



Doc. 13428

18 February 2014

Europe's endangered heritage

Report¹

Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media

Rapporteur: Ms Vesna MARJANOVIĆ, Serbia, Socialist Group

Summary

Heritage sites across Europe – buildings, monuments, urban and regional landscapes of historical or cultural significance – are under growing threat. Their upkeep is hit hard by budget cuts as a result of the recent financial crisis, and western Europe is no exception to this trend. Yet conserving these sites can have economic and social spin-offs, helping to create tourism opportunities, re-generate communities and connect new generations with their history and culture.

However, this will need long-term planning and integrated strategies – which take into account the potential benefits to society and the local economy as well as the costs of conserving the sites. States should ratify and implement the Faro Convention, the Council of Europe treaty which sets out sound principles and guidance in this field. National surveys can help to identify priority projects and ensure resources end up where they are needed most, boosted by tax breaks, soft loans and other incentives if necessary. Civil society, schools, universities and museums should be involved more in such projects, and craft and conservation skills should be nurtured.

Finally, there should be enhanced co-operation and greater coherency of action between the Council of Europe, the European Union and UNESCO, with a view to defining regional strategies, strengthening transnational co-operation and developing specific pilot projects which reflect European policy aims.

1. Reference to committee: [Doc. 12999](#), Reference 3901 of 1 October 2012.



Contents	Page
A. Draft resolution	3
B. Draft recommendation	5
C. Explanatory memorandum by Ms Marjanovic, rapporteur	6
1. Origin and objective of the report	6
2. Introduction	7
3. Factors threatening heritage in Europe	8
3.1. Neglect and ignorance, lack of training and of appropriate education	8
3.2. Institutional change	9
3.3. Economic development and infrastructure	9
3.4. Large-scale urban development	10
3.5. Landscape scale development such as mining and dams	10
3.6. Conflict and post-conflict situation	10
3.7. Emerging nationhood	11
3.8. Natural disasters	11
3.9. Conflicting policies	11
4. Good practice at national level	12
4.1. Survey and regular maintenance	12
4.2. Mainstreaming and community involvement	12
4.3. Education and awareness raising	13
4.4. Financial incentives	13
4.5. Legal framework and enforcement	14
5. International co-operation	15
5.1. European co-operation	15
5.2. UNESCO	16
5.3. Non-governmental organisations	16
6. Conclusions	17
Appendix – List of relevant Assembly texts on the protection of cultural heritage and landscape	19

A. Draft resolution²

1. The Parliamentary Assembly recalls that culture and heritage play a fundamental role in upholding democratic values and building citizenship: they embed cultural identity, deepen understanding and respect for others, and nurture respect for cultural diversity.
2. Citizen participation and non-governmental initiatives are crucial drivers to rescue endangered heritage. Awareness raising and education about the value of cultural heritage for society are essential to get citizens involved in projects for its conservation as well as its continuous use as a “living heritage”. The Assembly therefore stresses the need to build a stronger link between education and heritage, with a view to engaging people, especially youth, with their history and culture.
3. Moreover, the Assembly believes that economic development and protection of heritage are not in contradiction. Numerous examples show that investments made in heritage conservation can make a significant contribution to economic and social development. However, new innovative mechanisms and partnerships are needed to achieve those goals more effectively and more systematically.
4. The Assembly therefore underlines that heritage conservation needs long-term integrated strategies, coherent policies including investment plans, which should take account not only of the costs of heritage conservation projects, but also of the potential of heritage conservation as a key element in socio-economic regeneration projects and of its democratic value for society.
5. Accordingly, the Assembly recommends that the member States of the Council of Europe:
 - 5.1. concerning strategy and policy design:
 - 5.1.1. sign and ratify the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (CETS No. 199, “Faro Convention”) and the European Landscape Convention (ETS No. 176) if they have not yet done so, and develop national strategies which take into account cultural heritage according to the principles laid down in these conventions;
 - 5.1.2. conduct national surveys of heritage under statutory protection to identify endangered heritage, establish priorities for action, decide upon the most relevant action for each heritage site and help direct resources to where they are most needed, bearing in mind the right balance between monuments of architectural/historic value and smaller heritage sites of community value;
 - 5.1.3. mainstream heritage protection into decision-making in relation to planning and policy, at national, regional and local level, include “heritage impact assessment” alongside environmental impact assessment and use heritage as a key element in socio-economic regeneration projects;
 - 5.1.4. where feasible, conduct regional specific surveys to consider also heritage which is not yet under statutory protection in order to identify endangered heritage sites of value for the local community which could be included in regional development plans;
 - 5.1.5. introduce regular reporting on initiatives undertaken to safeguard endangered heritage in national parliaments and engage with the Council of Europe, the European Union and UNESCO to harmonise data related to endangered heritage and share best practice and knowledge;
 - 5.1.6. encourage co-operation between the ministries responsible for heritage and for education with a view to raising awareness of young people of the value of heritage and help them strengthen cultural understanding and democratic citizenship based on lessons learnt from heritage and experiences of democracy and human exchanges based on heritage interpretation;
 - 5.1.7. develop integrated and innovative heritage-led strategies for the protection of monuments and historic towns and local and regional development using the Council of Europe’s guidance and methodologies as developed within the framework of the “Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme related to the integrated conservation of the cultural heritage”, the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape initiative and the experience shared within the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions (EAHTR);

2. Draft resolution adopted unanimously by the committee on 3 December 2013.

5.2. concerning policy implementation:

5.2.1. review the appropriate level for decision-making concerning heritage in danger to ensure coherency between national, regional and local levels, which is an issue of relevance particularly in decentralised States;

5.2.2. improve co-ordination between government institutions, local authorities, heritage institutions, museums, academies and other partners to overcome “deadlock situations” associated with endangered heritage, often due to complex legal and ownership issues;

5.2.3. ensure regular inspection of heritage sites (using also digital technology) and harmonise data and relevant information gathering to monitor change and identify problems in order to facilitate regular maintenance;

5.2.4. review standards and guidelines for heritage maintenance, conservation, restoration and rehabilitation as a practical approach to managing change (appropriate materials and techniques), and provide tailored training for project and site management;

5.3. concerning financial and technical support:

5.3.1. ensure a level playing field between the conservation and the construction sector and introduce financial incentives for conservation and restoration projects, such as tax reductions, soft loans, insurance premiums and support to owners to help them face extra costs due to specific heritage requirements and fees of accredited professionals;

5.3.2. pool knowledge and know-how in crafts and conservation skills, including scientific analysis, digital recording of heritage and project management;

5.3.3. develop training programmes for professionals in different sectors and share good practice in urban regeneration projects, community engagement, use of economic tools, etc;

5.3.4. give recognition to and support the activities of heritage conservation groups working at national and local level.

6. The Assembly invites the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe to promote co-operation, exchange of expertise and practical experience between local and regional authorities, in order to better safeguard endangered heritage.

B. Draft recommendation³

1. The Parliamentary Assembly, with reference to its Resolution ... (2014) on Europe's endangered heritage, stresses the importance of heritage in shaping individual and collective cultural identity and promoting mutual understanding.
2. The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (CETS No. 199, "Faro Convention") and the European Landscape Convention (ETS No. 176) set a framework for sound cultural and natural heritage preservation policies. The Assembly therefore considers that specific activities should be envisaged to facilitate implementation of these instruments through technical assistance and exchange of good practice at operational levels.
3. Moreover, the Assembly strongly believes that there should be greater coherency of action between the Council of Europe, the European Union and UNESCO at the European level. In this respect, the Assembly welcomes the exemplary joint programme and the tangible results of the "Ljubljana Process", a joint initiative of the Council of Europe, the European Union and member States in South-East Europe, which developed innovative partnerships and pilot action to be replicated for the rehabilitation of 186 emblematic monuments and heritage sites in the region.
4. The Assembly therefore recommends that the Committee of Ministers:
 - 4.1. encourage integrated activities between culture, heritage, education and youth sectors of the Council of Europe with a view to providing guidance to the member States on innovative ways of interlinking heritage with the process of building democratic citizenship;
 - 4.2. provide support for member States to exchange good practices based on the standards and principles of the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society and provide assistance to member States in implementing the specific provisions of the convention;
 - 4.3. continue to support innovative Council of Europe integrated approaches through the development of its "Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme related to the integrated conservation of the cultural heritage" pilot projects in the member States, by focusing on needs and requirements related to the conservation or restoration of single monuments, the rehabilitation of historic towns and local and regional development;
 - 4.4. continue to support the European Heritage Network (HEREIN) as a unique governmental institutions' network and platform of convergence for harmonising and collecting relevant information related to heritage and developing a shared knowledge base;
 - 4.5. continue to support regional approaches, including in South-East Europe, the South Caucasus, the Black Sea and other European regions, with a view to defining regional strategies, strengthening transnational co-operation, and developing specific pilot projects which could benefit all member States, including in particular the Ljubljana Process and the Community-led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns.

3. Draft recommendation adopted unanimously by the committee on 3 December 2013.

C. Explanatory memorandum by Ms Marjanovic, rapporteur

1. Origin and objective of the report

“The unity of European culture is simply the end-product of 3 000 years of labour by our diverse ancestors. It is a heritage which we spurn at our peril, and of which it would be a crime to deprive younger generations. Rather it is our task to preserve and renew it.” (Hugh Nicholas Seton-Watson,⁴ historian and political scientist, 1916-1984)

1. On 1 October 2012, our committee was seized for report on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 12999) which Ms Muriel Marland-Militello and several other members had tabled on 6 July 2012. The committee appointed Mr Michael Falzon rapporteur on 18 December 2012. Following his departure from the Parliamentary Assembly, the committee appointed me rapporteur on 25 April 2013.

2. On 12 March 2013 in Paris, the committee held an exchange of views with Ms Mechtild Rössler, Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO, and Mr Léon Herrera, Director, European Co-operation and Strategy, Council of Europe Development Bank. Moreover, I wish to particularly thank Mr Adam Wilkinson, Director of Edinburgh World Heritage, for his assistance in drafting this explanatory memorandum. Following my participation in the Marseilles Forum organised by the Council of Europe and the European Commission on “The social value of heritage and the value of heritage for society” in September 2013, I established contacts with experts and staff who have assisted me in collecting information about relevant intergovernmental actions of the Council of Europe, which the draft recommendation proposes to promote and reinforce.

3. In line with the motion, the present report is intended to “raise awareness about the importance of more effective policies designed to safeguard cultural heritage with an aim to identify good practice and make practical recommendations on measures which could help to overcome existing problems and tap the economic potential of heritage as a resource for sustainable development”. It also seeks to “give political impetus to the implementation of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention, 2005)”.

4. The report focuses on tangible cultural heritage,⁵ identified on national lists across Europe, which can be considered “in danger”. Article 11 of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO, 1972)⁶ provides a definition of what could be considered “heritage in danger”:

“... property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage which is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves.”

5. The following analysis also builds on the important work of the Assembly on specific heritage conservation issues⁷ of direct relevance to this report. I wish to emphasise that examples of endangered heritage used in this report are random to illustrate a specific problem. They should not be considered as an exhaustive list of endangered sites, nor indicative to blame any quoted member State.

4. “What is Europe, Where is Europe? From Mystique to Politique”, 11th Martin Wight Lecture, delivered at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (note from “A history of Europe”, Norman Davies, Oxford press).

5. UNESCO defined cultural heritage in Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention of 1972 in terms of monuments, groups of buildings and sites, but has subsequently developed the definition to include intangible and other aspects of heritage. At the heart of the definitions is the concept of shared value, between people and peoples over time.

The Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage (ETS No. 66, “Granada Convention”, 1985) develops, in its Article 1, the definition of architectural heritage in considering single monuments, groups of buildings and sites. The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (CETS No. 199, “Faro Convention”, 2005) goes further, indicating in Article 2.a that “cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time”.

6. See the full text of the convention: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>.

2. Introduction

6. The theme of endangered heritage in Europe is of concern to many member States, with most acute problems in central and eastern Europe, south-east Europe and the Caucasus. However, due also to the financial crisis and severe budgetary cuts in the domain of culture, endangered heritage and its safeguard is an issue for many western European countries, too. The relevance and acuity of this problem clearly transpire from the work of UNESCO⁸ concerning the list of World Heritage in Danger and the related ICOMOS⁹ Heritage@Risk programme and from the main intergovernmental activities implemented by the Council of Europe which are part of its “Technical Co-operation and Consultation Programme related to the integrated conservation of the cultural heritage”, and especially its regional programmes in south-east Europe and the south Caucasus. The urgency to discuss it further was confirmed by the European Heritage Congress organised by Europa Nostra in June 2012.

7. Across Europe one can find the most stunning reminders of the legacy of thousands of years of mankind’s cultural development embodied in a remarkable built heritage, serving as reminder of the universality of human creativity and the common ground we share across diverse cultures.

8. The immense economic, technical and social progress of the last hundred and fifty years, along with migration, war, natural disasters, and the simple effects of old age have inevitably led to loss, most frequently through ignorance or the pursuit of apparent progress at any cost.

9. The increasing empowerment of communities in a globalised world has led to wider awareness of the value of place, and the value of this cultural heritage outside academic and governmental circles, the traditional guardians of the historic and architectural values of our built heritage. While it might be expected that this would lead to fewer losses of historic buildings, places, spaces and valuable objects, the level of threat – or the awareness of it – appears to be increasing.

10. The sorts of places that are threatened will surprise – and shock – the average European citizen: the Bagrati Cathedral, the Gelati Monastery and historic churches of Mtskheta in Georgia, Serbian medieval monuments in Kosovo*,¹⁰ and the maritime mercantile city of Liverpool – the three sites currently on the World Heritage in Danger list of UNESCO;¹¹ the World Heritage site of the Archaeological Areas of Pompei and Herculaneum, country houses and palaces across central Europe and Silesia, entire villages, a mountain and a two thousand year-old mine complex in the Rosia Montana area of Romania,¹² fenland landscapes of the Veneto, grand monasteries and convents, spectacular bridges in remote places, barracks (such as Vauban’s fortifications in Briançon) and fortifications – buildings, landscapes and settings of the most sublime beauty and highest historic importance.

11. Several organisations have established lists of endangered heritage, covering examples of endangered heritage at global, European and national level. For example, the World Monuments Fund, a leading independent organisation in the United States, has established its World Monuments Watch programme and the World Monuments List,¹³ which later inspired the Europa Nostra to launch its programme “The 7 Most Endangered Sites and Monuments in Europe”.¹⁴ At national level, the Swiss heritage society “Patrimoine Suisse” established the red list of endangered heritage¹⁵ and the Swedish Association for Building

7. The list of the most relevant Assembly texts is in the appendix. Among others: protecting the cultural heritage against disasters; tax incentives for cultural heritage conservation; the private management of cultural property; crafts and cultural heritage conservation skills; rescuing of archaeological finds from development projects; redundant religious buildings; industrial heritage in Europe; situation of the cultural heritage in central and eastern Europe; and, more generally, on awareness raising, the report on “Europe, a common heritage” – a Council of Europe campaign.

8. List of World Heritage in Danger, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/>.

9. International Council on Monuments and Sites, advisory body to the UNESCO World Heritage Programme, www.international.icomos.org/risk/.

10. * All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United National Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

11. See UNESCO World Heritage in Danger list:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/?search=&searchSites=&search_by_country=&search_yearinscribed=&type=all®ion=1&themes=&media=&danger=1&criteria_restriction=&order=country&description=1.

12. Endangered by opencast mining using cyanide technology of extracting gold which destroys the monuments (the oldest preserved gold mine from Roman times, the settlement of the mining area Rosia Montana) and risks polluting the whole cultural landscape area of the western Carpathian mountains.

13. www.wmf.org/watch.

14. www.europanostra.org/coming-events/222/.

15. www.patrimoinesuisse.ch/index.php?id=904&L=1; also www.patrimoinesuisse.ch/index.php?id=696&L=1.

Preservation (*Svenska byggnadsvårdsföreningen*) manages the yellow list of endangered heritage.¹⁶ However, these initiatives are not systematic in all countries in Europe and many sites of endangered heritage fall outside regular screening and monitoring.

12. The example of the World Heritage site of the Archaeological areas of Pompei and Herculaneum is a striking one not only for Italy, but because it illustrates complex situations that are associated with many other sites in danger. Nearly half of the 44 hectares of the open-air archaeological site is endangered by collapse and decay as a result of weather conditions, pollution and extreme pressure from 2.5 million visitors annually. The spectacular collapse of the house of gladiators alerted the international press in 2010, however many other parts of the site slowly decay in silence. Due to the State budgetary cuts,¹⁷ scientific staff and staff in charge of maintenance are seriously lacking. There is less than one guard per hectare to manage mass tourist flows. In addition, management of the site was entrusted by the former government to the civil protection organisation which normally intervenes in case of natural disasters. This solution certainly enabled lengthy administrative procedures to be shortened, but on the downside it raised serious allegations of corruption and misuse of public funding by local mafia. In March 2013, 105 million euros were released through the European Regional Development Fund to restore areas at high risk, on the condition that transparent management of funds be guaranteed through the creation of a "Special Superintendency for the Archaeological Heritage of Naples and Pompeii" (SANP).

3. Factors threatening heritage in Europe

13. The reasons for heritage being in danger are rarely simple and therefore solutions are rarely easy, but by taking a step back one can start to understand the broader themes behind the threats. The following list of broader themes behind threats is not comprehensive, but could be said to be indicative:

- neglect, ignorance;
- lack of training and of appropriate education;
- institutional change;
- economic development and infrastructure (energy, transport);
- large-scale urban development;
- landscape scale development such as mining and dams;
- conflict and post-conflict situations;
- emerging nationhood;
- natural disasters;
- conflicting policies.

3.1. Neglect and ignorance, lack of training and of appropriate education

14. The simplest themes are ignorance and neglect, and lack of training and of adequate education, one often flowing from the other. Ignorance of the significance of cultural heritage and its neglect lead to the inevitable decay of structures, which cannot survive intact without regular maintenance. The effects of climatic conditions are expected to be exacerbated with climate change, with more severe weather events, placing increased demands on historic buildings constructed with different climate conditions in mind. A great deal of work is needed to ensure that our historic places have the necessary resilience and are prepared for these changes.

15. Long-term degeneration, whether deliberate or accidental, can be a tremendous barrier to action in that it decreases land values to the point that financial institutions are unwilling or unable to invest. It warps perceptions of places and blinds people to their potential.

16. Deliberate neglect and degeneration have long been a crude tool for property speculators. A classic example of deliberate long-term degeneration, now happily resolved, were the blocks to the east of King's Cross Station in London. For many years, the landowner deliberately allowed the blocks to fall into disrepair,

16. www.byggnadsvard.se/artiklar/the-swedish-association-for-building-preservation.

17. In 2008, the Italian State allocated 0.28% of its budget (2.1 billion euros) to the ministry in charge of cultural property. In 2010, the budget was reduced to 1.7 billion and in 2012 to 1.6 billion euros.

blighting the lives of those in and around them, with a long-term vision of comprehensive redevelopment. As a result, the local community of the surrounding area was motivated to create change. When, after many years, initial proposals came forward for the site, involving total demolition of the collection of historic houses and industrial buildings, local opposition was vociferous. A local estate agent showed how value could be created from the existing buildings, and the community helped bring forward an alternative vision for the site. Eventually the developers saw that there was no hope for their initial plans and came forward with a new conservation-led scheme. The catalytic effect of this conservation-led development on the surrounding area was tremendous – an area that had been synonymous with drugs and prostitution became a thriving urban quarter.

17. Lack of training and education can result in inappropriate repairs and interventions to historic buildings that do more harm than good by speeding up decay. Historic buildings and structures are often built from materials that are significantly softer than their modern equivalents, and poor selection of materials for repair results in long-term damage.

18. In parts of Europe there is a major shortage of the skills and gaps in the traditional knowledge needed for the repair of historic buildings. Initiatives are under way in several countries to encourage the traditional craft skills needed to sustain these historic places, though the overall picture remains somewhat unclear: traditional skills are quickly lost and slow to regrow.

3.2. Institutional change

19. Institutional change can be at the root of many of the largest conservation challenges, leaving large buildings and important complexes redundant, be they religious, medical, military or industrial. The sheer scale of such sites makes reuse an extraordinary challenge, with approaches varying from the piecemeal to the large scale.

20. Spectacular religious complexes are increasingly falling redundant, and many religious buildings of local significance are decaying. Examples of threatened monastic complexes are the Monastery and Church of Setubal in Portugal, by Master Diogo de Boitaca, completed in 1494 (preceding his masterpiece, the Jerónimos Monastery of Santa Maria de Belém in Lisbon) and site of the Treaty of Tordesillas (1495),¹⁸ the orthodox church Our Lady of Ljevis in Prizren (Kosovo) and the ancient Armenian Church of Surp Levork in Mardin (Turkey) (restored in 1822).¹⁹

3.3. Economic development and infrastructure

21. Increasing connectivity is seen as vital to economic development, but the construction of new roads and railways takes its toll on heritage. A stark example of this was the construction of a large road bridge over the Elbe Valley in Dresden (Germany), which resulted in the removal of the valley's World Heritage Site label. In spite of a vigorous local and international campaign, the fenland landscape of the Veneto has been heavily blighted by the construction of the autostrada A31 Valdastico Sud between Vicenza and Rovigo, affecting the setting of numerous historic villas in the previously undisturbed landscape, while also opening up the area to industrialisation.

22. Power infrastructure has long been contentious. Greater pressure to access remote sources of power will mean further conflict. There is increasing concern across Europe at the impact of wind turbines on landscapes and the settings of historic monuments. A surprising recent proposal to site wind turbines within the setting of Mont St Michel in France, one of the most iconic European World Heritage Sites, led to UNESCO asking France to suspend its proposals to preserve its "timeless landscape". The cultural landscape of the Middle Rhine Valley (Germany), a World Heritage Site (since 2002) is also endangered by the impact of wind turbines.

18. It received the European Heritage Label in 2011, recognising its significance as a site of early European integration, but also as a very early example of the late Gothic Manuelin style, which includes the architectural language of the New World.

19. The Governorate of Mardin is keen to restore it for both religious and secular uses, including cultural activities, in partnership with Istanbul Technical University. This is a significant initiative of the Turkish authorities to restore Armenian heritage.

3.4. Large-scale urban development

23. The pressure for development is felt most acutely in Europe's long-established cities. Urbanisation continues apace across the continent, and while there are excellent European Union programmes such as URBACT to encourage the sharing of best practice across a range of common issues, poorly planned, badly executed and badly controlled development can wreak havoc on the delicate historic and social tissue of historic cities.

24. As parts of cities become more successful, land values increase and developers seek to intensify use in these areas through demolition and reconstruction. An extreme case of this is Moscow, where in the period between 1992 and 2010, the city transformed vast areas of elegant eighteenth and nineteenth century two or three-storey buildings to modern interpretations, losing all sense of history and authenticity. Other European cities have had greater success in managing the pressure for change and capturing it in a positive manner, accepting that gentrification of historic areas can, in some cases, be a force for long-term sustainability, while seeking to accommodate large-scale new development in restricted areas (such as La Defense in Paris).

3.5. Landscape scale development such as mining and dams

25. The pursuit of raw materials to power the economy rarely has positive long-term effects for an area, leading to massive landscape damage, the blighting of communities and their places, and their abandonment at the end of works.

26. Opencast mining for brown coal has been particularly damaging in parts of Germany. With the phasing out of nuclear power post-Fukushima, demand for baseload power will only rise. The scale of these operations is tremendous.²⁰ Mining not only dramatically affects historic landscapes and towns and villages, it also results in areas being physically disconnected from one another, creating social dislocation.

27. The constructions of dams for agriculture and power can be extremely destructive to historic landscapes and places. This is particularly of concern in Turkey, a country of astonishing archaeological and architectural riches. Many of its most historic sites are located close to the very rivers that are proposed for damming as a part of its plan to drive forward economic development. A terrible recent loss was the destruction of the Hadrianic (Roman) settlement at Allianoi.

28. The historic town of Hasankeyf is currently threatened by the construction of the Illisu dam. Hasankeyf is a site of important historic significance, bearing testimony to settlement from 9 500 BCE, and (more recently) the Roman empire, Byzantium, the Artukids, Ayyubids and Akkoyunlu, and, of course, the Ottoman Empire. The dam will result in the inundation of 80% of its historic monuments, with no internationally recognised scheme for their conservation, preservation and relocation.²¹ The proposals for the dam were ratified before Turkey had legislation requiring environmental impact assessments.

3.6. Conflict and post-conflict situation

29. This specific issue will be dealt by the committee in more detail in its report on "Culture preservation in crisis and post-crisis situations".²²

30. Conflict frequently leads to the rapid loss of large numbers of historic buildings and places. According to the data gathered by the Institute for the Protection of the Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina as of November 1995 (during the comprehensive survey carried out by the Council of Europe and the European Commission), 2 771 built heritage properties were partially demolished or damaged, 713 were totally destroyed and 554 were set on fire and are unusable following the 1992-96 war. The most infamous was the loss of the Old Bridge in Mostar, a symbol of the destruction of a community. However, its reconstruction provided a symbol of international solidarity and a very positive example of civil society support for preserving heritage.

20. For example, the Tagebau Hambach mine in North Rhine Westphalia required extraction of sand to a depth of 200 meters to access the 2.4 billion tons of brown coal over a period of five years, yielding around 40 million tons per year. The site is currently about 34 km², and will eventually grow to 85 km². Tens of thousands of people were evicted to make way for this particular mine (one of several) and mediaeval villages destroyed.

21. These monuments include the 12th century Great Mosque, the 12th century Aturkid Bridge over the Tigris, key to its success as a trading centre, the 15th Century Rizk Mosque, the Koc Mosque with its rare type of iwan and exceptional mihrab, and a huge number of minor monuments.

22. See [Doc. 13277](#), motion for a recommendation.

31. Another example is Cyprus, a country with a unique civilization dating back to 9 000 BCE, where a number of international initiatives had been undertaken to find solutions to safeguard endangered cultural heritage. It is estimated that, since 1974, hundreds of historic and religious monuments have been partially or completely destroyed and more than 60 000 ancient artifacts have been illegally transferred around the world. The Assembly rapporteurs who visited Cyprus in 1989 and 2000²³ suggested the setting up of a European Foundation for funding conservation work in the north and for facilitating international contacts to support local experts with conservation work, research and inventory of losses in cultural property. They strongly encouraged closer co-operation between the stakeholders and called for international assistance in the control of illegal trade in cultural property.

32. Linked to the theme of education is the need for the unbiased teaching of history – an overt focus on one interpretation at the expense of another tradition will result, in the long term, in a failure to value the buildings and monuments representing that tradition. This is the sad position that post-conflict Kosovo finds itself in, with a young ethnic Albanian population being brought up without a real understanding of the importance of the historic monuments around them. There is a danger that this will lead to the long-term neglect of an important part of the region's heritage.

3.7. Emerging nationhood

33. With new nationhood comes a new body politic seeking to find its way in the world, finding new allegiances and new investors. In south-east Europe this is quite evident in the form of benign Turkish investment in infrastructure, and Wahabi investment in new mosques of the Arabian type, neglecting local traditions and leaving vernacular religious buildings unused.

34. New nationhood often results in the rapid modernisation of capital cities in order to reflect the aspirations of the new leadership, resulting in the loss of older buildings and areas in order to present an apparently modern image to the outside world. This has been the case in the 19th century areas of Baku, in Azerbaijan: much care and attention has been paid to the historic walled city of Icherisheher, but other, later historic areas have suffered the loss of good, characterful historic buildings that formed the backdrop of the daily lives of citizens of the city.

35. Additionally, a critical danger in new nationhood is where benign nationalism within mainstream politics accidentally leads to extremism. There is the ever present danger of hatred when buildings with historic resonances become flashpoints, with the potential for active harm to historic remains, such as the desecration of holocaust memorials in Ukraine in recent years. Such actions are a denial of history.

3.8. Natural disasters

36. Natural disasters lead to questions about what is done afterwards, with the worst examples in Europe allowing rife property speculation to prevent rebuilding and to destroy communities. Measures can be taken to mitigate the worst effects of natural disasters but these are rarely inexpensive.

37. Italy, Georgia²⁴ and Spain²⁵ lay in zones of frequent seismic activity which strongly affects cultural heritage. While the absolute priority is to save lives, ensuring the adequate protection of historic buildings would be an inordinately expensive task. Consequently, the best course of action after an earthquake or other natural disaster is to seek the rapid rebuilding of shattered places, thus supporting the rebuilding of broken communities. This did not happen in L'Aquila (Italy) following the 2009 earthquake, with the loss of nearly 300 lives and damage to thousands of buildings. Some 65 000 people were displaced. In spite of national and international pressure, four years on, the city centre remains a ghost town, with householders effectively prevented from returning to their homes and rebuilding their lives and communities.

3.9. Conflicting policies

38. Public authorities responsible for action frequently do not have the experience, confidence or funding to act effectively. Occasionally they are blocked from acting because of their own internal politics. For all the excellent conservation policies that there might be, other governmental policies can act in contradiction to them, and often take precedence, such as economic, defence or health policies. It is difficult for lawmakers and policy experts to predict the consequences of one policy upon another.

23. Assembly Docs. 6079, 9458 and 9460, Cultural heritage of Cyprus.

24. Tbilisi earthquake in 2002.

25. Lorca earthquake in 2011.

39. The current retrenchment in public spending has hit governmental budgets hard, with a desire to protect core areas of spending, such as education and health care. This has meant that cuts to heritage sector funding have been all the deeper, with, for example, over €280 million cut from Italy's budget for museums, galleries and heritage sites in 2011-14. Added to this, the property crash has resulted in massively reduced developer contributions to conservation and restoration. Another striking example is Ireland, where the funding for the heritage sector has been reduced from €23 million to €2 million.

40. Examples of conflicting policies, to be found across Europe, relate most typically to economic development policies, especially where these policies focus on Keynesian economics, relying on and encouraging at a policy level the construction sector to drive forward gross domestic product (GDP) growth, with little consideration for the loss of value in other areas, most notably the historic environment. This apparent conflict is at the roots of many of the examples highlighted in this report. New construction also leaves a very visible, if short-term, political legacy. A better alignment of such policy would be around understanding the impact on the economy of maintenance and repair (for which real statistics are currently hard to find: in Scotland, for example, it is broadly estimated to be around 40% of the construction sector) and recognising this as a key economic driver.

4. Good practice at national level

4.1. Survey and regular maintenance

41. A number of national agencies and third party organisations carry out on-the-ground surveys of the state of statutorily protected heritage and consequently direct resources to where they are most needed – while also raising public and government awareness of the issue. Awareness-raising activities can be an incredibly powerful motivator for public authorities to act, particularly where pressure at grass-roots level is articulated in the language of government.

42. Third parties often pick up the work of surveying heritage at risk. The Swedish Association for Building Preservation produces the *Gulalisten* (Yellow List) with a view to raising awareness of threatened buildings and places and encouraging both citizen and government action. In the United Kingdom, the campaign group SAVE Britain's Heritage has produced lists of threatened buildings since its foundation in 1975 with a view to encouraging action – more recently the focus has been on encouraging individuals to take on some of these very challenging buildings. It is then the duty of government to help find solutions. Removing buildings from the list is an easily measurable metric, and in Scotland is the means by which the performance of the national heritage agency, Historic Scotland, is measured.

43. Critical to preventing buildings falling into neglect and disrepair is the process of systematic, regular maintenance. Approaches to this vary across Europe from non-existent to highly effective. Coupled to this is the notion of informed conservation, understanding levels of significance in a building, site or area before intervention to ensure priorities are set on a firm basis.

44. Perhaps the most studied and longest standing organisation involved with systematic, regular maintenance is *Monumentenwacht* (Monument Watch) in the Netherlands. *Monumentenwacht* offers a service to the owners of statutorily protected buildings of regular inspection to monitor change and catch problems before they grow into something larger. Small-scale repairs can be carried out on site and owners are kept informed of the works needed. Combined with a friendly tax regime, this is generally viewed as a highly effective means of preventing decay, and has been successfully replicated in other countries

45. A more extreme, but no less valid tactic for preventing the deterioration of heritage in danger has been taken by Cultural Heritage Without Borders in Kosovo, working on the traditional *Kula* building type around Peć. Here, the programme architects have been keen to tackle the preservation of as many of these vernacular buildings as possible but, being limited in capacity, they have taken to mothballing some structures. The aim is to ensure that the structures are stabilised, made wind and weather tight to survive the harsh winters. Their repair can then be addressed as and when the funding and organisational capacity allow.

4.2. Mainstreaming and community involvement

46. Within government, the function of heritage protection is often limited to one department, such as a Ministry of Culture, which may not necessarily have influence over other, more powerful ministries. There are good examples of efforts to ensure other departments are aware of the impact of their work on the built environment, strongly backed up by the requirements of environmental impact assessments. At the level of local government, the level of coverage on the issue varies from non-existent to highly effective, depending on

local political priorities rather than the scale of a place's heritage. At the root of gaining the right balance is an understanding of the contribution heritage can make to the economy and society in an area as well as to the international relations between countries. Key to this is ensuring that heritage is mainstreamed into decision-making in relation to planning and policy, avoiding problems and disputes further down the line.

47. The loss of heritage through poor development decisions can often be avoided through early consultation with public authorities and communities, creating a positive dialogue. Although this might on the surface appear to slow up the development and investment process, it ensures a greater degree of certainty for investors, and ultimately more sustainable change at the end, with community support.

48. An open and democratic approach to land use planning is challenging, particularly in countries with a history of central planning. Some countries have a long experience master planning with communities, particularly those in the north of Europe. In Denmark, local authorities are required to create a plan for any change in a local area and this is sent out for a local hearing among the citizens before the final decision is taken. This ensures that the overall planning synthesises the interests of society with respect to land use and contributes to protecting the country's nature and environment

49. Community involvement at the planning stage ensures long-term sustainability, using heritage and the culture of a place to create a firm base for society, with heritage (tangible and intangible) offering a reference point for society. It also offers a chance to focus on local needs rather than national politics.

4.3. Education and awareness raising

50. Public education and engagement with a nation's past and history is vital to ensuring conservation efforts are sustained in the long run. This valorisation covers not just the historical and architectural but also the social heritage, recognising the role heritage has to play as the glue that binds society together.

51. This point finds its strongest expression in Article 27 of the World Heritage Convention, which states: "The State Parties to the Convention shall endeavour by all appropriate means, and in particular by educational and information programmes, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage."

52. In relation to this article of the convention, there is an inherent recognition that the common ground between peoples identified in the outstanding universal value of a World Heritage Site is a means of creating international goodwill. This is just as valid at local level, demonstrating the role heritage has to play in the grander European aim of strengthening the ties between the different peoples of our continent.

53. The valorisation of heritage by community groups in effect engages heritage with the democratic process, creating the conditions in which politicians can take positive decisions relating to heritage with the support of the people. In this respect, the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society²⁶ is particularly relevant to serve as guidance for local, regional and national authorities.

54. At national level, Fondo Ambiente Italiano runs a number of programmes to raise awareness of buildings, places and issues relating to the historic environment most particularly through its programme "*I luoghi del cuore*" (Places of the heart).²⁷ National branches of Europa Nostra play an important role in raising awareness within their own countries. They are especially valuable in countries where civil society is still developing. The National Trust in England is active at national level in terms of education, although a great deal of latitude is given to individual properties to tailor the learning experience to the building and to local needs.

4.4. Financial incentives

55. Locating the funds required to repair and reuse heritage in danger is an increasingly complex business, and responses to it are increasingly sophisticated in terms of the partnerships that are created to address problem sites, and the ways in which funds are accessed from a broad range of sources (see guidelines published by the Council of Europe in 2009, "*Funding the architectural heritage: A guide to policies and examples*"²⁸).

26. <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=199&CM=8&CL=ENG>.

27. www.fondoambiente.it/Index.aspx.

28. <https://book.coe.int/eur/en/cultural-heritage/4242-funding-the-architectural-heritage-a-guide-to-policies-and-examples.html>.

56. The traditional approach of governments offering grant aid for the repair of buildings is not sustainable in the long term, and some argue that it rewards poor stewardship of historic buildings and places. An example of how limited government funding might be used more carefully is the *Nationaal Restauratiefonds* (National Restoration Fund) in the Netherlands. The fund does not give funds away – rather it offers soft loans to support owners in the restoration of their buildings, alongside a series of tax breaks. A more focused version of this is operating in the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site under the auspices of Edinburgh World Heritage. Funds are repayable on the sale of residential property or after ten years on commercial property, encouraging long-term ownership and proper stewardship. Within the wider European Union funding sphere there are a number of streams that, although not culture and heritage specific, could easily be applied to heritage in danger – for example the JESSICA funding stream could be used to provide working capital (in the form of cheap loans) for the repair of buildings with otherwise marginal commercial viability.

57. Across Europe there is uneven treatment of the repair of historic buildings in terms of value added tax (VAT). In some countries, such as the United Kingdom, this in effect acts as a 20% tax on the repair of historic buildings, whereas other countries, such as France, offer a degree of tax relief. In many respects, Europe is some way behind the United States of America, where tax breaks for the restoration of historic buildings have been responsible for anchoring in massive investments to buildings that would otherwise not be viewed as economically viable, and would have been left to rot. These breaks come in a variety of forms, from a time-limited relief on local property taxes for bringing a vacant building back into use, to relief against personal income for funds spent on restoration. Were such systems commonly in operation in Europe, the perceived divide between the world of heritage organisations and the world of development would be greatly narrowed, with commercial developers becoming commercial heritage developers.

4.5. Legal framework and enforcement

58. The above-mentioned points are related to proactive actions to avoid heritage falling into danger. However, all this must be backed up with solid legal frameworks to regulate the statutorily recognised heritage, creating systems staffed by experts and respected across government. The regulatory systems in use are closely related to a question of the priority placed on heritage, and degree to which the transformational role of the historic environment is understood. It is regrettable that due to radical cuts in public expenditure these regulatory systems have been weakened in a number of European countries. For example, in Hungary, the governmental office for historic monuments was dismantled in 2010 and in Ireland and Greece the expert staff has been reduced by more than 50%.

59. Challenges arise at national level in decentralised States, where the rules may be applied differently by different levels of public authority, creating weaknesses in the system that can be exploited. At the other end of the governmental scale, the counterbalance to this is the European requirement for environmental impact assessments of major developments, which is meant to ensure that the public decision-making process is properly informed in relation to potential loss of heritage.

60. All too often, systems, no matter how brilliant their structures or staff, fall down when there is a failure to enforce the rules. The reasons for failure to enforce are complicated and can involve expense, experience, legal know-how, political interference and so on. Where enforcement is taken, the actions vary from fines to prison sentences to the removal of the property from ownership to the removal of any past State support.

61. An interesting case of a governmental agency taking action in relation to heritage in danger is that of English Heritage over the demolition of a statutorily protected modernist building, Greenside, dating from 1937, by Connell, Ward and Lucas. Consent for the demolition of the house (to allow its replacement with a larger house) was given by the local authority against the advice of its own experts. In the period before this consent was validated by national government, the owner illegally demolished the building. In the event, national government refused the demolition application, opening up the owner to prosecution. The government agency, English Heritage, pursued the owner through the courts, resulting in a total fine of £25 000 for the demolition. While this sends out a clear signal, the owner might be considered to have got off lightly – United Kingdom law allows for fines of up to £200 000 and a jail sentence.

5. International co-operation

5.1. European co-operation

62. There are efforts undertaken across Europe to ensure that those involved in the efforts of public authorities to conserve and regenerate places are equipped with the right technical skills to ensure large-scale investments take advantage of all that the heritage of a place has to offer, strengthening concepts of conservation-led regeneration.

63. Under the umbrella of the Council of Europe, several activities are of particular interest: The Ljubljana Process: Rehabilitating our Common Heritage, carried out together with the European Commission (DG-EAC and later DG-ELARG) since 2003,²⁹ mobilises and assists cross-sector institutions and social stakeholders to develop monument- and site- rehabilitation projects so that they connect closely with their social and economic environments in order to secure external funding and investment; the “pilot projects on rehabilitation of historic towns”, also carried out with the support of the European Commission in the south Caucasus and Black Sea countries (and which should be continued from 2014 as part of *Community-led Rehabilitation Strategies in Historic Towns* within the Eastern Partnership programme),³⁰ were designed to identify heritage-led urban projects capable of boosting revitalisation strategies; the Local Development Pilot Projects³¹ propose a political framework for consultation involving a wide range of public and private players in discussion about future of outstanding rural areas, where heritage is taken as a sustainable local resource for development; the European Union/Council of Europe “Support to the Promotion of Cultural Diversity in Kosovo (PCDK)”³² ensures a cross-sectorial and integrated approach focusing on four major components: capacity development, education and public awareness, local economic development and community well-being, where all the elements come together in innovative pilot actions based on common heritage; the European Heritage Network (HEREIN),³³ set up in 1999, brings together 44 government departments responsible for cultural heritage is a reference point for government bodies, professionals, researchers, non-governmental organisations active in this field and all interested citizens. The database provides an overview of the cultural heritage policies, it promotes best practice and helps public authorities to adapt policies and to improve governance methods for cultural heritage.

64. There are a number of programmes enabled by European Union funding which ensure the sharing of information and of experience. The HERO network, co-ordinated by the City of Regensburg as a part of the URBACT programme, worked to promote the idea of heritage as an opportunity. Working closely with the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions (EAHTR), formed by the Council of Europe in 1999, the network aimed to develop integrated and innovative management strategies for historic urban landscapes, ensuring a balance between conservation of the cultural heritage and the sustainable, future-proof socio-economic development of historic towns in order to strengthen their attractiveness and competitiveness. Emphasis was placed on managing conflicting interests and capitalising on the potential of cultural heritage assets for economic, social and cultural activities.

65. The European Union HERMAN project recognised the potential of the sustainable use of cultural heritage for boosting the development of small and medium-sized cities in central Europe, focusing on models of better co-ordinated, integrated and systematic approaches to governance. It connects 10 cities,³⁴ with the aim of understanding and implementing best practice from cities that have already successfully implemented such solutions.

66. In terms of training, there are European Union-supported programmes such as SATURN, which aims to create a series of publications for those teaching in the fields of urban regeneration, highlighting examples of best practice in community engagement with the development processes and the sorts of economic tools available, and ensuring outcomes that respect the historic built environment

67. There are further excellent opportunities for spreading best practice across Europe, from annual conferences such as *The Best in Heritage*, an international survey of award-winning museum, heritage and conservation projects, launched in 2003 by the European Heritage Association. The event is held in Dubrovnik on an annual basis, giving professionals the opportunity to exchange experience, contacts and information.

29. www.coe.int/irppsah.

30. www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/cooperation/Kyiv/urbanrehab_en.asp.

31. www.coe.int/ldpp.

32. www.coe.int/pcdk.

33. www.coe.int/herein.

34. For more information: www.central2013.eu/nc/central-projects/approved-projects/funded-projects/?tx_fundedprojects_pi1%5Bproject%5D=126.

68. The standards and guidelines for conservation vary within Europe, with some countries taking a highly technical approach and others a somewhat more practical approach. The more successful examples appear to seek to manage change rather than completely control it, through proactive land-use planning. The theoretical background for the sustainable management of the built environment has been greatly strengthened by UNESCO's Historic Urban Landscape initiative,³⁵ although this is focused around urban management.

69. The Historic Urban Landscape initiative is a welcome attempt to ensure that the decision-making process in relation to city management is thoroughly integrated, with heritage considerations in place from the start. This then avoids the situation that so frequently arises, whereby interest groups only learn of development plans and threats to their historic places after decisions have been made.

70. Looking at the conservation and restoration projects that have won the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage/Europa Nostra Awards reveals a broad range of funding packages and innovating in bringing projects forward, accessing charitable, corporate and governmental support, as well as funding from lottery programmes and private property developers. However, there remains further work to be done to share experience across Europe in the sorts of innovative funding packages that different groups are bringing together in support of their projects.

5.2. UNESCO

71. Co-operation between the State Parties to the World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage Centre is an important way of avoiding difficulties, and indeed of enhancing the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage sites through sensitive change.

72. There are a number of mechanisms to support State parties in the management of their World Heritage Sites, from the UNESCO regional bureau in Venice, which fosters international co-operation in south-east Europe, to the informal networks that build up between cities through natural discourse and co-operation. It is, however, hard to enforce compliance with the convention, and even harder to ensure all nations meet the same standards, given the differing levels of expertise available to them. There is perhaps a greater role for UNESCO's World Heritage Centre in bringing site managers together to share their experiences.

73. The World Heritage concept in particular (but not exclusively) provides a strong network for the transnational exchange of experience, demonstrating what can be achieved in the field. There are also a number of initiatives relating to international valorisation, such as Europa Nostra's Heritage in Danger programme, that seeks to share examples of bad practice.

74. The Organisation of World Heritage Cities, whose north-west regional secretariat is based in the Regensburg World Heritage Site, is a powerful tool for the exchange of experience, active in bringing urban World Heritage Site managers together to understand common problems and study best practice, as well as developing a sense of solidarity amongst its members

75. The World Heritage Concept encourages an understanding of shared values, with the focus on education guiding the State Parties towards the importance of engaging their peoples, especially young people, with their history and culture. Beyond strengthening cultural understanding, learning in this area broadens the capacity of children to acquire creative, abstract and innovative thinking, and should be applied at all levels of cultural heritage, not just world heritage.

5.3. Non-governmental organisations

76. There are thousands of heritage community groups across Europe, with distinctive voices on their particular issues of concern. Countries of western and northern Europe have a long and deep experience in citizen participation, with long-standing organisations such as the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in the United Kingdom (founded in 1877) campaigning at national level, and smaller groups campaigning at local level.

77. Civil society in central and eastern Europe has been strengthening since the political changes in the early 1990s, although there remain challenges in some countries such as Russia, where laws regarding society organisations, which play such an important part of the fight for heritage in danger, are very strict.³⁶

35. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/638>.

36. In April 2013, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International produced a report noting that laws "clearly seek to limit, or even end, independent advocacy and other NGO work".

78. At European level, there are a number of initiatives to co-ordinate the extraordinary range of civil society organisations into one clear voice for heritage, from the “We Are More” campaign seeking to influence the European Union budget via Culture Action Europe, to Europa Nostra, which acts as the voice of cultural heritage in Europe.

79. Europa Nostra’s new programme *The 7 Most Endangered*, seeks to identify the most threatened sites in Europe, and help find solutions to them through its network of experts and through its partners in the programme, the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank. Although the programme is in its early stages, the bringing together of experts from different countries, cultures and skill sets is already proving productive in identifying solutions, encouraging both civil and governmental participation in finding solutions, and bringing non-European Union countries into the fold. One of the most interesting aspects of its shortlist of 14 for the 2013 list is that it deliberately and positively includes sites relating to conflict or points of international tension, such as the buffer zone of the historic centre of Nicosia in Cyprus, or addresses seemingly distant problems, such as Armenia’s remarkable heritage.³⁷

80. A major pan-European resource for technical information and advice is the Scientific Committee of Europa Nostra, which produces in-depth guidance on issues through its bulletin. While its focus is on the remarkable military heritage of Europe, this is not just a matter of individual castles and fortresses, but of entire areas of cities and sections of countryside, of works and cultural landscape, representing our common heritage.

81. The challenge of redundant churches is being addressed in different ways across Europe, but there is a concerted attempt to share expertise through *Future for Religious Heritage*, the European network for historic places of worship. This group works across religious groups, the voluntary sector, government and academia sharing expertise, ideas and projects. For example, in the United Kingdom there are a number of bodies able to take on the most valuable redundant religious buildings such as the Churches Conservation Trust and the Historic Chapels Trust. Through their care, these buildings avoid dereliction or insensitive conversion to new uses. Both organisations potentially provide a learning experience for other countries.

82. All of these movements and initiatives demonstrate the importance of investing in culture in these times of economic and political challenges as a means of upholding tolerance, identity, diversity and respect for others. Heritage and the history this reflects are a positive base from which to build a common ground and understanding and are a means through which one can strengthen society: culture and heritage are the visible outputs of society. A variety of programmes and activities can use heritage to support this aim, from tourism to education to economic development.

6. Conclusions

83. The question of endangered heritage raises not only technical issues but also important political issues, when it comes to decision-making on what should be considered priority for protection, which is becoming particularly complex in the current context of severe cuts in public spending. It raises also the issue of an appropriate level of decision-making and coherency between national, regional and local levels, particularly in decentralised States. Furthermore it raises the question of priority and coherence across different, at times conflicting, policies.

84. Challenges will remain in terms of the funds required to solve many of the problems. I believe that economic development and protection of heritage are not necessarily in contradiction, but rather can be complementary. Many examples show that investments made in heritage conservation can make a significant contribution to economic and social development. However, whenever it is feasible, governments need to play an active role to put in place incentives so that the conservation and restoration of Europe’s special historic places can be a profitable economic activity. I wish to underline the importance of investing in safeguarding endangered heritage even when this does not bring economic returns. In addition, new innovative mechanisms and partnerships are also needed to fully use the potential of heritage conservation in socio-economic regeneration projects.

85. In addition, I strongly believe that investment in heritage is a vital investment for a better society, and should not be regarded as a luxury commodity to be cut down in times of crisis. Culture and heritage not only contribute to economic and social development, but more importantly they embed cultural identity and uphold

37. See Europa Nostra’s web page: www.europanostra.org/7-most-endangered/.

democratic values of tolerance, they deepen understanding and respect for others, and cultivate respect for cultural diversity. I therefore consider that heritage has a fundamental role to play in building citizenship, which is essential today to overcome many social anxieties, particularly for younger generations.

86. Across Europe there are as rich a range of solutions to the problems of endangered heritage as there are endangered buildings, places and landscapes. While not every solution will be applicable to every building type or every country, there are lessons to be learned from one another at a range of different levels, from legislation to skills to valorisation, and there is the opportunity to offer guidance on standards and means of addressing issues across Europe. There is very great breadth in the means by which expertise can be shared, but these are not accessible to everyone, particularly the voluntary sector.

87. It is therefore important to create the right mechanisms to share experiences and good practice at the European level. I consider it particularly important to involve in this process authorities, experts and the voluntary sector from countries of central, eastern and south-eastern Europe and the south Caucasus region so that they can fully benefit from this transfer of experience and expertise. Moreover, the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society and the European Landscape Convention could be used as innovative policy instruments to assist member States in mainstreaming heritage protection into decision-making in relation to planning and policy, at national, regional and local level, and to involve the public and heritage conservation groups at the early stages of decision-making. In addition, through regular reporting and public debate, national parliaments could play an important role in monitoring public authorities' actions to safeguard endangered heritage nationally.

88. Finally, I wish to underline that there should be greater coherency and co-operation for cultural heritage at the European level, between the Council of Europe, the European Union and UNESCO to ensure that coherent policy guidance is streamlined through heritage projects funded by the European Union.

Appendix – List of relevant Assembly texts on the protection of cultural heritage and landscape

- Resolution 1924 (2013) Industrial heritage in Europe
- Recommendation 2001 (2012) Protection of and access to the audiovisual cultural heritage
- Resolution 1883 (2012) Jewish cemeteries
- Recommendation 1942 (2010) A balanced approach to the rescuing of archaeological finds from development projects
- Recommendation 1884 (2009) Cultural education: The promotion of cultural knowledge, creativity and intercultural understanding through education
- Resolution 1638 (2008) and Recommendation 1851 (2008) Crafts and cultural heritage conservation skills
- Recommendation 1835 (2008) Sustainable development and tourism (Committee's opinion, Doc. 11580)
- Resolution 1487 (2006) The future and regeneration of coalfields in Europe
- Recommendation 1730 (2005) The private management of cultural property
- Recommendation 1651 (2004) Ending the plundering of African cultural objects
- Recommendation 1660 and Resolution 1375 (2004) Situation in Kosovo (Committee's opinion, Doc. 10170)
- Resolution 1355 (2003) Tax incentives for cultural heritage conservation
- Recommendation 1599 (2003) The cultural situation in the south Caucasus
- Recommendation 1486 (2000) Maritime and fluvial cultural heritage
- Recommendation 1465 (2000) "Europe, a common heritage" – a Council of Europe campaign
- Resolution 1205 (1999) on looted Jewish cultural property
- Recommendation 1372 (1998) The Unidroit Convention on stolen or illegally exported cultural property
- Recommendation 1173 (1992) Preservation of libraries and scientific archives in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe
- Recommendation 1172 (1992) Situation of the cultural heritage in Central and Eastern Europe
- Resolution 916 (1989) Redundant religious buildings
- Recommendation 1043 (1986) Europe's linguistic and literary heritage
- Recommendation 1042 (1986) Protecting the cultural heritage against disasters
- Recommendation 987 (1984) European pilgrim routes
- Order 421 (1983) Movement of art objects
- Recommendation 921 (1981) Metal detectors and archaeology
- Recommendation 898 (1980) Memorials
- Recommendation 881 (1979) Rural architectural heritage
- Recommendation 880 (1979) Conservation of the European architectural Heritage; Resolution 707 (1979) Role of national parliaments in the conservation of the architectural heritage; Resolution 708 (1979) Role of local and regional authorities in the conservation of the architectural heritage; and Resolution 709 (1979) Role of independent associations in the conservation of the architectural heritage
- Recommendation 872 (1979) Industrial archaeology
- Recommendation 848 (1978) Underwater cultural heritage
- Resolution 667 (1977) Establishment of parliamentary heritage groups
- Recommendation 788 (1976) Arrangements for reviewing the progress of architectural conservation

[Recommendation 750 \(1975\)](#) Conservation of Europe's architectural heritage

Information reports by the committee

Information report on Rosia Montana (December 2004; General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage: Mr O'Hara; [Doc. 10384](#))

Information report on protection of the cultural heritage in Kosovo. (April 2004; General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage: Mr O'Hara; [Doc. 10127](#))

Information report on the cultural heritage of Cyprus (May 2002; General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage: Ms Štěpová, [Doc. 9460](#))

Information report on cultural aspects of the Ilisu Dam Project, Turkey (January 2002; General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage, Ms Štěpová, [Doc. 9301](#))

Information report on the cultural heritage of Cyprus (July 1989, [Doc. 6079](#) and Addendum, rapporteur: Mr van der Werff)