

Research for CULT Committee - Best practices in sustainable management and safeguarding of cultural heritage in the EU



Culture and Education



Research for CULT Committee - Best practices in sustainable management and safeguarding of cultural heritage in the EU

Abstract

The study provides an overview of the benefits of cultural heritage conservation and describes good practices for sustainable management and safeguarding of tangible cultural heritage in the European Union. It also presents a brief overview of actions and programmes on the European level in the field of cultural heritage.

This document was requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education.

AUTHORS

Christer GUSTAFSSON (chapters 2, 3, 4 and 6)
Balázs MELLÁR (chapters 1 and 5)

Research manager: Balázs MELLÁR
Editor: Balázs MELLÁR
Project and publication assistance: Adrienn BORKA
Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, European Parliament

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all those who provided me the possibility to complete this report. A special gratitude I give to my colleagues in the expert panel of the European Heritage Label; Matthias Ripp, Jacek Purchla and especially Beatrice Kelly together with Stefano Della Torre, Gediminas Rutkauskas and Ragnar Siil whose contribution in preparing the case studies, helped me in writing this report.

LINGUISTIC VERSIONS

Original: EN

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

To contact the Policy Department or to subscribe to updates on our work for the CULT Committee please write to: Poldep-cohesion@ep.europa.eu

Manuscript completed in November 2018
© European Union, 2018

This document is available on the internet in summary with option to download the full text at: <http://bit.ly/2qtz8MC>

This document is available on the internet at: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_IDA\(2018\)601988](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_IDA(2018)601988)

Further information on research for CULT by the Policy Department is available at: <https://research4committees.blog/cult/>

Follow us on Twitter: @PolicyCULT

Please use the following reference to cite this study:

Gustafsson, C & Mellár, B 2018, Research for CULT Committee – Best practices in sustainable management and safeguarding of cultural heritage in the EU, European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, Brussels

Please use the following reference for in-text citations:

Gustafsson & Mellár (2018)

DISCLAIMER

The opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorized, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© Cover image used under licence from Shutterstock.com

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. NEW PARADIGM IN CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION	7
3. AN OVERVIEW OF THE BENEFITS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE	8
3.1. Job creation	8
3.2. Economic growth	9
3.3. Social and environmental benefits	9
4. GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES FOR SAFEGUARDING, DEVELOPING AND MANAGING CULTURAL HERITAGE	11
4.1. Job creation – cross-sectorial cooperation – innovation-driven growth	11
4.2. Local development – investments – cultural planning	11
4.3. Integrated heritage management planning – social resilience	12
4.4. Industrial heritage – creative industries	12
4.5. Negotiating planning – international funding – innovative reuse	12
4.6. Attracting global enterprises – attracting talent – liveable places	13
4.7. Innovative small-scale tourism	13
4.8. Participatory bottom-up planning – restoration of buildings and relations	13
4.9. Sustainability – focus on inhabitants	14
4.10. Sustainable city – open to the world	14
4.11. Network of world heritage sites in the Baltic Sea Region	14
5. RECENT POLICY DEVELOPMENTS AND INITIATIVES ON EUROPEAN LEVEL	15
5.1. Faro Convention and “Strategy 21”	15
5.2. EU actions and policies	15
5.3. 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH)	16
6. CONCLUSIONS	17
REFERENCES	18

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CHCFE** Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe
- CoE** The Council of Europe
- CULT** The Culture and Education Committee
- EU** European Union
- EYCH** European Year of Cultural Heritage
- GDP** Gross Domestic Product
- JRC** The European Commission's Joint Research Centre
- NGO** Non-Governmental Organisation
- UNESCO** The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- While many people still consider cultural heritage as an obstacle to economic growth or as a luxury, it is increasingly regarded as positive contributor to Europe's competitiveness and GDP.
- Today the focus of the cultural heritage sector is no longer just on preservation and protection of monuments. It has become more important to be able to find new activities to take place in historic buildings and landscapes and to find new uses for old buildings (adaptive reuse).
- We can observe a transition from conservation of tangible heritage to transmission of intangible heritage. Our current day challenges imply that conservation should not start from the objects only, but to a larger degree from the human beings.
- The case studies presented in this study show that the focus is shifting away from preservation and protection based on a supply-driven planning concept where heritage advocates try to convince the rest of the society of the importance to safeguard historic buildings. Instead a demand-driven heritage-led development can be noticed today, where the emphasis is on the spill-over effects of cultural heritage projects which are linked to e.g. regional development strategies in collaboration with other sectors and disciplines.
- Good practices for managing and safeguarding cultural heritage include: stimulating interaction between the groups belonging to different disciplinary fields; involving private sector and supply chains, which usually are not involved in cultural processes; holistic approach; focusing on the human side and enhancing urban liveability; promoting interaction between the groups belonging to different disciplinary fields; combining heritage protection plans with regional development strategies into heritage-led specialisation strategies; integration of regional and national levels; and participatory bottom-up planning.
- The economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts of cultural heritage are generally positive.
- The cultural heritage sector employs over 300,000 people in Europe and 7.8 million European jobs are indirectly linked to it.
- The total turnover generated in industries closely linked to cultural heritage is € 498 billion per year, or 3% of the EU GDP.
- Cultural heritage can be regarded as enabler of social cohesion and inclusion and a driver for equity and inclusive economic development in the urban economy. Furthermore, cultural heritage and historic quarters of cities can improve liveability, resilience and sustainability of both older and new urban areas.
- The positive impact of cultural heritage has been recognised also at EU level and today a large number of European Union policies, programmes and activities contribute to preserving and developing cultural heritage.
- The 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage is a sign of recognition of the yet undervalued impact of cultural heritage on societies and an opportunity to raise awareness of the social and economic importance of cultural heritage and to celebrate Europe's cultural richness and diversity.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study comes at an important time, with the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage in full swing. The cultural heritage sector employs over 300,000 people in Europe and 7.8 million European jobs are indirectly linked to it.¹ With its 453 inscribed sites, Europe as a region accounts for almost half of UNESCO's World Heritage Sites.² According to a recent Eurobarometer survey, 8 out of 10 Europeans think cultural heritage is not only important to them personally, but also to their community, region, country and the European Union as a whole.³

Against this background, the objective of this study is to identify the **benefits of cultural heritage conservation** and to describe **good practices for sustainable management and safeguarding of cultural heritage in the EU**. The study also provides a brief overview of **actions and programmes on the European level**.

The focus of the research is tangible heritage, but some aspects linked to intangible heritage are also covered. The study is a compilation of existing documents and based on bibliographical research and desk study.

¹ Nypan, 2005

² <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

³ Eurobarometer, 2017

2. NEW PARADIGM IN CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION

An early objective for the modern cultural heritage sector from the 1960's and onwards was concentrated on tangible heritage with a focus on monuments. Preservation was often considered by contemporary decision-makers as a cost to the society; a financial burden tolerated as a moral duty.⁴

Historic buildings and environments were regarded as an obstacle to economic growth and also to development in general. Spatial and urban planning became the main arena for cultural heritage advocates for preservation and protection of cultural landscapes in cities, as well as in rural areas. Cultural heritage policies thus became mostly re-active, leaving the initiatives to other actors.

Since the end of the 1990's, historic and cultural values have come to be judged by experts using models based on knowledge values, experience values, and use values. In parallel, conservation theories and principles have evolved during the 20th century. Often the importance of the concepts of authenticity and integrity were emphasised.

While many people still regard cultural heritage as an obstacle to economic growth or as a luxury, more and more come to see it as a **crucial resource for citizens and a key part of Europe's competitive advantage**. It is increasingly regarded as positive contributor to European GDP. Historic parts of cities are powerful magnets for attracting talent, tourists and investment. This opens up for new opportunities for preservation of built cultural heritage.

Today the focus of the cultural heritage sector is no longer just on preservation and protection of monuments. It has become more important to be able to find new activities to take place in historic buildings and landscapes. **Adaptive re-use**, which can be defined as "any building work and intervention aimed at changing its capacity, function or performance to adjust, re-use or upgrade a building to suit new conditions or requirements"⁵ is becoming more and more prevalent.

Adaptive re-use of cultural heritage is also one of the most effective and **environmental friendly** tools of modern urban development in a circular economy and towards sustainability.⁶ In this way, historic environments could also be used and understood as a **vital resource for development** for present and future generations.

People's individual as well as common interpretation and experiences or the understanding of heritage is of decisive importance. With growing importance of sustainable development in general and sustainable social development in particular, objectives but also opportunities for conservation have changed. **A transition from conservation of tangible heritage to transmission of intangible heritage can be observed.**⁷

Our current day challenges imply that conservation should not start from the objects only, but to a larger degree from **the human beings**. The paradigm of resilient and integrated conservation strategies requires solutions on how to find balance between preserving the heritage and at the same time providing **opportunities for smart, inclusive and sustainable development**.

⁴ European Commission, 2015

⁵ Douglas, 2006

⁶ Yung and Cheon, 2012

⁷ [UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003](#)

3. AN OVERVIEW OF THE BENEFITS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

A comprehensive overview of the **economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts of cultural heritage** is presented in the EU-funded research project Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe (CHCfE) conducted in 2015.⁸ Some conclusions from the study are that:

- cultural heritage is a key component and contributor to the attractiveness of Europe's regions, cities, towns and rural areas,
- cultural heritage provides European countries and regions with a unique identity,
- cultural heritage is a significant creator of jobs across Europe,
- cultural heritage is an important source of creativity and innovation,
- cultural heritage has a track record of providing a good return on investment and is significant generator of tax revenue for public authorities, and
- cultural heritage is a catalyst for sustainable heritage-led regeneration.⁹

Below we look at the main impacts in turn, and provide some additional analysis and data on the benefits.

3.1. Job creation

According to Terje Nypan, the cultural heritage sector employs over 300,000 people in Europe and 7.8 million European jobs are indirectly linked to it.¹⁰ In the cultural heritage sector people are employed in private companies, public authorities and organisations, academia, as well as NGOs. **Investments in heritage have also spill-over effects in many other industries with impacts on employment in the whole economy.**

Terje Nypan conducted another survey in 2015 based on official statistics that quantify turnover generated by cultural heritage in the construction, property and real estate, tourism, cultural and creative industries to assess the contributions of cultural heritage to economic turnover and jobs.¹¹ The survey estimates that the **number of jobs generated by cultural heritage could be in the order of 9 million, or approximately 4% of the employed EU workforce.**¹²

Accessible and attractive historic environments are important sources of tourism in many regions. Tourism is often the first business that is understood and mentioned when the economic benefits of cultural heritage are discussed. **Cultural heritage tourism** has a dual effect - directly through the purchase of goods and services and indirectly by generating employment in hotels, restaurants, travel agencies, museums, guides, as well as in production of souvenirs and more.

Today it has become obvious that the socio-economic impact of investments in cultural heritage goes beyond tourism. Many regions, cities and individual sites (e.g. Château de Versailles, wooden churches in Norway) have major problems with too many visitors. Attractive parts of cities are reserved for the tourism industry. Tourists use often flights or cars to travel which have a negative impact on the environment. To handle this situation, **sustainable tourism** has become an increasingly important field of research and education.

⁸ CHCfE Consortium, 2015

⁹ *ibid*

¹⁰ Nypan, 2005

¹¹ Nypan, 2015

¹² Some of the assumptions used are non-empirical, the results should thus be treated with caution

3.2. Economic growth

The already mentioned survey¹³ for the European's Heritage Head Forum shows that the total turnover generated in the construction, property and real estate, tourism, and cultural and creative industries is **€ 498 billion per year, or 3% of the EU GDP.**

Conservation, renovation and maintenance represents more than a quarter of the value of Europe's construction industry.

In a study conducted by Maria Juul for the European Parliament, Europe with its heritage sites is recognised to be **the world's biggest tourist destination and tourism is the third largest socioeconomic activity in the EU.**¹⁴ Tourism makes hereby an important contribution to the GDP of the European Union. However according to Juul, Europe is not the fastest-growing region and its market share is shrinking.

The prosperous European cultural heritage is a vital resource not only to attract visitors, but also talents and investors. Businesses often locate in historic areas, as they find it is easier to attract specialists and experts to live and work in these environments. In this way, historic environments could work as fields of creative powers and cultural heritage thus also enables innovation and enhances the long-term competitiveness of the European economy.

Beyond its direct contribution to GDP and employment, cultural heritage is also an important driver of economic and social innovation in many other sectors. The economic importance of these **spill-over effects** of cultural heritage is not only found in the construction industry, the property and real estate, tourism or the cultural and creative industries. The spill-over effects of cultural heritage affect other industries and ultimately actually the economy as a whole.

Cultural heritage also has an economic value in itself, being an important asset in the economy. Attempts to determine the economic value of cultural historically important properties were one of the projects in a study conducted in 2013.¹⁵ Of all 130,000 buildings in the Swedish region Halland, more than 10,000 have been considered to have cultural historical values. Analysing real estate transfers in 2005-2012, it was found that, historically valuable houses in relative terms had a higher final price than other properties.¹⁶ The historically valuable properties were then grouped in three categories: 1. very high value of national interest, 2. high value of mainly regional importance and 3. properties with local cultural historical value. The investigation also showed that real estate with a national or regional value had a higher final price on sales than real estate with a local value.

3.3. Social and environmental benefits

Cultural heritage can be regarded as **enabler of social cohesion and inclusion** (e.g. shared identity; pride and attachment to a place; integration of migrants, new residents and existing ones; historic public places; mixed uses). **Cultural heritage and creativity is also a driver for equity and inclusive economic development in the urban economy** (e.g. heritage places as incubators of creativity, cultural capital, intangible heritage, sustainable tourism). Furthermore, **cultural heritage and historic quarters of cities can improve liveability, resilience and sustainability of both older and new urban areas** (e.g. walkability and compactness, adaptive re-use of existing built fabric, embodiment of traditional knowledge, proven models of resilience for new urban settlements).

¹³ Nypan, 2015

¹⁴ Juul, 2015

¹⁵ Gustafsson, 2013; Riksantikvarieämbetet, 2017

¹⁶ Gustafsson, 2017

Cultural heritage might also be considered as a part of **the solution to Europe's climate change challenges**, for example through the protection and revitalisation of the historic building stock with huge embedded energy. In other cases, where cultural environmental work does not directly promote ecologically sustainable societal development, solutions that benefit the ecological environment are needed without the expense of the cultural environment.

Cultural landscapes are based on both cultural and natural values. Landscapes are formed by human beings in direct and indirect interaction with the nature. The management of cultural environments often also favour biodiversity.

The CHCfE study stresses that cultural heritage contributes to the quality of life, it provides an essential stimulus to education and lifelong learning, and finally it combines many of the above mentioned positive impacts to build social capital and helps deliver social capital.¹⁷

Cultural heritage has the potential to strengthen and sustain territorial as well as **social cohesion**. In order for all people to enjoy heritage it is important that environments and buildings of historic value are available. Heritage can also address the integration of disadvantaged and marginalised communities.

"The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor" by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) provides a common evidence base at city level e.g. to support policy makers with assessing policy actions and to communicate the importance of culture and creativity for improving socio-economic perspectives and resilience.¹⁸

¹⁷ CHCfE Consortium, 2015

¹⁸ European Commission, 2017

4. GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES FOR SAFEGUARDING, DEVELOPING AND MANAGING CULTURAL HERITAGE

Several European regions have today successfully exploited cultural heritage as a **production factor** in local and national economies, generating prosperity, bringing new jobs and creating improved environments. Below we present a number of good practice examples from Member States on cultural heritage conservation and development.

4.1. Job creation – cross-sectorial cooperation – innovation-driven growth

In the Baltic Sea Region, **the Halland Model**, with its initial focus on conservation of cultural heritage in Sweden, was an innovative and successful strategy in times of recession and all-time high unemployment.¹⁹ The focus was on regional sustainable development and employment. The cross-sectorial project created more than 1,400 jobs in the construction industry and approximately 350 new jobs on the improved premises in cultural and creative industries, tourism industries, and digital and clean technologies. More than 130 historic buildings were conserved within a cross-sectorial and multi problem-oriented regional cooperation between regional authorities, the construction industry and the cultural heritage sector. The project was nominated by the United Nations to the World's best project during the World Summit in Johannesburg 2002.

The actors and stakeholders in the Halland Model represented different sectors from national, regional, and local authorities, the construction industry, as well as the cultural heritage sector all of them with different objectives and viewpoints, values, policies, resources as well as legal frameworks. To make it possible to cooperate it was important to develop common objectives built on trust and an intermediate language which allowed them to communicate and create new cooperation.²⁰ The negotiations between the actors and stakeholders were based on the concept of **trading zone**, which could be understood as a useful instrument for understanding innovation processes in various fields of e.g. planning and research. The Halland Model could be described as an innovation and paradigm change through interaction between the groups belonging to different disciplinary fields. Such collaboration does not require all the participants to share all the objectives of the action, but joint action may occur in a trading zone, even if objectives are conflicting. Full agreement is therefore not necessary.

4.2. Local development – investments – cultural planning

In Italy, the *Distretti culturali* call issued by Fondazione Cariplo in 2007 is a huge matching-grant program aimed at producing new attitudes toward culture as a factor for **local development**. More than 60 Million Euros have been invested in six financed projects in different areas of Lombardy region. Each project included several actions, some related to tangible heritage, some to intangibles, some targeted at governance and communication.

The aim was to involve **private sector** and supply chains, which usually are not involved in cultural processes. *Distretti Culturali* program aimed at going beyond the normal assumption within the Heritage sector that the problem is just to collect money to pay conservation costs, and that Heritage makes money directly through valorisation and tourism.

¹⁹ Gustafsson, 2009

²⁰ Galison, 1997

In fact, this project increased employment and enhanced skills. The main challenge has been to improve skills and also to change the mind-set about the link between economy and culture, with a special reference to the economy of heritage. The crucial test in measuring the success of this model will be the capacity of local systems to set up new projects and new alliances, which will enhance the territorial capital in cities and/or regions.

The financed projects have been tailored to the characteristics and the opportunities of each place, thus developing the model both for networks connecting small towns as well as for urban contexts where **inclusive and innovative actions** have been promoted.

4.3. Integrated heritage management planning – social resilience

In Regensburg (Germany), a World Heritage Site, urban heritage was used to stimulate development in the sense of **the improvement of quality of life for the inhabitants**. The innovative tool used was an integrated heritage management plan. The methodology was developed in the framework of the EU project URBACT II Project HerO (Heritage as opportunity) and has been exported into many European projects, most recently to the EU Project COMUS (Community led urban development) together with the Council of Europe.

The integrated approach fosters a holistic understanding of the historic urban fabric and the development of joint objectives and actions. With the **integration** of regional and national levels, funding for many proposed projects was secured. Challenges for the urban heritage, like climate change, economic crisis, etc. were integrated in the concept to stimulate urban resilience.

4.4. Industrial heritage – creative industries

In Katowice (Poland) it was decided that one of the triggers for city development would be the creation of a new “zone of culture” located right next to the former Katowice Coal Mine – symbol of the industrial era wealth of the city. The uniqueness of the project lies in its holistic approach towards revitalisation of the historic coal mine and its surrounding area located in the city centre and turning it into a centre of **culture and cultural industries rooted in the genius loci**.

The project is part of the larger urban revitalisation plan turning the city away from heavy industry towards an economy of culture, knowledge and science. The zone of culture has been a flagship project of transformation of cities and regions, important elements of forging new images of cities both on local ground among inhabitants and in nationwide communication campaigns.

4.5. Negotiating planning – international funding – innovative reuse

In Łódź (Poland) the conservation and refurbishment of the *Poznanski* textile factory with its industrial heritage significance was an investment to a value of 250 million euros and it resulted in the establishment of *Manufaktura* and was the starting point for the regeneration of the city. In the late 1990’s Łódź was facing serious economic, social and environmental problems and almost 200,000 inhabitants had left the city after more or less all factories were closed. Of the 800,000 that remained in Łódź more than 200,000 were unemployed.

After the successful **transformation** of *Manufaktura* to an important arena for culture, meetings and business most of the **historic industrial complexes were conserved and transformed to new innovative uses**. In the *Poznanski* case a new model for **negotiating planning** between the local authorities and the international investors and developers was introduced.

4.6. Attracting global enterprises – attracting talent – liveable places

The historic significance of Dublin (Ireland) has played an important role in **attracting many global enterprises** to locate their international headquarters in the city (e.g. Google, LinkedIn, Microsoft, Facebook, PayPal). Even if the favourable corporation tax regime is the main and initial attraction to bring the enterprises to Dublin, other factors like civil stability, schools and certain aspects of cultural heritage also contribute to retaining highly mobile international executives as residents in cities like Dublin.

Dublin also is host to the International Financial Services Centre (IFSC), established in 1987 in which many international banks and insurance companies are located. The IFSC also has a museums levy to be raised from its financial partners; this levy is about to be tested in that a new private-based museum on the Irish Diaspora being developed within the district.

The Heritage Council (statutory body) is working with much smaller towns around Ireland including Westport, Co Mayo which has actively conserved and enhanced its cultural heritage over the past 20 years or so. Westport was elected by public vote through a national newspaper as the most liveable place in Ireland, and will make an interesting role model too for towns of smaller scale.

4.7. Innovative small-scale tourism

In May 2012, the Estonian Maritime Museum opened a new exhibition place at the Seaplane Harbour. The museum's main functions include research, organizing conferences and seminars, publishing articles, yearbooks, catalogues and other publications. Today, the Maritime Museum is one of the largest museums in Estonia, and the most popular one - particularly thanks to the Seaplane Harbour exhibition.

The restoration of the Seaplane Harbour was awarded the Europa Nostra Grand Prix victory in 2013. The Estonian Maritime Museum's Seaplane Harbour has also received many awards such as e.g. best development project; best tourism attraction; best tourism developer; annual marketing achievement and marketing team; family-friendly museum; the best design object; concrete building of the year; construction project of the year.²¹ Also, the director of the Maritime Museum was elected Man of the Year of Estonia in 2012.

4.8. Participatory bottom-up planning – restoration of buildings and relations

Cultural Heritage without Borders is a non-profit organisation that has been in charge of many important conservation projects including the Western Balkans. Their motto is “We **restore buildings and relations**”. In 2014, they were rewarded by Europa Nostra for their program for education, training and awareness-raising.

In Gjakove in Kosovo, with one of the highest rate of unemployment in Europe the inhabitants are still suffering from the effects of the 1990's civil war. The organisation received a small grant of 100,000 euros and then simply asked the inhabitants what were the biggest challenges and problems to the society.

With this **participatory spatial planning bottom-up approach** 10 projects were selected aiming at both conservation objects as well as new uses for the buildings. The projects had major impacts and many new businesses and jobs were created when cultural heritage was used as an important production factor in the local economy.

²¹ <http://meremuuseum.ee/en/awards/>

4.9. Sustainability – focus on inhabitants

In Ljubljana, capital of Slovenia, a strategy of regeneration of the historic centre combined with an approach to sustainability for the **enhancement of the urban liveability** has been adopted. The objective is to create an inhabitant friendly city based on its cultural heritage, creating the condition for residents to use the city centre and move constantly and easily from the centre to the periphery, served by district services.

Most of the investments in the urban requalification were possible thanks to a fantastic mediation work of the municipality with the main national infrastructure companies, associating their works with design projects, as well as with the bank system, that anticipated most of the budget.

4.10. Sustainable city – open to the world

"Sustainable city - open to the world" is the vision for the city of Göteborg (Sweden) now facing its fastest expansion ever. 55.000 new homes will be built until 2035 - the inner city will grow to twice its size. The biggest challenge for the city is to **counteract segregation** and link the centre with areas in the northeast. Cultural heritage will be used to strengthen a common identity, create context and drive sustainable growth.

The suburbs in northeast are the result of a large-scale building program from the 1960-70s. Today 95,000 people from many different nationalities live there. The area has many challenges but also great opportunities. For several years many bottom-up projects have started aiming at increasing residents' involvement in sustainable urban development. The objective is to create new jobs through these ventures and to change the stigmatized image of these areas as problem areas.

The aim is to use the area's cultural history to **create a new identity and new jobs in green industries** among others. LAB 190 is a development scheme with the objective to connect the multicultural suburbs of north-western Göteborg with surrounding municipalities. Today there is a strong common feeling among all partners in the suburbs of being outsiders in the process of "sustainability" and hereby not playing a part of the strong urbanisation process. In LAB 190 the border between tangible and intangible cultural values will be used as a driving force for sustainable development based on the bottom up perspective as mentioned in the European Landscape convention.

4.11. Network of world heritage sites in the Baltic Sea Region

Vilnius (Lithuania) has had a profound influence on the cultural and architectural development of much of Eastern Europe. Despite invasions and partial destruction, it has preserved an impressive complex of Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque and classical buildings as well as its medieval layout and natural setting.

The challenge today is to establish a **cross-sectorial cooperation** aimed to improve and make sustainable maintenance of built heritage and upgrade of urban historic environment; social and economic cohesion (well-being) through engagement and consolidation of local communities; development of creative fields of power in the historic city centre.

The challenge is to **combine heritage protection plans with regional development strategies into heritage-led specialisation strategies**. In the Operational Programme for Growth and Employment, the challenges are described as one-sided economic structure, weak growth in SMEs, need to increase the knowledge-intensive business, low level of investment in R&I, sparse and unbalanced population structure, and limited access to broadband.

5. RECENT POLICY DEVELOPMENTS AND INITIATIVES ON EUROPEAN LEVEL

5.1. Faro Convention and “Strategy 21”

The Council of Europe (CoE) Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, known as the Faro Convention is a key international legal instrument aiming to implement the “cultural sustainability” concept at European level. Its three core objectives are:

- managing cultural diversity for cohesive societies (enhancing of social, economic and reconciliation dimensions of cultural heritage),
- improving the living environment and quality of life (combining economic efficiency, social cohesion and ecological balance within heritage-led strategies),
- developing democratic participation (enhancing a feeling of belonging to heritage-led communities and implementing “shared responsibility” for heritage-led initiatives).

The Convention entered into force in June 2011. To date, 17 Member States of the CoE have ratified²² it and five have signed²³ it. Further consideration of its ratification and implementation are among its main challenges.

The European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century (“Strategy 21”), was launched in April 2017 by the CoE. It pursues an inclusive approach of the Faro Convention and involves not only local, regional, national and European public authorities but also all heritage stakeholders including professionals (NGOs, the voluntary sector and civil society). It seeks to create synergies between existing tools and policies and to complement them on the basis of international and European legal instruments. It is based on three components: “social”, “economic and territorial development” and “knowledge and education” and their interaction. Within these components, the “Strategy 21” formulates very concrete recommendations, complemented by best-practices from all over Europe. It encourages synergies between its implementation and the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage.

5.2. EU actions and policies

Promoting culture is one of the three main objectives of the “European Agenda for Culture” since 2007.²⁴ Of interest is, that in the Agenda the culture sector including cultural heritage is considered as an important driver of growth, competitiveness and jobs. The importance of maximising the intrinsic, economic, and societal value of cultural heritage was also clearly expressed in the European Commission 2014 Communication “Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe”²⁵. The European Commission has recently proposed a “New European Agenda for Culture”²⁶ which has amongst its goals to “protect and promote Europe's cultural heritage as a shared resource, to raise awareness of our common history and values and reinforce a sense of common European identity” and to “reinforce cooperation on cultural heritage”.

²² Among which the following EU Members States: Austria, Croatia, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovak Republic, and Slovenia.

²³ Among which the following EU Member States: Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland and Italy.

²⁴ European Commission, 2007

²⁵ European Commission, 2014a

²⁶ European Commission, 2018

A large number of European Union policies, programmes and activities contribute to preserving and developing cultural heritage. A first mapping of policy initiatives and support actions undertaken by the European Union in the field of cultural heritage, was done in 2014 by the European Commission with the aim to contribute to the development of a strategic approach to the preservation and valorisation of European heritage.²⁷ A second edition of this document was published in August 2017.²⁸

5.3. 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH)

The EYCH was officially launched on 7 December 2017 at the European Culture Forum in Milan. Thousands of initiatives and events implemented in EU Members States, municipalities and regions will be complemented by transnational projects funded by the EU (Creative Europe, Horizon 2020, Erasmus+, Europe for Citizens and others). The aim is to reach out to the widest possible audience, in particular children and young people, local communities and people who are rarely in touch with culture. On EU level and in collaboration with key partners (Council of Europe, UNESCO, etc.), 10 long-term initiatives will be run in support of four objectives:

- **Engagement (Objective 1):**
 - Shared heritage: cultural heritage belongs to us all (Initiative 1)
 - Heritage at school: children discovering Europe's most precious treasures and traditions (Initiative 2)
 - Youth for heritage: young people bringing new life to heritage (Initiative 3)
- **Sustainability (Objective 2):**
 - Heritage in transition: re-imagining industrial, religious, military sites and landscapes (Initiative 4)
 - Tourism and heritage: responsible and sustainable tourism around cultural heritage (Initiative 5)
- **Protection (Objective 3):**
 - Cherishing heritage: developing quality standards for interventions on cultural heritage (Initiative 6)
 - Heritage at risk: fighting against illicit trade in cultural goods and managing risks for cultural heritage (Initiative 7)
- **Innovation (Objective 4):**
 - Heritage-related skills: better education and training for traditional and new professions (Initiative 8)
 - All for heritage: fostering social innovation and people's and community's participation (Initiative 9)
 - Science for heritage: research, innovation, science and technology for the benefit of heritage (Initiative 10)

A budget of €8 million has been allocated to the Year.

²⁷ European Commission, 2014

²⁸ European Commission, 2017a

6. CONCLUSIONS

In recent years, we can witness a complete **new paradigm** emerging for the cultural heritage sector. Hereby, cultural heritage can be regarded as an important infrastructure for innovative use and **conservation not as a cost but instead as an investment for the future**. This new paradigm is becoming more visible as regards EU policies and actions, international documents and treaties, and also in local/regional initiatives.

Cultural heritage has become more and more understood as a **cultural capital** and the market creates economic **returns on investments** which could be recognised within e.g. the property market, tourist industry, refurbishment projects and the cultural and creative industries.²⁹

Historic buildings and environments are acknowledged today as important factors to **develop dynamic territories**, which are powerful magnets for attracting talent and creative people, tourists as well as investments and processes. Hereby cultural heritage contributes to **increase the capacity building as well as the competitiveness of regions**.

Cultural heritage has the potential to stimulate **sustainable development**, social and territorial cohesion, welfare, creativity and innovation, growth and jobs, as well as liveability of urban/territorial environments, in particular for younger and future generations. Recovery of unused buildings and landscapes present also opportunities for social regeneration of cities and territories, as well as reducing the need of new areas for urban development. Together this results in significant environmental benefits.

The case studies presented in this study show that the focus is shifting away from preservation and protection based on a supply-driven planning concept where heritage advocates try to convince the rest of the society of the importance to safeguard historic buildings. Instead a **demand-driven heritage-led development** can be noticed today, where the emphasis is on the spill-over effects of cultural heritage projects which are linked to e.g. regional development strategies in collaborations with other sectors and disciplines.

Cultural heritage planning could be **mainstreamed** and clearly integrated into smart specialisation strategies which would focus not only on preservation, but also on the adaptive re-use of historic buildings and how these activities could be linked to inclusive, sustainable and innovation-driven development.

²⁹ e.g. Throsby, 2001, Rypkema, 1994

REFERENCES

- Bandarin F., van Oers R. (2014) *Reconnecting the city: the Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the future of urban heritage*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- CHCFE Consortium (2015) *Cultural Heritage counts for Europe*. International Culture Center. Krakow. http://blogs.enatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CHCFE_FULL-REPORT_v2.pdf
- Douglas J. (2006) *Building adaptation* (2nd ed.). Woburn: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Eurobarometer (2017) Special Eurobarometer 466 Cultural Heritage Report September-October 2017. <http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/80882>
- European Commission (2006) *A renewed EU Tourism Policy: Towards a stronger partnership for European Tourism*, COM(2006) 134 final, Brussels.
- European Commission (2007) *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world*
- European Commission (2014) *Mapping of Cultural Heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities*, first edition (July 2014).
- European Commission (2014a) *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Towards an Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage for Europe*.
- European Commission (2014b) *National/Regional Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialisation (RIS3). Cohesion Policy 2014-2020*.
- European Commission (2015) *Getting Cultural Heritage to work for Europe*. Report of the Horizon 2020 Expert Group on Cultural Heritage. http://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/horizon2020/document.cfm?doc_id=10194
- European Commission (2017) *The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor. 2017 Edition*. ISBN 978-92-79-70205-1. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017.
- European Commission (2017a) *Mapping of Cultural Heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities*, second edition (August 2017).
- European Commission (2018) *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic And Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - A New European Agenda for Culture* COM/2018/267 final.
- Della Torre, S. (2003) *La conservazione programmata: una strategia per il patrimonio storico-architettonico*. Milano.
- Faro Convention (2005) *The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Faro, Portugal.
- Fusco Girard, L.; Levent Baycan, T.; Nijkamp, P. (2011) *Sustainable city and creativity: promoting creative urban initiatives* Farnham.
- Galison, P. (1997) *Image & Logic: A Material Culture of Microphysics*. Chicago.
- Getty Conservation Institute (1998) *Economics and Heritage Conservation*. (edited by Maria de la Torre), Los Angeles.

- Gustafsson, C. (2009) *The Halland Model. A Trading Zone for Building Conservation in Concert with Labour Market Policy and the Construction Industry, Aiming at Regional Sustainable Development*. Göteborg.
- Gustafsson, C. (2013) *Kreativa kraftfält i Halland*. Halmstad.
- Gustafsson, C. (2017) *Kreativa kraftfält i Göteborgsregionen och Fyrbodal*. Göteborg.
- Licciardi, G. and Amirtahmasebi, R. (eds.) (2012) *The economics of uniqueness: investing in historic city cores and cultural heritage assets for sustainable development*. Washington.
- Juul, M. (2015) *Tourism and the European Union. Recent Trends and Policy Developments*. European Parliamentary Research Service. Brussels.
- Nijkamp P. (2012) *Economic Valuation of Cultural Heritage*. In: *The Economics of Uniqueness*; Licciardi, G., Amirtahmasebi, R., Eds. Washington.
- Nypan T. (2005) *Cultural Heritage Monuments and Historic buildings as value generators in a post-industrial economy*.
https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/175613/nypan_cultural_heritage.pdf
- Nypan T. (2015) *A proposal for a design to develop European statistics on the socio-economic contributions of the physical cultural heritage*. in Koen Van Balen and Aziliz Vandesande (Eds.), "Heritage Counts", *Reflections on Cultural Heritage Theories and Practices*. A series by the Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation, KU Leuven, vol. 2, Garant: Antwerp – Apeldoorn
- Ost C. (2016) *Innovative financial approaches for culture in urban development*, in UNESCO (2016), *Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development*.
- Pereira Roders A. (2016) *Smarter urban governance: towards an integrative framework*, in UNESCO (2016), *Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development*.
- Regeringens proportion 2016/2017:116. *Kulturarvspolitik*. Stockholm
- Riksantikvarieämbetet (2017) *Räkna med kulturarvet*. Stockholm
- Rypkema, D.D. (1994) *The Economics of Historic Preservation. A Community Leader's Guide*. Washington.
- Sacco, P.L. (2011) *Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funds programming*.
http://www.eenc.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/pl-sacco_culture-3-0_CCI-Local-and-Regional-Development_final.pdf
- Sacco, P.L., Ferilli, G. Tavano Blessi. G. (2014) *Understanding culture-led local development: A critique of alternative theoretical explanations*. *Urb. Stud.* 51 2806-2821.
- Throsby, David (2001) *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge
- UNESCO (2010) *The power of culture to development*.
- UNESCO (2013) *Recommendations on Historic Urban Landscapes*.
- UNESCO (2016) *Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development*.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford.
- Yung E. H. K. and Chan E. H. W. (2012) *Implementation challenges to the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings: Towards the goal of sustainable, low carbon cities*. *Habitat International*, vol. 36, pp. 352-361.

The study provides an overview of the benefits of cultural heritage conservation and describes good practices for sustainable management and safeguarding of tangible cultural heritage in the European Union. It also presents a brief overview of actions and programmes on the European level in the field of cultural heritage.

PE 601.988

IP/B/CULT/IC/2017-099

Print ISBN 978-92-846-1232-1 | doi:10.2861/25066 | QA-02-17-782-EN-C

PDF ISBN 978-92-846-1231-4 | doi:10.2861/28172 | QA-02-17-782-EN-N