

School of the Built Environment Research Library

Journal Article

Subject Group: Property and Real Estate

Full Reference: Pickard R. (2002) Area-Based Protection Mechanisms for Heritage Conservation: A European Comparison Journal of Architectural Conservation Vol. 8 No. 2 pp69-88 Donhead ISSN 1355-6207

Please scroll down to read a copy of final draft of the journal article.

[Click here to read the published article online.](#)

Pickard, R. (2002) 'Area-based protection mechanisms for heritage conservation: a European comparison', in *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, Vol.8 No. 2, at pp. 69 – 88 (ISSN 1355-6207).

Area-based protection mechanisms for heritage conservation: a European comparison

ROBERT PICKARD

Abstract

This paper examines the progress of six European countries towards establishing area-based mechanisms for conservation: Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, and the UK (England). It considers the historical background and current protection area policies, their scope, the integration of conservation with planning mechanisms and funding. Key issues arising from this discussion relate to the use of special plans, the cultural and natural heritage and the achievement of economic and social goals through conservation regulation and management.

INTRODUCTION

In 1964 the ICOMOS *Venice Charter*¹, although emphasising the cultural significance of individual monuments, extended the concept of the historic monument from 'not only the single architectural work' to 'the urban...setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilisation'. In 1980s the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (the *Granada Convention*)² identified the need for signature countries to develop protection policies for 'groups of buildings' and 'sites' and 'integrated conservation' and further guidelines advocated the need to include not only the concept of the 'historic centre' but further to consider the entire built fabric as a conservation target³. Progress towards this goal will be examined in six European countries⁴.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Development of area-based mechanisms: conservation sites and zones

As early as 1950, the Czechoslovakian government designated a number of *urban conservation sites*. The 1958 law on cultural heritage protection also made it possible to declare a *protective zone* around a *conservation site* where the regime is regulated so that certain activities can be prohibited or other suitable protection measures can be created.

During the 1970s and 1980s action was taken to record whole structures of settlements in the country (including towns, villages and hamlets) and a Register of all historic towns

was set up. Further action was proposed to:

- Increase the number of urban *conservation sites* from 35 to 40;
- Protect the most important parts of 160 other historic towns as *conservation zones* with a more moderate, differentiated regime of protection – these were subsequently provided by the new law (No. 20/1987) on cultural heritage protection (which is still in force today).

During the 1990s village settlements and landscape areas have been designated (the latter mainly according to ‘cultural’ rather than ‘natural’ values: natural sites are protected by other means).

In practice areas have been declared as *urban, village, landscape or archaeological conservation sites and zones*. The total number of declared areas is expected to reach 600. Some of these protected areas are listed on the UNESCO World Heritage List such as the *urban conservation site* covering Telč (Figure 1).

Funding and integration with planning

The process of “integrated conservation” is still developing in the Czech Republic, so declaratory *conservation site and zone* provisions have been ahead of advanced management mechanisms. But in 1992 a government ruling (No.209/1992) required the development of a grant-funding *programme for the regeneration and enhancement of urban conservation sites and zones*. Other programmes have been developed including programmes for the preservation of *village conservation sites and zones and landscape conservation zones*.

There has also been progress in developing integrated management systems for *conservation sites and zones*. For example in Telč a pilot project was developed with the assistance of the Council of Europe, which has examined possibility of using the French system of safeguarding and enhancement master plans (*plan de sauvegarde et mis en valeur*) for historic centres in the Czech Republic.

The preferred approach is to develop an integrated system in two steps. The first would be through a *General Plan of cultural heritage sustainability* and the second through a *Plan for the safeguarding of cultural heritage*.

The component parts of the *general plan* will include a *graphical (map) part* and a *written policy statement* covering the strategic conditions to preserve historic and natural values in a town. The *safeguarding plan* will have a more detailed emphasis. Both types of plan will require changes to existing legislation.

DENMARK

The SAVE system and the Preservation Atlas

The wide interest that has surrounded urban conservation and the preservation of buildings in Denmark in the 1990s prompted the Danish parliament to press for increased priority to be given to activities in this field. As part of its commitment to the *Granada Convention* the national agency that deals with cultural heritage matters developed a quick and simple system - **SAVE** - for the **S**urvey of **A**rchitectural **V**alues in the **E**nvironment⁵. The consolidated 1997 law concerning the protection of *listed buildings* widened the scope of protection to include *buildings worthy of preservation* which may be given a form of protection and assistance through urban local plans, specific *local preservation plans* and urban renewal schemes in association with the *SAVE* system. This is used instead of a specific area-based protection mechanism.

The *SAVE* surveys are conducted on a municipal basis in co-operation with the national agency. The purpose of the survey is first of all to identify which buildings and environments require protection in municipal planning and in the local administration of building applications and secondly to establish a platform for evaluating ways in which new buildings can be fitted into existing environments. The survey is conducted in three phases involving a *preliminary investigation* of the area, which is followed by *fieldwork* to provide additional information on dominant architectural features, building patterns and selected urban settlements, which culminates in the publication of a *preservation atlas*.

In principal the *SAVE* system covers the whole municipal area but it tends to concentrate on an agglomeration of buildings such as the main town and the groups of villages within a municipality. About 60 municipal areas had been surveyed using the *SAVE* system by the end of 1999.

One of the first *preservation atlases* was developed for Ribe, the oldest city in Denmark, in 1990. It describes the special historical and topographical conditions that have caused the building patterns of Ribe to become distinctive and special. The *preservation atlas* also indicates the characteristics of individual periods, and thus indirectly indicates the urban elements and building elements that can be developed further in terms of quality. Based on the different phases, the *preservation atlas* describes developed structures on the basis of topographical surveys, historical analyses, and architectural observations. In addition to this, the architectural values in the environment of the municipality are described on the basis of six different conditions. In turn, this forms the basis for a summary of the general preservation goals for an area to inform future planning and building control activities. Thus, the *preservation atlas* provides a way of combining the traditional view of preservation (concentrating on individual buildings), with a progressive planning view to provide a more holistic approach to the management of the urban environment.

In order to be able to use the *preservation atlas* as a tool in connection with conservation work, significant elements of the Ribe atlas have been incorporated in the *local authority plan 1998-2009* and a detailed *urban plan* and thereby used as the basis for preparing design guidelines, more specific action plans and urban renewal activity. These are

directed at building works, development and providing environmental improvements, particularly targeting the weakest areas of the city.

Funding

If a municipality has carried out a survey under the *SAVE* system special urban renewal funding becomes available for the most significant *buildings worthy of preservation*. Moreover, a number of local authorities have preservation funds, which can now be linked to the *SAVE* mechanism. By example, in the small fishing town of Dragør (Figure 2), a local scheme has assisted the renewal of traditional lime washing for the traditional *buildings worthy of preservation*.

FRANCE

Secteurs sauvegardés and ZZAUPs

In France the focus of conservation efforts has gradually progressed from individual monuments to urban areas and landscapes. An Act of 1943 systematically extended protective measures for historic monuments to their surroundings (within a 500 metre radius) to take a wider view of heritage conservation. This enabled the preservation of a monument to be linked to the management of the entire area. From the 1960s this trend led to the adoption of a more comprehensive approach entailing the protection of entire sites, including groups of buildings and public areas, delimited by a legal instrument.

An Act of 1962 (*Loi Malraux*) provided for the establishment of *secteurs sauvegardés* (conservation areas). This idea was a reaction to the sweeping renovation projects of the time, which were used to “clean up” historic centres of towns and cities in line with the then prevailing preference for modernity. There are now 92 *secteurs sauvegardés* covering a total of 5,694 hectares and home to 800,000 people. This procedure mainly concerns towns and cities with historic centres, sometimes showing a decline in their population, characterised by a high concentration of old buildings. Typical examples are the Marais and Faubourg Saint-Germain districts in Paris, the historic part of Troyes (Figure 3), the centre of Bordeaux, but also parts of much smaller towns.

The Decentralisation Act of 1983 (law No. 83-88) transferred responsibility for town planning to local and regional authorities, which in turn led to the introduction of contractual instruments for heritage conservation and management, passed between the state and the local authorities. An Act of 1993 (law No.93-24) broadened the concept with the introduction of *zones de protection du patrimoine architectural, urbain et paysager* (ZPPAUPs) (architectural, urban and landscape heritage protection zones). The purpose of the ZPPAUPs is to enable the protection and management of the urban and rural heritage, of built areas and landscapes, on a contractual basis, allocating the responsibilities between central government and local authorities. This form of protective measure is increasingly being used following an initial trial period. ZZAUPs have already been adopted in some 300 municipalities, generally villages or small towns,

with a further 600 in the course of preparation⁶. A ZZAUP may accompany a *secteur sauvegardé* to assist in conserving neighbourhoods of more recent construction beyond the historic city centre and may also serve as a preliminary step for implementing a *secteur sauvegardé*. A ZZAUP can also be created as a component part of policies that set up regional nature parks to protect and promote the combined aspects of the cultural and natural heritage. The heritage features of an historic monument's surroundings may also be stipulated by establishing a ZPPAUP, instead of applying the 500 metres rule.

Identification and integration of protected areas

The *Inventaire général des monuments et des richesses artistiques de la France*, a general topographical inventory of all categories pre-1940 buildings (25% complete), has increasingly served as starting point for new protection decisions concerning *secteurs sauvegardés* and ZPPAUPs. In addition studies are conducted by specialist freelance architects/town-planners with a view to both making preparations for implementing the protection procedure and providing the documentation on historical and development aspects needed for future management activities.

Following designation, all projects in the surroundings of historic monuments (within a radius of 500 metres), in ZPPAUPs or *secteurs sauvegardés*, which are likely to alter the state of land or buildings in the protected area, require the express approval of the official architect (architecte des bâtiments de France) assigned to the government agency with jurisdiction for the area concerned (*service départemental de l'architecture et du patrimoine*). Authorities issuing permits must abide by the official architects' views on projects in ZPPAUPs under the rules specific to each of these zones according to a contractual conservation plan and incorporated within a *plan local d'urbanisme* (PLU) (local land use plan). The ZZAUP does not impinge on the interiors of buildings but provides a controlling regime for development and demolition permission and alteration work. A similar approach is taken in *secteurs sauvegardés*, under the provisions of the relevant *plan de sauvegarde et de mise en valeur* (PSMV) (preservation and enhancement plan), which cover not only the external appearance of buildings but also their internal lay-out and decoration, as well as urban infrastructure, the quality of public areas and landscape aspects. Advertising hoardings are not allowed in any protected areas.

Finance and Funding

Under a budget administered by the *service départemental de l'architecture et du patrimoine* of the Ministry of Culture and Communication, managed funds have been provided for studies and work in connection with the policy and enhancement of *secteurs sauvegardés*, ZPPAUPs and the surroundings of historic monuments.

As state funding for conservation is at a much lower level in *secteurs sauvegardés* and ZPPAUPs compared to individual monuments, building owners must generally cover the cost themselves. However, in ZZAUPs a defined perimeter is designated to encourage the rehabilitation of decayed buildings as part of a larger strategy of revitalising whole neighbourhoods - the emphasis based on economic and social regeneration. In addition,

urban improvements to improve public spaces can be supported through grant assistance. Generous tax incentives apply to landlords who undertake restoration work on residential properties intended for renting for a minimum period of six years. Many municipalities may also provide grants for the renovation of facades restoration work on buildings located in their historic districts.

The rehabilitation of old parts of towns is further supported through *Opérations programmées pour l'amélioration de l'habitat* (OPAH) (Planned Housing Improvement Operations). Since 1977, when the OPAH programme was introduced, over 3,000 improvement operations have been carried out, resulting in the rehabilitation of over 600,000 dwellings (mostly in old quarters and historic centres). The main body for grant provision is the *Agence nationale pour l'amélioration de l'habitat* (ANAH) (National Housing Improvement Agency) whose role is to subsidise work undertaken by private landlords and in the case of protected areas the normal upper limit on grants for architectural restoration work can be removed.

GERMANY

Area-based mechanisms

In Germany each *Länder* (federal state) has its own law on cultural heritage protection. These are similar but not the same and therefore the treatment of area-based mechanisms is similar but can differ. By example, in the state of Thuringia (one of 16 new states created since reunification), the conservation legislation (dating from 1992) defines and provides various criteria for the designation of a number of different types of *monument ensembles*. These include the following:

- Composite building complexes
- Typical configurations of streets, squares and localities
- Typical layouts of localities
- Historical parks and gardens
- Historical manufacturing plant and equipment

Looking at *composite building complexes*, these are particular groups of buildings and historic town centers and can include vegetation, open spaces and expanses of water within them. The topography of a *conservation area* can also be described but must be formally declared a *monument ensemble* to be protected by the law.

Integration with planning

Preservation of the architectural heritage is a requirement of regional and urban planning legislation. In particular planning provisions are laid down in the *building code*, which stipulates that when drawing up a *Flächennutzungsplan* (*county or town map*) and *Bebauungsplan* (*local plan*) the interests of monument protection and conservation (including *monument ensembles*), as well as districts, roads and squares of historical,

artistic or urban design importance that are worthy of preservation are taken into consideration.

In addition the *building code* provides that a local authority can make a *conservation statute* to maintain the structural character of an area, which means that changes of use and structural alterations to buildings not protected through the conservation legislation come under special control. Applications for permits to undertake such work can be refused if the building in question is of itself, or in conjunction with others, characteristic of the area or otherwise of urban, historic or artistic importance. Similarly new development can be refused if it would impair the character of an area (*design statutes* can be introduced to guide the design of new building work).

The conservation legislation also requires that a local authority and the relevant conservation authority draw up a *monument conservation plan* for each *monument ensemble*, which must contain:

- An inventory and analysis of planning considerations from a monument protection and conservation viewpoint
- Topographical data on the location and extent of the *monument ensemble*
- Conservation objectives to be observed in the care and maintenance of the area

Urban renewal

The *building code* also provides for urban and village renewal procedures to take account of conservation. In the new Länder this was supported by the federal *städtbaulicher denkmalshutz* funding program (monument preservation in the context of town planning) between 1991 – 1997. (Similar programmes were operated in West Germany before reunification). Apart from the normal state heritage assistance for monuments this urban renewal programme has tackled problems in a comprehensive manner in 123 historic towns (dealing with protected buildings and groups of buildings as well as other buildings, streets, the environment, infrastructure provision, housing provision etc) and has also drawn on other existing funding opportunities. The program was focused mainly on achieving sustainable development of inner cities, socially-orientated holistic and integrated urban renewal, and urban development that preserves heritage resources.

A European Union conference on Heritage Conservation and Employment in 1999 identified that public expenditure invested in the *Städtbaulicher Denkmalshutz* program resulted in up to nine times as much investment by the private sector⁷ (in the historic quarter of Erfurt the ratio was 1: 12) (Figure 4). Empirical studies carried out between 1997 -1999 confirmed the labour-intensive nature of conservation or rehabilitation work compared to new construction (creating twice as many jobs) as well the promotion of small and medium-sized enterprises and other benefits (e.g. creation of pleasant environment to attract business and industry, diversity of functions in buildings, and greater tourist attractiveness).

SPAIN

Historic Sites

The 1985 law on the Spanish “historical heritage” (No. 16/1985) defined the concept of the *historical site* as being an urban settlement comprising a group of real properties “*that form a township unity, either continuous or scattered, conditioned by a physical structure representative of the evolution of a concrete human community*”.

Such a site can be further protected, physically and visually, by designating the *environment*, which is defined as a surrounding space inseparably linked to the area. There is no standard protection area as the law and regulations contained in *special plans* permit the *environment* to be defined in each particular case.

Plan mechanisms for historic sites

Planning mechanisms in Spain are identified in a law from 1992. The *Municipal General Plan* or *Urban Order General Plan* is a land-use plan covering municipal areas and provides suitable measures to protect landscape, territory and *historical sites*. Municipal councils are required to prepare a *special plan* for *historic sites*. This implies “*the maintenance of its urban and architectural structure, as well as the general character of its setting*”. The municipal council is responsible for development control and approval for new works unless they will have a detrimental impact on *monuments, historical gardens* or buildings included in the *environment* of a *historical site*. New development may exceptionally be allowed within an *historical site* as long as it would contribute to the general preservation of the site’s character. There is also a control over demolition of existing buildings.

Santiago de Compostela

Following the inclusion of Santiago de Compostela in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1985 (Figure 5), a revised *general plan* was approved in 1988, expanding the area of the historic city to 170 ha. It was aimed at opening up new economic channels and implementing sustainable, high-quality policies including the prevention of social exclusion. In 1997 the *special plan* for protection and rehabilitation of the historic city was approved with the following aims:

- Protection of the architectural heritage including nearly 1800 buildings in four categories of architectural or historic value - but allowing some flexibility for change with the lowest category (covering some 1400 buildings).
- Rehabilitation of the central functions and future economic and institutional uses either by the rehabilitation of buildings or the through the provision of new facilities.
- Improving residential uses by rehabilitation or new housing and the creation of a green belt.
- Development pedestrian areas and pedestrian routes through existing developments.

A special heritage body “Real Patronato de la Ciudad de Santiago” was set up for the purpose of conserving, restoring and rehabilitating the city's heritage under the patronage of the King of Spain with representatives of the three levels of government (local, regional and national), as well as of the University and the Church. From this an executive body was set up, the “City Consortium”, chaired by the Mayor and comprising representatives for each level of government i.e. with the aim of making decisions by consensus. On the budgetary front, the state contributes 60%, the regional authority 35% and the municipality 5% of overall funding. The basic aim of the consortium is to channel various actions into one overall strategy and for all three levels of government to implement this on an annual basis. The scheme covers both major ‘investment’, which is normally earmarked for development areas outside the city walls, and ‘operations’ inside the historic centre. These operations have been successful so far because the project concept has been fully supported by all the parties involved, apart from the intrinsic potential of the historic city itself.

In the two years following the approval of the *special plan* rehabilitation action culminated in completed projects involving 323 dwellings, 435 commercial premises and 8 hotels. These figures show the importance of the activity in the historic centre, in urban development and economic terms.

THE UNITED KINGDOM (SPECIFICALLY ENGLAND)

Conservation Areas

The Civic Amenities Act 1967 introduced the concept of *conservation areas*, which are now covered by legislation dating from 1990. They can vary in size, scale and character. Historic town centres are usually designated as one or a number of *conservation areas* and urban designations include groups of buildings and even 1930s suburban districts. About half of the designated areas cover village and rural settlements. *Conservation areas* usually have a number of listed buildings located within them, but this is not a prerequisite for designation.

Every local authority is under a statutory duty to define which parts of their administrative area are ‘*areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance*’. In fact the meaning of these words has been tested many in terms of whether new development would be benefit or would cause harm to a *conservation area*.

There is considerable discretion on the part of local authorities as to whether to designate such areas. There are now about 9,000 in England and 10,000 for the whole of the United Kingdom) - far more than the original expectations. But since *planning policy guidance (No. 15)* on the *historic environment* was issued in 1994, the notion of the *conservation area* is fully accepted and forms the basis of many conservation-led economic and social regeneration schemes.

Policies for the *preservation* and *enhancement* of conservation areas are mainly set out in

detailed *local plans* and *English Heritage* has provided specific guidance on relevant policies to be adopted. There has been some discussion recently of the need for local authorities to adopt *spatial master plans* for their historic environments based on *character appraisals* (which have been encouraged as a way of informing *local plan* policies for *conservation areas* since 1993).

There are specific planning controls applied to *conservation areas*. These include:

- a blanket control over demolition of buildings
- a temporary control over the felling of trees
- strict control over new development
- minor changes to land or buildings that would not normally require planning permission can be brought under control
- advertisement regulations can be applied in *areas of special control*
- *urgent repair notices* can be served on buildings that are prominent in the area and in need of emergency repairs

Many local authorities issue *design guides* and *developments briefs* for *conservation areas* and recent guidance has encourage the use of *supplementary planning guidance*. Moreover, the focus now is very much upon sustaining the historic environment by specific management and financing strategies.

Conservation-led regeneration in conservation areas

In 1994 15 pilot *conservation area partnership schemes* (CAPS) were created with funding from *English Heritage* and matched by the local authority. The CAPS were developed to target action based on a checklist of issues. In 2000 a study 31 CAPS (nearly 10% of the 357 CAPS operated between 1994 – 1997) identified that for every £10,000 directed into the scheme this generated £48,000 from other public and private sources (a leverage of nearly 1: 5) and together this delivered on average 177 square meters of improved commercial floor space plus one new job, one safeguarded job, and one improved home (apart from the conservation benefits)⁸.

Sustainable regeneration of the historic environment has been subsequently encouraged through two new funding schemes: *the heritage economic regeneration scheme* (HERS) in 1998 and the *townscape heritage initiative* (THI) in 1999. HERS are set up for 3 years and directly replace CAPS while the THI is run by the Heritage Lottery Fund and lasts for 5 years. Both schemes centre on the need to form partnerships (between public authorities and agencies and the private sector) to fund programmes of action aimed at resolving economic and social deprivation in *conservation areas*.

Specific actions are directed towards:

- Repair historic buildings and structures that are *at risk* through *vacancy or disrepair*
- Authentic reinstatement of architectural features to historic buildings and their settings
- Bringing vacant floor space in historic buildings back into use

- Filling gap sites with buildings of appropriate use and demonstrating a high standard of contextual design
- Repair and authentic reinstatement of elements lost from green spaces, historic surfaces and other “public realm” features

Grainger Town, Central Conservation Area, Newcastle upon Tyne

Grainger Town has one of the highest densities of listed buildings in England (40% of the total of about 500 buildings in the area) and a higher than average number of the highest quality listed buildings (30% are graded I and II* compared to the national average of 6% in these categories). In 1992 a survey found there was a high number of listed buildings *at risk* (47% against the national average of 7%) and a considerable number in a *marginal* condition (29%). The area suffered a consequent lack of economic confidence and other environment-related problems.

A CAPS commenced in Grainger Town in 1994, covering an area of 36 hectares of the city centre, which was subsequently turned into a HERS (Figure 6). A board of 20 directors has led the project in consultation with a business and residents’ forum and based on an *action plan*. The partnership has attracted £40 million of public sector support (from *English Heritage* and the *city council* on the conservation side, and an *Enterprise Council*, *English Partnerships* and the *Single Regeneration Budget* for a wide range of improvements: employment, training, business, offices, housing, shop-fronts, ethnic minorities, crime and safety). By 2000 40% of the worse case *at risk* buildings and 50% of the *marginal* cases had been rescued and reused. The project aims to deal with the remaining problem buildings up to the end of 2003 with lifetime targets including the creation of 1,900 jobs, 522 homes, 70 buildings brought back into use and £80 million private investment.

REVIEW

All these examples show that area-based protection and enhancement mechanisms are either significantly developed or in the process of development. This represents progress beyond the notion of “groups of buildings” and “sites” as suggested by the *Granada Convention*. Moreover the key issue today is that areas and zones are managed in a sustainable way, ensuring preservation, rehabilitation and the management of change. Greater attention is being placed on rehabilitation of the “wider historic environment” through relevant planning tools such as special preservation or conservation plans and specifically directed funding programmes for conservation-led regeneration.

A number of issues are significant. First, with reference to the examples of Czech Republic and France in particular, the concept of cultural landscapes, to protect the relationship between the built and natural heritage is being considered. The World Heritage Convention⁹ deals with this issue but not specifically for both the cultural and natural heritage together (although there are some examples). However, the European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000)¹⁰ acknowledges this relationship and opens the opportunity for signature countries to define more broadly cultural landscapes in both

rural and urban contexts to reinforce local and regional identity and to promote sustainable development of areas. At the end of 2001 this convention had been signed by 23 countries (including Denmark, France and Spain of the six countries under examination) and ratified by Norway (10 ratifications are required before the convention comes into force). This signals a new way forward but it may be some time before the United Kingdom will accept another form of European regulation having just ratified the European Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised)(Valetta, Malta 1992)¹¹ some nine years after it was opened for signature. Moreover, the concept of 'historic landscapes' has gained some recognition but lacks a statutory footing.

Secondly, a key issue that has arisen from this study is that many countries are now adopting special preservation or conservation plans/master plans to co-ordinate and integrate the management of activities in protected areas. France has exported its approach to Czech Republic and is influencing other countries such as Romania. Similarly Denmark has helped some countries such as Slovenia, and more recently in Kosovo, by introducing the *SAVE* concept. This sort of approach is also well defined in Belgium with Bruges having a model master plan for the management of the historic environment, tourist interest and those that live and work in the city. By contrast the British Venice-in-Peril Committee is examining the need for integrated approaches to help resolve the problems for the 90% of the vernacular buildings of the city that are not of monumental note but nevertheless could assist in bringing back a resident rather than tourist population. The Republic of Ireland has also recently reformed its legislation and will introduce integrated mechanisms through *architectural conservation areas*.

The integrated approach is a key requirement of the *Granada Convention*. In the United Kingdom it could be said that conservation interests are well integrated. However, while recent funding programmes have sought to direct conservation-led regeneration, the idea of a spatial master plan for conservation areas remains a wish. In fact the Council of British Archaeology advocated the need for a '*heritage plan*' to form an obligatory part of the development plan process when the concept of *conservation areas* was first being considered in the 1960s¹². The recent English Heritage review advocated this approach¹³, but the government's response remains unclear¹⁴.

Thirdly, funding mechanisms are being more tailored towards sustainable conservation-led regeneration taking into consideration social and economic needs. This is necessary because many of our older areas have fallen behind. By example, social considerations have been given considerable weight in France via subsidisation of rehabilitation of older buildings for long-term renting. Moreover, over the evidence from the English, German and Spanish examples show that partnership is important and financial support for areas is more than justified in terms of private investment, job creation, new enterprises and the provision of homes. The evidence of conservation economics is significant and should be provided to other countries, particularly those in central and eastern Europe that are in the process of reforming legislation, in order to justify sustainable and integrated approaches for the cultural heritage.

Integrated approaches to areas-based protection systems have progressed significantly in recent years. Much can be learnt from the examination, co-ordination and exchange of information on conservation policies as advocated by the *Granada Convention*. Whether by monitoring or by dialogue, detailed comparative studies would benefit practice in many countries.

Biography

Robert D. Pickard, BSc, PhD, DipBldgCons, MRICS, IHBC

Robert Pickard is based in the School of Built Environment at the University of Northumbria at Newcastle and is a key researcher in conservation issues. He was granted two research awards from the RICS Education Trust to investigate European Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation (1993) and Methods of Financing the Preservation of the Architectural Heritage in Europe and North America (1998). Since 1994 he has been an expert consultant to the Cultural Heritage (and now Natural) Department of the Council of Europe and in 1997 he became a member of its Legislative Support Task Force to provide assistance to countries reforming legislation and policy on cultural heritage matters and has co-ordinated this task force since 1998. He is an external examiner to the MA in Historic Conservation at Oxford Brookes University/University of Oxford.

¹ International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites.

² European Treaty Series No. 121

³ ICOMOS Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas 1987.

⁴ This paper is developed from three research studies including Pickard, R. (ed): *Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation* and Pickard, R. (ed): *Management of Historic Centres*, in the Conservation of the European Built Heritage Series, Spon Press, London and New York (2001) in association with the Council of Europe, as well as further unpublished research supported by the RICS Education Trust to investigate funding mechanisms for the built heritage in North America and Europe.

⁵ National Forest and Nature Agency: *InterSAVE: International Survey of Architectural Values in the Environment*, Danish Ministry of Environment and Energy (English Version) (1995).

⁶ Féralut, M-A: *Les zones de protection du patrimoine architectural, urbain et paysager (ZPPAUP)*, presented at *ZZAUP et Dynamiques Territoriales Colloque*, Lyon, France 6- 8 December 2001.

⁷ Deutschen Nationalkomitees Für Denkmalshutz: *Denkmalpflege und Beschäftigung* (Heritage Conservation and Employment) (2000).

⁸ English Heritage, Town Centres Ltd. and London School of Economics: *The Heritage Dividend: Measuring the Results of English Heritage Regeneration*. 2nd ed. (2000).

⁹ UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972).

¹⁰ European Treaty Series No. 176.

¹¹ European Treaty Series No. 143.

¹² Council of British Archaeology, *Memorandum on Historic Towns* (1965).

¹³ English Heritage: *The Power of Place: The future of the historic environment* (2000).

¹⁴ The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future: issued by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport on 13th December 2001.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Telč: a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site and ‘urban conservation site’

Figure 2: Buildings worthy of preservation in Dragør

Figure 3: A typical rehabilitated timber framed building in the secteur sauvegardé in Troyes

Figure 4: Santiago de Compostela: a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site and ‘historic site’

Figure 5: Erfurt: restoring the relationship of the water to the buildings

Figure 6: Grainger Town: improved public realm and shop fronts.