeguard heritage for the benefit of future generations. A historic monument can embody the evidence of particular uses or traditions of past generations, a significant development, or a historic event. Also, a historic monument is inseparable from both its historic and physical setting. The specific—mostly formal and stylistic—elements to be aware of terms of significance are items of sculpture or painting, composition, technical features, typology, decoration, layout, style, color, mass, and scale or their relation with each other, their setting, or their surroundings. The integrity and authenticity of cultural heritage is to be protected in all its richness because of its aesthetic, artistic, and/or historic value from any period in time. In addition to those explicitly mentioned values, the text also includes more implicit references to what is valued. Significance is acquired “with the passing of time”; therefore, age in itself also seems to be valued. Also, a scientific value seems to be recognized by describing heritage as evidence of civilization and the witness to age-old traditions, and by defining technical features as possible elements of significance.

The **World Heritage Convention** defines three specific types of cultural heritage: monuments, groups of buildings, and sites.³³ Separately, it also defines three types of natural heritage. Those types evolved as can be found in the UNESCO Operational Guidelines, and the sites that are “combined works of nature and of man” are now known as cultural landscapes.³⁴ The Convention is written so as to single out those cultural and

Table 3. Analysis of selected charters and conventions since the 1964 Venice Charter. (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders)

	VENICE [1960's]	WH-CONVENTION [1970's]	WASHINGTON [1980's]	BURRA [1990's]	WH-INTANGIBLE [2000's]	VALLETTA [2010's]	HUL [2010's]
WHAT-main	historic monument	cultural heritage	cultural property	place of cultural significance	heritage	historic areas and surroundings	historic urban landscape
	single architectural work; urban or rural setting	monuments; groups of buildings; sites	(historic) urban area; setting	historical record of any scale; setting	(tangible support for) intangible attributes	tangible attributes; intangible attributes	tangible attributes; intangible attributes
WHAT-specific*	T] object T] area — I] asset related I] societal —	T] object T] area T] landscape I] asset I] societal —	T] object T] area — I] asset related I] societal —	T] object T] area T] landscape I] asset I] societal —	T] object T] area T] landscape I] asset I] societal —	T] object T] area T] landscape I] asset I] societal I] process	T] object T] area T] landscape I] asset I] societal I] process
WHY-main	it has acquired cultural significance over time; imbued with a message from the past	to single out those heritage properties that are most representative, unique and irreplaceable (OUV)	it constitutes memory of mankind, expresses historic character	it expresses cultural identity and experience	it is a mainspring of cultural diversity and cultural dialogue, guaranteee of sustainable development	it is an essential resource, as part of the urban ecosystem	it constitutes a key testimony to humankind's endeavours and aspirations through space and time
WHY-specific**	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> age — — —	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> — <u>social</u> ecological — —	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> age <u>social</u> ecological <u>economic</u> political	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> — <u>social</u> <u>ecological</u> — —	<u>historic</u> — <u>scientific</u> age <u>social</u> ecological <u>economic</u> political	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> — <u>social</u> <u>ecological</u> <u>economic</u> political	<u>historic</u> <u>aesthetic</u> <u>scientific</u> age <u>social</u> <u>ecological</u> <u>economic</u> political

*T = Tangible; I = Intangible

**underlined font = mentioned explicitly in text; normal font = mentioned implicitly in text

natural heritage properties that are most representative, unique, and irreplaceable, and therefore of outstanding universal value. These properties are to be preserved for humankind as a whole, ensuring their transmission to future generations. Cultural heritage can be revealed from a historic, aesthetic (art and architecture), scientific, or social (ethnological or anthropological) point of view. It is the result of the genius and the history of the peoples of the world, no matter to whom it may belong. UNESCO defines the “site” as “works of man or the combined works of nature and man,” although it is specifically considered within a historical, aesthetic, ethnological, or anthropological point of view.³⁵ As such, nature becomes a possible feature, implicitly introducing the ecological value, though only in relation to the other explicitly defined values.

The **Washington Charter** defines heritage as a cultural property that constitutes the memory of humankind, emphasizing the (historic) urban area, which is not delimited in size or scale. It should include all spiritual and material elements that express the (historic) character, including functional and formal/stylistic features and the relationship of all of those elements to the (natural or human-made) setting and to the urban settlement as a whole.³⁶ The Washington Charter aims to protect and develop urban areas, which are of value as historical documents and as an embodiment of traditional urban cultures. Such areas constitute the memory of humankind and include all material and spiritual elements that express their values, which can be historical, aesthetic, social, and economic. In addition, the technical value implies scientific value, and the importance given to value acquired over time implies that age is also valued. As the natural environment of a cultural property can be of importance, this charter refers to ecological values, although only as context. The significance should be protected but also (re)used to adapt these areas to contemporary life. By doing so, heritage becomes part of a development strategy, not only by addressing its political (management) value, but also for the first time taking the concept of heritage as a driver for sustainable development, possibly in the slipstream of the release of “Our Common Future.”³⁷

The **Burra Charter** defines heritage as a place of cultural significance that serves as an historical record of any scale; it is important as the tangible expression of identity and experience.³⁸ It refers as much to the material and physical location of a place as to the significance embodied in its setting, use, relationships, associations, and meanings. It states that cultural significance is irreplaceable and precious, and it defines a value system that comprises the following values: aesthetic, historic, scientific, social (e.g., identity, experience, spiritual), and natural, which are important for past, present, and future generations. Those values are equally important and can coexist; the range of values could be different for different individuals or groups, and as such, they may conflict. There is no unwarranted emphasis on any one particular value. However, the Burra Charter introduces the idea of defining relative degrees of cultural significance for a place, which can lead to tailored management strategies.

The **Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage** defines intangible heritage as “the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills, as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith” that

people recognize as part of their cultural heritage.³⁹ Domains are defined as the places where such heritage may manifest itself, such as in oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practices, or traditional craftsmanship. It aims at protecting human practices, performances, traditions, knowledge, and skills that are transmitted from generation to generation (age value) and constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature, and their history. In this convention, the social, ecological (nature), historic, and scientific (knowledge and skills) values are explicit; the political and economic values can be derived from the text. Noticeably absent is any reference—explicit or implicit—to aesthetic value. Rather, this convention considers that intangible attributes should be protected because, when respecting human rights, they are considered a main-spring of cultural diversity and cultural dialogue, and a guarantee to sustainable development.

The **Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation** defines heritage as (historic) urban areas that constitute a key testimony to humankind’s endeavors and aspirations through space and time.⁴⁰ More specifically, it defines Historic Urban Landscapes (formerly Urban Heritage) to be an urban area, including its urban and geographical setting, that is the result of historic layering or an accumulation of cultural and natural (tangible and intangible) attributes and values. In addition to previously mentioned elements and relations, the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation also considers development processes, diversity, identity, and local practices as possible attributes of cultural heritage. The recommendation addresses a wide spectrum of cultural values, including aesthetic, historic, scientific, economic, social, spiritual (sense of place), memory, and ecological values as important for past, present, or future generations. The political values are implied, for example, by the valuation of (urban) process or development values; the passage of time also implies that age is valued. It recognizes such values for both tangible and intangible attributes, and they can be present in a specific location or in a wide landscape. Such values are shaped by generations and constitute a key testimony to humankind’s endeavors and aspirations through space and time. The aim for a balanced and sustainable relation between the needs of current and future generations and the legacy of the past also shows the socioeconomic and political value of using heritage strategically as a driver for sustainable development.

In the **Valletta Principles**, heritage is defined as historic areas and their surroundings, including all elements—tangible, intangible—that have significance in relation to the coherent whole of relationships between the site, its constituent parts, and any context that influences or influenced the static or dynamic ways that such areas are perceived, experienced, or enjoyed, including the social fabric and cultural diversity.⁴¹ The principles value the coherence of all tangible and intangible elements that represent the authenticity and integrity of an urban area, including social (e.g. civic, traditional, religious, sociological, meaning, emotional, mysterious, educational, leisurely), historic, economic, ecological (environmental, respecting the balance of natural cycles and natural resources), aesthetic (beautiful, architectural, characteristic), and scientific (skilled, knowledgeable, technical)

values. Many characteristics that can be of value are addressed in this document, as already categorized. They can also refer to different or multiple values. In addition, political values are implied, e.g. by stating changes in political governance requires change in the urban areas.

What and Why: A Comparative Analysis from Venice to Valletta

ICOMOS and UNESCO use similar terminology when defining *what* heritage is, and the evolution of such terminology over time is intertwined. In its general definition, ICOMOS moves from “historic monument” to “cultural property” to “place of cultural significance” to “historic area,” while remarkably, all are described in terms of a historic area and its setting. Differences are only related to the addressed scale of such a historic area, ranging from a single building to “any scale” of development. Instead, UNESCO uses “cultural heritage,” “heritage,” and “historic urban landscape” as general definitions while stating four clear types: monument, groups of buildings, site, and cultural landscape. Those still exist, although they have been complemented by the notion of “attributes,” which can be either tangible or intangible. ICOMOS also uses this notion in its most recent documents.⁴²

This shift to defining heritage in terms of tangible and intangible attributes represents another important change. It is the reason for addressing the chapters of “what and why” simultaneously in this paper. While earlier documents acknowledge only the tangible dimension of heritage when it comes to protection, those tangible assets could also include what we now call intangible attributes. However, in those cases, those references to intangible attributes are seen as the reason *why* the tangible result should be considered heritage. Addressing intangible attributes as a separate “what,” rather than a connected “why,” changed this dynamic of protection, as part of what was before considered a “why” (values) became a “what” (attributes).

Currently, tangible and intangible attributes and cultural values are three independent “notions,” while before, the emphasis was on tangible attributes and cultural values (which thus included the intangible attributes). Both tangible and intangible attributes are now considered heritage because of the cultural values attached to them. Thus, intangible attributes can now be of value by themselves (e.g. a traditional dance), although they can also still be linked to a tangible asset (e.g., the building where people meet for dancing). Many intangible attributes have interconnected tangible dimensions, for example the instruments and tools used, spaces used, products produced, or urban form produced. As such, tangible attributes can either directly represent a cultural value, or represent an intangible attribute that, in its turn, is the reason that value is attached to the tangible attribute. Such values are attached to those attributes by us, as a community, as experts, as residents, as tourists, and as individuals or groups. They may be contested or contradictory, and they may change over time and with each generation. In this line, some scholars even argue that heritage is only about values (values-based heritage management), making the attributes redundant.⁴³ However, a clear distinction between what is valued and why it is values is often not made, which makes it unclear if the approach really only takes the

Table 4. Result matrix describing the tangible “what” attributes of assets, areas, and landscapes. (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders)

Asset	Building element	Parts of buildings, for example, detail, parcel, façade, roof, material, or colors
	Building	Entire buildings
	Urban element	Man made elements in the urban landscape, for example, a square, bridge, street furniture, quayside, or public art
	Natural element	Natural (or designed) green elements, flora or fauna, water elements, etc.
Area	Ensemble	A group of buildings or specific urban ensemble or configuration
	Context or setting	The buildings or elements surrounding, supporting, contextualizing the actual heritage
	Area	A district in a wider (urban) landscape, a specific combination of cultural and or natural elements, for example, a neighborhood, urban fragment, urban structure, townscape, route, or park
Landscape	Layers	A landscape illustrative of the evolution or development of human society and settlement over time, a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment
	Everything	Every part of the landscape is considered to be of value, and the attributes have a level of significance

values as a starting point, or if it also considers the attributes valued without clear distinction.⁴⁴ For the categories found regarding the “what,” it is necessary to distinguish between tangible attributes and intangible attributes. The categories for tangible attributes are object, area, and landscape. The categories found within the intangible attributes are asset, society, and process.

The analysis revealed that once a category existed, it remained. None of the categories disappeared over time; if anything, they got more detailed in description. The six specific categories have structured the taxonomy and are further subdivided into more detailed sub-categories of attributes (Tables 4, 5, and 6).

When looking at the “why” question, the reasons for protection vary considerably between the different documents and decades (Table 3). The main change is in the previously-discussed relation between the attribute and the value. It starts with the basic idea that “heritage has value for mankind,” which implies that heritage *contains* value and is endogenous. This corroborates the objective that such value has to be transmitted to future generations. Later, heritage is defined to represent humankind’s memory and cultural diversity; in other words, heritage *conveys* value, which is still endogenous, although with an acknowledgement of the wider range of options, as everyone can find something else conveyed. The Intangible Heritage Convention completely turns this idea of value

Table 5. Result matrix describing the intangible “what” attributes that include asset-related and societal aspects of a site as well as processes of management and development. (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders)

Asset related	Concept or artistic trend	The ideas behind the design or place, for example, period, style, design ideology (often related to, or represented by, a tangible heritage asset)
	Relation context—location	The relation with another connected element, location, place, or environment (relation object–object)
	Character	The character or image, as supported by specific design, for example, typology, morphology, layout, composition and proportion, as well as atmosphere, for example, tranquil, lively, urban, rural.
Societal	Use, function	The specific (typical, common, special) use or function of a place or environment
	Knowledge, traditions, customs	The (local) practices, traditions, knowledge, customs of a community or groups (often related to a location or tangible results, tools/instruments)
	Relation context—association	Human associations with a place, element, location, or environment (relation men– object)
	Community/people	A community or society itself (its members, or specific individuals/groups) and/or their cultural identity or diversity
Process	Management processes	The process of managing, the type of strategy or approach (instead of the result) is what is valuable
	Development or evolution	The process of layering, development, or evolution (instead of the result)

around: heritage is now important because it is a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee for sustainable development. The relation between heritage and value is moving toward the idea that heritage *creates* values, which change over time and with each person.

In either case, such values can be important for past, present, and future generations, and there can also be value in the fact that values are re-created or confirmed by each new generation. This can be seen, for example, in the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation, which considers heritage to be a key resource in enhancing the livability of urban areas, although it also refers to the importance of heritage as a key testimony to humankind’s past endeavors and aspirations. This can be seen as an evolution from a main focus on valuing the “result” to an emphasis on valuing result aligned with process.

Increasing rationales for valuing heritage are included in the various value systems established over the past decades; as a result, the number of mentioned values grew. However, they can all be categorized under the eight cultural values defined by Pereira Roders.⁴⁵ Earlier documents focused on the aesthetic, historic, and scientific values. In connection to historic values, Pereira Roders distinguishes the age value, which has been implicitly mentioned since the first documents on heritage and refers to heritage valued for its survival, maturation, or evolution over a period of time.⁴⁶ Those four cultural values can

Table 6. Result matrix describing the “why” values of a site. (Adapted from A. M. Tarrafa Pereira da Silva and A. R. Pereira Roders, “Cultural Heritage Management and Heritage Impact Assessments,” *Proceedings of the Joint CIB W070, W092 & TG72 International Conference on Facilities Management, Procurement Systems and Public Private Partnership*, January 23–25, 2012, Cape Town, South Africa.)

Traditional	Aesthetic	Artistic, original product of creativity and imagination; product of a creator, conceptual, authentic exemplar of a decade, part of the history of art or architecture
	Age	Value oriented toward the production period; maturity, a piece of memory, reflecting the passage/lives of past generations; the marks of the time passage (patina) present on the attribute
	Historic	A potential to gain knowledge about the past; a testimonial of historic stylistic or artistic movements, or to concepts which are now part of history; related to an important event in the past; archaeological connection with ancient civilization
	Scientific	An original result of human labour or craftsmanship; technical or traditional skills and/or connected materials; integral materialization or knowledge of conceptual intentions
Community	Social	Spiritual, beliefs, myths, religions, legends, stories, testimonial of past generations; collective and/or personal memory or experience; cultural identity; motivation and pride; sense of place; communal value; representation of social hierarchy/status; anthropological or ethnological value
	Ecological	The (spiritual or ecological) harmony between the building and its environment (natural and man-made); identification of ecological concepts on practices, design, and construction; manufactured resources to be reused, reprocessed, or recycled
Process	Political	Educational role for political targets (for example, birth-nations myths, glorification of political leaders); part of management or strategies and policies (past or present) or for the dissemination of cultural awareness explored for political targets; representing emblematic, power, authority and prosperous perceptions
	Economic	The function and utility of the heritage, expired, original, or attributed; the option to use it and/or bequest value for future generations; the role it might have (had) for market or industry; property value

be considered more traditional values (Table 5).⁴⁷ Soon, community-related values are also introduced, for example by suggesting an ethnological or anthropological point of view, stressing the importance of cultural diversity, the relation between humans and the environment, or spiritual values that are considered social values.⁴⁸ In the build-up to the explicit inclusion of the “cultural landscape,” ecological values are also distinguished within cultural heritage. These ecological values are considered a community value because within a cultural landscape, the relation between humans and nature is essential. Such ecological values are often related to the community making use of the natural qualities in and of their environment, as confirmed by the Burra Charter. Moreover, the “associative cultural landscape” is crucial in the recognition of the heritage of local communities and indigenous

peoples and their (spiritual) connection to the cultural and natural environment.⁴⁹ In the documents that are more explicitly directed toward the urban scale, including the Washington Charter, Valletta Principles and Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation, it is emphasized that a city is a dynamic and living environment. This introduces values that relate to the development process and management strategies, which are often argued to be economic or political values. It accompanies the general shift toward heritage as a strategic asset and a resource for sustainable urban development. Heritage management's role is to facilitate and value change as evidence of a significant development process and of how communities interact with their environments.

Conclusion

As introduced, during the final decades of the twentieth century, the city became understood as a strategic and complex system. Urban management, parallel urban sciences, heritage, and heritage management studies now acknowledge and confront this challenge. Heritage management has redirected its attention toward a wider definition of cultural heritage, one that is more fitting to the urban scale and dynamics and the needs and wishes of those with a stake in the management process. This focus has led to a new approach that integrates heritage and urban management: the landscape-based approach.

First, the systematic analysis shows that the understanding of heritage and its values grew in complexity. The relation between values and attributes, tangible and intangible, became much more dynamic, and re-theorizing and demystifying these relations is important. Attributes, whether tangible or intangible, are the actual objects of protection, conveying or creating value as a reason for protection. However, what may seem to be a value related to a tangible attribute can actually be an intangible attribute, or the other way around. In terms of heritage management, this distinction between *what* and *why* is very important, and it should be made more clearly. The management of an intangible attribute likely involves measures and actions distinct from the management of a tangible attribute, even when the attributes are protected based on the same values. For example, if the evolution of an area is what is of value, this would mean that the tangible result of this evolution is less important (or not important at all) to keep. The management should be focused on keeping the evolutionary process going in the same manner as before. If the tangible result of a certain evolution is valued, management practices should focus on illustrating this past evolution. In addition, tangible and intangible attributes can coexist in the same heritage asset, representing the same or different values. Values of an attribute can also disappear, evolve, or differ in time and between people or communities. Also, the attributes themselves will unavoidably change over time; it is yet to be discovered to what extent and at what pace an asset's attributes and values change. The impact of governance on which attributes and values are recognized remains another question to be resolved; other attributes and values might be acknowledged or prioritized based on the local or global perspectives.⁵⁰

Second, the analysis shows that the scale of attributes has increased from single object to landscape. This up-scaling of attributes is also related to the scale of the tools

used, including protected areas and the historic urban landscape approach. This could arguably also be attributed to an acknowledgement that attributes and values are often distributed along an area without exact locations. Locating attributes and values can be a difficult exercise, and a larger scale of protective measures (e.g., zoning) will probably make it easier to protect attributes and their respective values in relation to each other. In this way, the specific relations and dynamics do not have to be described or illustrated, nor do the attributes have to be located within that protected area. Such vagueness could lead to complications in management. It is not clear what to protect, which may lead to very black-and-white situations. This may lead to very black-and-white situations in which either all or nothing is protected; if a rolling scale is applied, it could become difficult to apply different treatments within the same zone once a precedent is set.

It can be argued that the introduction of the notions of “attributes” and “values” theoretically eliminated the issue of scale from protective measures. Management based on attributes and values implies that the whole environment is a cultural landscape and that protective measures are related to the attributes’ level of significance. It is, however, still unexplored how such system would work in practice and in relation to both management and monitoring.

This analysis also found that a third influential factor for what we value (and why) is the cultural identity and diversity related to place and people. As theory evolves from an understanding of heritage as something that contains value, to a perception of something that conveys value, to something that creates value, the importance of acknowledging local identity and diversity has become a main focus. The input of local knowledge and identity becomes essential to heritage management, as local management practices are considered to be more sustainable. This is not only because local practices likely contributed to heritage as it is found today, but also because supporting or continuing such practices is often more sustainable in terms of socioeconomic development than applying alien practices. Cultural identity and diversity also relates to the involvement of a wider group of stakeholders to address the full range of diversity and identity in terms of attributes and values, and in terms of heritage management.

By untangling the evolution of concepts and building as a classification of categories based on this process of development, we take an important first step toward a better understanding of the revealed dynamics, issues of scale, and cultural diversity. On one hand, this analysis enables a discussion on the comprehensiveness of heritage management’s seminal international documents. On the other, it serves as the foundation of a classification system, which could possibly lead to taxonomy. Such a study can be used to analyze existing significance assessments to reveal the attributes, values, and dynamics for each case study. Moreover, the identification of the various categories of values and attributes in policy can help clarify whether the applicable policy is actually sufficiently managing the attributes and values addressed in the significance assessments.⁵¹ This type of application should be further explored by discussing the categories with professional and academic stakeholders, not only to understand if the categories and sub-categories are applicable and comprehensive, but also to compare different categorization models, such

as divergent evolution (as in the attribute categories) and parallel evolution (values). This would raise further understanding, continuing to build on the taxonomy for heritage management. Such taxonomy can also enable a global assessment of state of preservation practices, allowing for a comparative analysis between cities, countries, and regions. This is only a small step toward the future, enabling the research community to support governments and communities in truly managing their heritage as a resource for sustainable development.

References

1. J. Jokilehto, "International Trends in Historic Preservation: From Ancient Monuments to Living Cultures," *APT Bulletin* 29, no. 3/4, Thirtieth Anniversary Issue, (1998): 17–19; Laurajane Smith, *The Uses of Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2006); G. Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson, Jr., and John Schofield, eds., *The Heritage Reader* (London: Routledge, 2008); John Pendlebury, Michael Short, and Aidan While, "Urban World Heritage Sites and the Problem of Authenticity," *Cities* 26, no. 6 (December 2009): 349–58; Jeremy Whitehand, "Issues in Urban Morphology," *Urban Morphology* 16, no. 1 (2012): 55–65; L. Veldpaus, Ana R. Pereira Roders, and Bernard J. F. Colenbrander, "Urban Heritage: Putting the Past into the Future," *The Historic Environment* 4, no. 1 (April 2013): 18–33.
2. A. R. Pereira Roders and L. Veldpaus, "Tolerance for Change in the Built Environment: What Are the Limits?" in *Culturele draagkracht, Op zoek naar de tolerantie voor verandering bij gebouwd erfgoed*, ed. M. C. Kuipers and W. J. Quist (Delft: Delftdigitalpress, 2013).
3. J. Jokilehto, "International Charters on Urban Conservation: Some Thoughts on the Principles Expressed in Current International Doctrine," *City & Time* 3, no. 3 (2007): 23–42; Fairclough et al., *The Heritage Reader*; Randall Mason, "Be Interested and Beware: Joining Economic Valuation and Heritage Conservation," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 14, no. 4 (2008): 303–18; UNESCO, *Proposals Concerning the Desirability of a Standard-Setting Instrument on Historic Urban Landscapes* (Paris: UNESCO, August 18, 2011), including the "Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape," as adopted on May 27, 2011, at the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on the Historic Urban Landscape; Francesco Bandarin and Ron Van Oers, *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).
4. Veldpaus et al., "Urban Heritage."
5. Ken Taylor and Jane L. Lennon, *Managing Cultural Landscapes* (London: Routledge, 2012); UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (Paris: UNESCO, 1972), accessed March 31, 2014, www.whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext.
6. Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, U.K.; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 379; S. Sassen, "When Cities Become Strategic," *Architectural Design* 81 (2011): 124–27.
7. Edward Soja, "Writing the City Spatially," *City* 7, no. 3 (2003), 269–80; Chapuis and European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, *Preserving Our Heritage, Improving Our Environment, Volume II, Cultural Heritage Research: FP5, FP6, and Related Projects* (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2009); Helmut K. Anheier and Yudhishtir Raj Isar, *Cultures and Globalization: Cities, Cultural Policy and Governance* (SAGE, 2012); Ed Taverne, Len de Klerk, Bart Ramakers, Sebastian Dembski, and Jaap Evert Abrahamse, *Nederland stedenland: continuïteit en vernieuwing* (Rotterdam: nai010 uitgevers, 2012).
8. Sassen, "When Cities Become Strategic."
9. A. Corboz, "The Land as Palimpsest," *Diogenes* 31 (1983), 12–34; J. W. R. Whitehand, *The Making of the Urban Landscape* (New York: Wiley, 1993); Françoise Choay, *The Invention of the Historic Monument* (New York: Cambridge University, 1992; 2001); Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1997), 9–13.
10. A. R. Pereira Roders, "Lessons from Island of Mozambique on Limits of Acceptable Change," in *Swahili Historic Urban Landscapes*, ed. R. Van Oers, (Paris: UNESCO, 2013), 41–50.

11. C. Landorf, "A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management: A Study of UK Industrial Heritage Sites," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15, no. 6 (2009): 494–510; R. Van Oers, ed., *Swahili Historic Urban Landscapes*; Karima Kourtit, Peter Nijkamp, Rachel Franklin, and Andrés Rodríguez-Pose, "A Blueprint for Strategic Urban Research: The Urban Piazza," *Town Planning Review* 85, no. 1 (January 2014): 97–126.
12. Robert Pickard, *Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2001); Peter Nijkamp and Patrizia Riganti, "Assessing Cultural Heritage Benefits for Urban Sustainable Development," *International Journal of Services Technology and Management* 10, no. 1 (2008): 29–38; A. Bond and J. Teller, "The Consideration of Cultural Heritage in Present European Environmental Policies," in *SUIT 2.4 Sustainable Development of Urban Historical Areas through an Active Integration within Towns*, ed. A. Dupagne et al. (Belgium: LEMA, 2004); Landorf, "A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management"; URBACT II, *Brochure Project Results 2011*, accessed March 31, 2014, www.urbact.eu/fileadmin/general_library/Rapport_Urbact_II.pdf; Miklas Scholz, Asa Hedmark, and William Hartley, "Recent Advances in Sustainable Multifunctional Land and Urban Management," *Europe: A Review, Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 55, no. 7 (2012): 833–54; Anheijer and Isar, 2012.
13. Council of Europe, *The European Landscape Convention*, CETS No. 176 (Florence: Council of Europe, 2000); UNESCO, *181 EX/29 Preliminary Study on the Technical and Legal Aspects Relating to the Desirability of a Standard-Setting Instrument on the Conservation of the Historic Urban Landscape* (Paris: UNESCO, 2009), accessed March 31, 2014, www.unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001811/181132e.pdf; UNESCO, *WHC-05/15.GA/INF.7 Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture: Managing the Historic Urban Landscape*, as adopted by the International Conference "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture: Managing the Historic Urban Landscape," held May 12–14, 2005, in Vienna, Austria, under the patronage of UNESCO and welcomed by the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban: UNESCO, 2005); UNESCO, *36 C/23 Proposals Concerning the Desirability of a Standard-Setting Instrument*; ICOMOS, *Xi'an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas*, adopted General Assembly of ICOMOS on October 21, 2005 (Xi'an, China: UNESCO, 2005); ICOMOS, *The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas*, adopted by the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly (Paris: ICOMOS, 2011).
14. Veldpaus et al., "Urban Heritage."
15. Sander Happaerts and Karoline Van Den Brande, "Sustainable Development and Transnational Communication: Assessing the International Influence on Subnational Policies," *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 13, no. 5 (2011): 527–44.
16. Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith, and Gary Campbell, "The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12, no. 4 (2006): 339–55, doi: 10.1080/13527250600727000.
17. Fairclough et al., *The Heritage Reader*; Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, "Tolerance for Change"; Fortuna De Rosa and Maria Di Palma, "Historic Urban Landscape Approach and Port Cities Regeneration: Naples between Identity and Outlook," *Sustainability* 5, no. 10 (2013): 4268–87; Smith, *The Uses of Heritage*; Sophia Labadi, UNESCO, *Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-Based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions* (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013).
18. E.g. M. De la Torre, M. MacLean, R. Mason, and D. Myers, eds., *Heritage Values in Site Management: Four Case Studies* (Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2005); Jokilehto, "International Charters on Urban Conservation"; R. Mason, "Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices," in *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage Research Report*, ed. M. de la Torre (Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2002), 5–30; A. Tarrafa da Silva and A. R. Pereira Roders, "Cultural Heritage Management and Heritage (Impact) Assessments," in *Proceedings of the Joint CIB W070, W092 & TG72 International Conference on Facilities Management, Procurement Systems and Public Private Partnership* (January 2012, Cape Town, South Africa), 375–82; Labadi, UNESCO, *Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*; Yahaya Ahmad, "The Scope and Definitions of Heritage: From Tangible to Intangible," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12, no. 3

- (2006): 292–300; Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, *Intangible Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2008); Bandarin and Van Oers, *The Historic Urban Landscape*; Veldpaus et al., “Urban Heritage”; Taylor and Lennon, *Managing Cultural Landscapes*; Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*.
19. R. Van Oers, “Toward New International Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes,” *City and Time* 3, no. 3, (2007): 43–51, accessed March 31, 2014, www.ct.ceci-br.org/novo/revista/viewarticle.php?id=113; A. R. Pereira Roders, *Re-architecture: Lifespan Rehabilitation of Built Heritage—Book I* (Eindhoven: Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 2007), 48.
 20. R. E. Slavin, “Best Evidence Synthesis: An Intelligent Alternative to Meta-Analysis,” *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 48, no. 1 (January 1995): 9–18; Alison Nightingale, “A Guide to Systematic Literature Reviews,” *Surgery* 27, no. 9 (September 2009): 381–84.
 21. Ray Pawson, “Evidence-Based Policy: In Search of a Method,” *Evaluation* 8, no. 2 (April 1, 2002): 157–81.
 22. Van Oers, “Toward New International Guidelines”; Pereira Roders, *Re-architecture*; Landorf, “A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management.”
 23. Van Oers, “Toward New International Guidelines.”
 24. Pereira Roders, *Re-architecture*.
 25. Landorf, “A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management.”
 26. UNESCO, *181 EX/29 Preliminary Study*; ICOMOS, *The Valletta Principles*.
 27. UNESCO Standard-Setting Instruments, accessed March 31, 2014, www.portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=12024&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
 28. UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Paris: UNESCO, 2003); UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*.
 29. ICOMOS, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)* (Paris: ICOMOS, 1964), accessed March 31, 2014, www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf; ICOMOS, *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter)* (Paris: ICOMOS, 1987).
 30. Pickard, *Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation*, 325–28; Martha Demas, *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites Sorted by Category: A Select Annotated Bibliography* (Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2003); Michael Petzet, “Principles of Preservation: An Introduction to the International Charters for Conservation and Restoration 40 years after the Venice Charter,” in *International Charters for Conservation and Restoration* (München: ICOMOS, 2004), 7–29; Waterton et al., “The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies.”
 31. Pickard, *Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation*, 325–28; Demas, *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*; Waterton et al., “The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies”; John Hudson and Philip James, “The Changing Framework for Conservation of the Historic Environment,” *Structural Survey* 25, no. 3/4 (2007): 253–64; A. R. Pereira Roders and J. Hudson, “Change Management and Cultural Heritage,” in *Facilities Change Management*, ed. E. Finch (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2011).
 32. ICOMOS, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)*.
 33. UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*.
 34. UNESCO, “The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention,” accessed March 31, 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.
 35. UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*.
 36. ICOMOS, *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter)*.
 37. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
 38. Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, (Australia ICOMOS, 1999), accessed March 31, 2014, <http://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/>.
 39. UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
 40. UNESCO, *236 C/23 Proposals Concerning the Desirability of a Standard-Setting Instrument 011*.

41. ICOMOS, *The Valletta Principles*.
42. Ibid.
43. Smith, *The Uses of Heritage*; Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*; Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, "Tolerance for Change."
44. E.g. Andrew McClelland, Deborah Peel, Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes, and Ian Montgomery, "A Values-Based Approach to Heritage Planning: Raising Awareness of the Dark Side of Destruction and Conservation," *Journal Town Planning Review* 84, no. 5 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013): 583–604.
45. Pereira Roders, *Re-architecture*.
46. Tarrafa da Silva and Pereira Roders, "Cultural Heritage Management."
47. Mason, "Assessing Values in Conservation Planning."
48. UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*; ICOMOS, *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter)*.
49. Taylor and Lennon, *Managing Cultural Landscapes*.
50. E.g. Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*.
51. L. Veldpaus and A. R. Pereira Roders, "Historic Urban Landscapes: An Assessment Framework, Part I," *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA13) Impact Assessment: The Next Generation* (Calgary: IAIA, May 13–16, 2013), 1–6; L. Veldpaus and A. R. Pereira Roders, "An Assessment Framework on Historic Urban Landscapes," *Proceedings (USB) of the Sustainable Architecture for a Renewable Future* (München: PLEA-Technische Universität München, September 10–12, 2013), 1–6.