ICOMOS Slovenija

03

Management of Cultural Heritage Sites
Upravljanje območij kulturne dediščine

03

Management of Cultural Heritage Sites
Upravljanje območij kulturne dediščine

Index

SONJA IFKO, JELKA PIRKOVIČ

Editorial

The topic of the third volume in the Monographic Publications series of ICOMOS Slovenia is the management of cultural heritage sites. This monograph is a way to commemorate the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH), which was celebrated in 2018, and to relate to the central EYCH starting-points that underlined the significance of awareness-raising about cultural heritage belonging to all of us and the necessity to promote cultural innovation and collaboration of people and communities, while fostering commitment to responsible and sustainable tourism with cultural heritage.

The central thought when selecting the articles was borrowed from Donald Insall: "Good planning is only good management." Insall underlines that successful conservation and active life of cultural heritage sites are a consequence of a careful and interdisciplinary planning of development activities, taking into account the features of heritage to develop its potentials in a balanced way, including the economic and tourist opportunities of these sites. This book presents the management processes and also insight into the diverse set of approaches and successful practices, particularly in Southeast Europe.

There are eight chapters in this book. The introductory article was prepared by Jelka Pirkovič, where she presents contemporary concepts of heritage management. This is followed by four articles on the challenges of managing and governing heritage sites in Slovenia. Špela Spanžel discusses the implementation of UNESCO cultural heritage in Slovenia, and Nataša Kolenc talks about the challenges of private-public partnership in built heritage restoration. Tomaž Golob's article provides a theoretical overview of participatory management of urban areas of cultural heritage, using several Slovenian cases as examples, while Vlasta Vodeb reports about best practices related to the use of historic building information modelling (HBIM) methods in managing and monitoring historic building areas.

TOMAŽ GOLOB

Participatory Management of Historic Urban Areas

SUMMARY

This paper discusses the significance of participatory management of postmodern urban areas of cultural heritage marked by heterogeneity, diversity and fragmentation of social and spatial phenomena. Using several Slovenian cities as examples, the paper examines the increasingly obscure boundary between management and governance responsibilities in the management process. The question is whether complex culture heritage areas can be efficiently managed through positivist and technocrat approaches that advocate linear progress, absolute truths, rational planning, and standardisation of knowledge, or whether new democratic and plural approaches should be developed to understand the diversity and particularity of processes, relationships, ideas, interests and to elaborate new forms of wider social participation. Since heritage areas are increasingly seen as a social process, it is important to study why and how people individually and collectively evaluate such spaces, attributing to them a special social force, why and how they use this force. In doing that, Foucault's discourse analysis will be employed[1]. Namely, labelling certain spatial phenomena and undertakings as excesses always conceals interest and power struggles of various stakeholders, and the discourse also helps to shape the image and social significance of cultural heritage areas.

The paper derives from the hypothesis that, in order to achieve quality interdisciplinary and participatory management of protected cultural heritage areas, a suitable organisation system should be set up. The managers or coordinators of management processes must therefore be well-acquainted with planning and communication methods and techniques, but in the first place, they must possess intuition. [2]

1   Foucault, M. (1997). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. In Neil Leach (Ed.), Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory. New York: Routledge, pp. 330–336.
2   Intuition results from the manager being engaged in a specific task or solving a problem that requires making decisions. Such a person is not a layman who finds himself unexpectedly in a certain situation. He acts in the area of his expertise, his title and position, and he has some experience. Not seeing a solution, he wishes for a decision and awaits inspiration. The intuitive moment is very important in managing processes and human resources when the coordinator of a working group is sometimes forced to very quickly make decisions regarding tactics and policies for achieving the desired goal (more in: Vila, A., Kovač, J. (1997). Osnove organizacije in managementa. Kranj: Moderna organizacija).

slovenia.info / Marko Šinkovec

Participativno upravljanje zgodovinskih mestnih območij

POVZETEK

V prispevku obravnavamo pomen participativnega upravljanja postmodernih urbanih območij kulturne dediščine, ki jih zaznamujejo heterogenost, različnost in fragmentiranost družbenih in prostorskih pojavov in procesov. Na primeru več slovenskih mest preučimo vse bolj nejasno mejo med upravljavskimi in vladovanjskimi (angl. governance) odgovornostmi znotraj upravljavskega procesa. Odgovorimo na vprašanje, ali je mogoče kompleksna območja kulturne dediščine učinkovito upravljati zgolj s pozitivističnimi in tehnokratskimi pristopi racionalistične modernosti, ki zagovarja linearni razvoj, absolutne resnice, racionalno načrtovanje idealnega družbenega reda ter standardizacijo znanja in produkcije, ali pa je treba razviti nove demokratične in pluralne pristope v razumevanju različnosti in partikularnosti procesov, odnosov, idej in interesov. Kako se – in ali se sploh – uveljavljajo nove oblike širšega družbenega sodelovanja, preučimo na primerih številnih slovenskih mest. Ker tudi območja kulturne dediščine vedno bolj razumemo kot družbeni proces, preučimo, zakaj in kako ljudje individualno in kolektivno vrednotijo (angl. evaluate) te prostore, jim pripisujejo posebno družbeno moč, zakaj, kako to moč uporabljajo in s kakšnimi diskurzi se pri tem srečujejo. Pri tem se opremo na Foucaultovo analizo diskurza kot izraza določene konceptualizacije realnosti in znanja, ki si prizadeva za prevlado.[1] Označevanje določenih prostorskih pojavov in delovanj kot ekscesnih namreč v sebi vedno skriva interes in merjenje moči različnih deležnikov (od odločevalcev, organizirane javnosti do posameznikov), in te različne oblike diskurza, kot so kapital, okus, dominantne kulturne elite, prevladujoče družbene vrednote in tradicija, raznolikost, pestrost ipd., sooblikujejo tudi podobo in družbeni pomen območij kulturne dediščine.

Prispevek bo izhajal iz hipoteze, da je treba za kakovostno interdisciplinarno in participativno upravljanje varovanih območij kulturne dediščine vzpostaviti ustrezen organizacijski sistem. Upravljavec oz. koordinator upravljavskih procesov mora pri tem dobro poznati metode in tehnike načrtovanja ter komuniciranja, predvsem pa mora imeti sposobnost intuicije.[22]

1   Foucault, M. (1997). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. In Neil Leach (Ed.), Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory. New York: Routledge, 330–336.

2   Intuicija je posledica angažiranja upravljavca pri neki določeni zadolžitvi ali razreševanju problema, ki zahteva odločitve. Na tem področju človek ni laik in se ni nepričakovano znašel v določenem položaju. Deluje na področju svojega poklica, svojega naziva in položaja, na katerem že ima nekaj izkušenj. Želi si neke odločitve, za katero trenutno ne pozna rešitve, je lahko tudi zanj zelo pomembna, in pričakuje navdih. Moment intuicije je zelo pomemben pri upravljanju procesov in človeških virov, ko se mora koordinator delovne skupine včasih zelo hitro odločiti glede taktičnih in vsebinskih usmeritev za dosego želenega cilja (več v Vila, A., Kovač, J. (1997). Osnove organizacije in managementa. Kranj: Moderna organizacija).

1   Introduction

The modern age is marked by globalisation processes and the turn from production to consumption. Nasser notes a particular risk to spaces with heritage values where local culture and cultural heritage are subject to mass tourist consumption.[1] In rehabilitating historic urban areas, especially historic urban centres, there is a great danger, as stressed by Oncu and Weyland, that they are considered only as tourist destinations which compete with each other by way of their unique tourist services and activities, and therefore a decision is taken to redefine and reinterpret cultural heritage.[2] Public urban space thus turns more and more into a simulacrum[3] where the neo-liberal idea is financially and economically materialised in consummation-oriented spectacles, events, and experiences at the expense of a socially diverse spontaneity. In particular, squares and streets of historic urban centres are increasingly becoming places of spectacle and consumption and not places of encounters and socialising. The city agora is increasingly given the function and look of shopping malls. In this case short-term consumer trends overcome recognised cultural values and social, ecological, and economic principles of sustainable development of cultural heritage. Nasser therefore emphasises the need to formulate a management policy which makes possible a balance between socio-cultural needs, economic profit, and heritage resources protection.[4] Especially, as Nasser establishes, since the newly discovered historicism and a romantic nostalgia for the past give rise to dichotomy between recognised heritage values and development needs.[5]

In rehabilitations of open public spaces in historic urban centres and other historic areas, lately an actual denial of the modern architectural language takes place, together with a rebirth of historic styles mainly derived from design trends of the 19th and early 20th centuries. For Foucault, the reason as to why exactly this era has its great mark on the present built environment is the accessibility of material sources such as photographs, blueprints, drawings, mock-ups, journals,

1   Nasser, N. (2003). Planning for Urban Heritage Process: Reconciling Conservation, Tourism, and Sustainable Development. In: Journal of Planning Literature, no. 17/4, pp. 467–479.
2   Oncu, A., Weyland, P. (1997). Space, Culture and Power: New Identities in Globalising Cities. London: Zed Books.
3   Potočnik Černe, G. (2013). Jean Baudrillard: Simulaker in simulacija/Popoln zločin. Available online: https://filozofskaposvetovalnica.wordpress.com/2013/03/14/jean-baudrillard-simulaker-in-simulacija-popoln-zlocin/. Potočnik Černe explains a simulacrum as a phenomenon which is merely an image and a reflection of the real.
4   Nasser, N. (2003). Planning for Urban Heritage Places: Reconciling Conservation, Tourism, and Sustainable Development. In: Journal of Planning Literature, no. 17/4, p. 467.
5   Ibid., 468.

studies, etc.[6] This could be the case with Slovenian historic urban centres as well. Foucault recognises the heterotopia in museums and libraries that are typical 19th century products. They derive from the desire to enclose all times, all eras, forms, and styles within a single place, and yet a place that is outside time and seems to be almost irremovable.[7] To a degree, timeless cultural heritage can also be considered as such heterotopia, however, to paraphrase Foucault, particularly in historic cities someone may always be excluded from social processes. Rehabilitation of historic urban areas is thus still all too often undertaken in the interest of consumption-oriented city users and at the expense of their inhabitants.

But why do urban centres lately face a popularisation of modern consumer trends where streets and cities are being given a more idealised look of 19th-century towns? Cities are witnessing a modern revival of the past. According to Lowenthal, nostalgia is a widely accepted buzzword for looking into the past.[8] It is encountered in magazines, in advertising, in sociological studies. No other word better reflects the malaise of the modern society in the postmodern era. The postmodern era allows a lot of freedom and constant changes but not dominant styles and conceptual tendencies as well, as postmodernism is the only cultural dominant.[9] Our generation lives in a time where the capital more and more intrudes upon cultural production and where aesthetic production is transformed into production of goods. As a consequence, modern society undergoes structural changes characterised by superficiality, inconstancy, individualised diversity, absence of the dimension of time, and gradual disappearance of historical tradition. Beck warns that everybody lives in a risk society that demands from us a critical stance towards products of the global media industry and consumerism, while on the other hand it requires us to be sensitive to the interplay and co-dependence of global and local cultural tradition, identity, and operating practices.[10] In this regard, Lowenthal noted that if the past is actually a foreign country, then nostalgia has very successfully discovered it through tourism.[11] Our intimate associations to the past are clearly a very successful merchandise and are also relevant in rehabilitating historic urban areas. Consumer-oriented experiences and events can only take place in a place dominated by visual order, user-friendly architectonic solutions, and a necessary feeling of well-being.[12] As a rule, heavy-handed modernistic solutions disavow the human scale and architectonics of structures that both surround and co-create open urban public spaces, and are therefore obviously no longer acceptable in the modern era.[13]

Time precisely is the factor in the Western culture which is, according to Foucault, always closely tied to space.[14] Protection of cultural heritage areas is – similar to urbanism – management of space in a certain time, the only difference for Dešman being that time is no longer mechanic (tick-tock) but digital and experienced as "time of discontinuity, time of cuts, time of permanent connection to the network, information time".[15] Historic cities have become places of "discontinuities, relocations, incessant changes to time, aesthetic, value coordinates, new and unexpected connections".[16] Foucault remarks that our time is characterised not so much by the need for progress, then by the need to continuously link different views, needs, values, and lifestyles into new networks. This means that social relations in a place – both at the global and the local level – either occur in parallel, contradict each other, or connect with each other.[17] Today's society is constantly witnessing new, time and space-conditioned networks. Even urban space is nowadays presented as various arrangement patterns.[18]

2 Historic urban areas are dynamic organisms

Bandarin and Van Oers emphasise that cities are dynamic organisms and that there is not a single "historic" city or town in the world with its "original" character preserved.[19] Historic cities change alongside urban societies and their needs, but still remain a record of history and collective memory that, together with built environment, shapes the urban character. However, historic cities are not merely architecture that one designs and puts in a certain place but living organisms with unique topographic, morphologic, and building typology characteristics and their very own cultural context which reflects the collective identity and memory. Management of historic urban centres needs to allow for the human factor and the position of humans towards space. Modern, management-oriented protection of historic urban centres introduces to daily social-spatial phenomena and urban processes the principles of integrated conservation and sustainable development while being aware that cities are, as stated by Bandarin and Van Oers, "places of social and economic exchanges and settings of experiences and impressions."[20]

6   Foucault, M. (2001). Arheologija vednosti. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.
7   Foucault, M. (1997). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. In: Neil Leach (Ed.), Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory. New York: Routledge, p. 335. An explanation of the term heterotopia is also given by Sudradjat, I. (2012) Foucault, the Other Spaces, and Human Behaviour. Procedia – Social nad Behavioral Sciences, no. 36, pp. 28–34. Available online: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82579543.pdf.
8   Lowenthal, D. (2006). The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
9   Jameson, F. (1991). Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham: Duke University Press.
10 Beck, U. (2009). Družba tveganja: Na poti v neko drugo moderno. Ljubljana: Založba Krtina.
11 Lowenthal, D. (2006). The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 4.
12 The latest such rehabilitations of Slovenian historic urban centres took place in Ljubljana, Celje, Kranj, and Novo mesto.
13 The latest examples of historic urban centres rehabilitated in this manner are Ljutomer, Piran, and Idrija.

14 Foucault, M. (1997). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. In Leach, N. (Ed.), Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory. New York: Routledge, pp. 330–336.
15 Dešman, M. (2007). Namesto zaključka. In: Miha Dešman, M., Čerpes, I. (Eds.) O urbanizmu: Kaj se dogaja s sodobnim mestom? Ljubljana: Krtina, p. 371.
16 Ibid.
17 Foucault, M. (1997). Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. In Neil Leach (Ed.), Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory. New York: Routledge, p. 330.
18 Ibid., p. 331.
19 Bandarin, F., Van Oers, R. (2012). The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, p. xi.
20 Ibid.

Fig. 1: *The case from Vegova ulica in Ljubljana, where the herms are at risk from the high beeches, while due to public pressure the City of Ljubljana refuses to cut them, is an example how cultural heritage sites are evaluated through discourses rooted in knowledge, beliefs, wishes, and personal preferences of stakeholders, causing conflicting opinions and interests among the profession and the public, which may grow into conflict situations. Labelling phenomena and undertakings as excesses always conceals interest, motives, politics, expression and power struggles of various stakeholders (individuals, civil initiatives, professional and other services, decision makers, etc.). Nevertheless, excesses must be perceived as a form of democratisation of public, particularly urban, spaces and a way of co-existence of various ideas, practices, lifestyles, etc. Over recent years Slovenia has witnessed public resistance to professional decisions regarding the evaluation of vegetation in city centres, which was as a rule planted to the design of architects as a visual element of public spaces, while over time the trees grew over the originally planned height and became disruptive or even started to endanger the adjacent public monuments. Similar cases as that in Ljubljana are the renovation of the market in the city centre of Ptuj and the central square in Novo mesto (Photo: Tomaž Golob, Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia, Regional Office Novo mesto, 2019).*

Bandarin and Oers observe that the contemporary protection service (despite various instruments such as international charters, national legislation, spatial-planning frameworks, and skills and experience gained in the past century in different fields of activities) often demonstrates its weakness in following and adapting to changes in the modern world. Facing both environmental and urban changes, it is witnessing the increasingly obvious transfer of decision-making processes from the state to the local level and simultaneously from the local environment to the global level, particularly in tourism, real estate market, and economic-financial currents. These forces pull into different directions and the protection service often finds itself at a crossroads, unable to recognise oppor-

tunities and set its priorities.[21] Similar processes also take place in urbanism which, according to Dešman, only has meaning if it is able to anticipate and direct urban development; however, it is not very good at it as it does not keep up with new and quickly changing social and spatial phenomena and processes.[22] Due to this, it increasingly leans towards ad-hoc projects with no vision of social and spatial development.

The protection service and urbanism do not control neo-liberal social-spatial phenomena and processes which are also encountered in Slovenian cities and towns and impact the present and future significance of historic urban areas. For instance, Ploštajner ascertains that a city must be interpreted as a space where neo-liberal principles of production and business are implemented, and simultaneously as the production of space which is also subject to principles of competition and entrepreneurship.[23] Because a neo-liberal city is less dependent on the state and increasingly more on financial markets and must therefore strive to increase its competitiveness towards other cities, it is, according to our findings, subject to numerous new forms of regulation; this also changes the manner of urban management. Increased importance is given to development based on local natural features, locally-conditioned cultural tradition, and unique cultural heritage as the values which cities use to design their entire visual identity, and build their trademark and recognisability on them. A city acquires less and less public resources for its developmental projects and therefore increasingly depends on its ability to draw in private financial sources, leading to privatisation of public space.

Urbanism has revived the method of zoning urban areas geared at fostering production and consumption, modern cities no longer having a single centre but several (typically competing) centres. However, the city is mainly an increasingly equal network of urban spaces marked by specific historic development and more recent areas built solely for utilitarian purpose.[24] In order to efficiently manage the picturesque collage of urban spaces, one must make use of the instrument of multi-functional zoning and strategical steering of built environment, as well as social and economic development of individual city areas in the context of the whole city and the region. For instance, if rehabilitation of an urban area encompasses only replacement of street paving and street furniture but no well-planned regulation of traffic (as lately seen in restoration of historic urban centres of Kranj, Celje, Novo mesto, and Ajdovščina), forgetting the social and developmental aspect of rehabilitation, urban space with a rich historic tradition will remain subject to backsliding. A contrast to the first two

21 Ibid., p. xv.
22 Dešman, M. (2007). Namesto zaključka. In Dešman, M., Čerpes, I. (Eds.), O urbanizmu: Kaj se dogaja s sodobnim mestom? Ljubljana: Krtina, p. 372.
23 Ploštajner, K. (2015). Neoliberalizem in njegove manifestacije v mestu. In: Teorija in praksa, no. 53/3, pp. 476–493.
24 Augé (Augé, M. (1999). Novi svetovi. In: Igor Španjol (Ed.), Mestomorfoze. Ljubljana: cf, pp. 69–91) labels a city a place and a non-place at the same time. A place is a symbolic space with its characteristic locations, monuments, and a possibility of memorial revival by everyone connected to it. He describes a non-place as a space that is not identity, a relationship, or history. They are spaces of transport (highways, airways, bus, coach, and railway stations, shopping malls, etc.) and communication (phone, telefax, television, cable networks). For the latter, Koolhaas (Koolhaas, R. (1999), ibid., pp. 5–32) employed the term „generic spaces".

examples is the recent rehabilitation of Ljubljana Old Town in connection with the developmental policy of the city to deliberately turn the oldest part of the city into an area dedicated exclusively to consumer-orientated mass tourism at the expense of social, economic and cultural diversity of urban life.

A unique cultural tradition and city image supported by a developed cultural industry and rich cultural offer, are the merchandise that attracts tourists and urban populations to historic urban centres and gives them added value in a broader urban landscape. Unfortunately, the practice of urban areas rehabilitation remains limited only to upgrading utility infrastructure, traffic regulation, and beautification of open urban spaces by replacing paving and street furniture. What is missing are well-thought and integrated management approaches to historic urban areas based on a more detailed study of social-spatial phenomena and processes not only in a particular historic urban area, typically a historic urban centre, but in the entire urban landscape. Without a more detailed situation analysis performed at least every five years on the basis of pre-determined indicators, it is not possible to formulate protection and a development vision or determine efficient management methods and tools. Rehabilitation of historic urban areas should therefore have a strong (micro)local tone and be highly cultural, unique, and socially-oriented. Here we can point to the dissimilarity between the significance of a historic urban centre and neighbouring historic urban areas. The urban centre must become accessible to all, a democratic space whose offer meets the needs and wishes of the entire urban population.[25] On the other hand, other historic urban areas such as former peri-urban villages incorporated into a city, historic suburbs, industrial-residential areas, villa districts, and also housing estates built after World War II, must maintain or form anew a multi-functional environment with its own identity, intended primarily for urban populations that live and work there and not so much for external city users.[26]

3 | Urban heritage values

Urban heritage values refer to buildings and spaces, as well as tradition and practices of people. Safeguarding and re-creating space full of tradition and history is crucial for keeping or fostering the sense of belonging to a place and for an active stakeholders' participation in the day-to-day urban processes. In antiquity, genius loci was a divine guide through a place, a "spirit of the place" or a spiritual protector; today, the spiritual and symbolic dimension has been lost and the term is now used to describe the character and the quality of a place as perceived upon visiting it.[27] Smith also concludes that it is impossible to achieve the sense of belonging to a space solely through urban planning measures.[28] Peo-

ple perceive a place with their senses and express their feelings collectively, as a community that lives and works there and socialises the place. Visitors hardly ever perceive a place the same way as locals. Inhabitants intermingle natural and cultural components with their everyday practices and behaviour, beliefs, tradition, and value system into a homogeneous experience which others can truly experience and value if they participate in these practices, as well. Therefore, one of the [29]recent trends in cultural tourism is to make it possible to experience everyday vibes of a tourist destination and to partake in its cultural tradition by visiting not only monuments, sites, and cultural performances but also sporting events, festivals, market places, cemeteries, and the like.

Although cultural heritage is a non-renewable environmental resource, because of its social component and the interlinked tangible and intangible significance, heritage theory recently treats heritage together with culture in general as the fourth pillar of sustainable development. As already said, immovable cultural heritage is a non-renewable resource, but its intangible values such as tradition, beliefs, skills, rituals, as well as the emotional, symbolic, and identity heritage significance have immense cultural meaning for individuals, regions, nations, continents, and in many cases the humanity as a whole. For such reasons, the significance of heritage protection that is socially and locally oriented is increasingly underlined.[30]

Fig. 2: *Session of the working group for drawing-up the conservation plan for the revitalisation of the historic centre of Metlika (Photo: Judita Podgornik Zaletelj, Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia, Regional Office Novo mesto, 2017). One of the solutions to mitigate these excesses is certainly to establish a working group of various decision-makers, professional and other services, non-governmental organisation representatives, and all stakeholders affected by a management process. The working group involved in the management of the historic city area has the task to understand the wide dynamics of challenges, set the basic policy in searching for solutions, and allow the decision-makers to formally accept and implement the policy.*

25 Urban population mainly consists of inhabitants, city users, and commuters.

26 Golob, T. (2016) Upravljanje varovanih zgodovinskih mestnih območij v Sloveniji. Doctoral thesis. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, p. 221.

27 Bandarin, F., Van Oers, R. (2012) The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century. Chichester: Wiley ☐ Blackwell, p. 107.

28 Smith, J. (2010) The Marrying of the Old with the New in Historic Urban Landscapes. In: Van Oers, R., Haraguchi, S. (Eds.) Managing Historic Cities: World Heritage Papers 27, pp. 45☐52. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

29 Bandarin, F., Van Oers, R. (2012) The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century. Chichester: Wiley ☐ Blackwell, p. 108.

30 Golob, T. (2014) Razvoj sodobne teorije varstva kulturne dediščine v svetu in na Slovenskem. In: Varstvo spomenikov, nos.47☐48, pp. 7☐23.

The text cited above concludes in contemplation on culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development by pointing out that if, when carrying out interventions in historic urban areas decision-makers respect the social and local aspects of heritage protection, they automatically respect its cultural aspect, as well. Every historic urban intervention is in the first place a cultural activity deriving from its cultural context and based on strategic, legal, administrative, and technical measures and activities. Therefore, the integrated heritage conservation is a complex and diverse social practice deriving from a specific cultural environment and closely connected to natural resources management and dynamic conducting of changes.[31]

Uršič and Hočevar's position is different: that the location itself does not define and individual's actual participation in urban life as many city dwellers don't feel the need for such a lifestyle. Many reside in cities because they have no other option. On the other hand, a number of people living in the countryside can still experience urbanity and urban environment, thanks to the development and accessibility of contemporary information and communication technology.[32] Uršič and Hočevar therefore make distinction between the terms citification, urbanisation, and urbanity. They use citification to name processes that contribute to the creation of certain social connections, while urbanisation refers to the upsurge in urban population. They interpret urbanisation as a dynamic process that encompasses and merges demographic, social-spatial, communicative, and cultural strands. On the other hand, they see urbanity as "part of the individual's value system, as an element of collective identification, as individualisation of lifestyle, and as a factor of reproduction or altering of the physical space".[33] Lefebre sees urbanity as the intensity of various interactions, as well.[34] In this regard, Uršič and Hočevar emphasise the significance of the individual's chosen lifestyle and the diminishing dependence of lifestyle on a pre-given place of residence.[35] This new phenomenon which Strassoldo named the new localism,[36] differs from the new urbanism by being more open, transient, and heterogeneous, while the characteristics of the new urbanism contribute to the fact that such local communities are more closed, homogeneous, and rigid. For Uršič and Hočevar, the new urbanism is controversial because it produces intensive spatial interventions and low population density.[37] Their notion is that the new localism is a transitional phase towards a modern community of self-standing individuals in the context of general awareness of the integration (into a community) and in parallel, the awareness of overarching (global) social impacts.[38]

Historic urban areas need to become, due to their unique tangible and intangible heritage, the carriers of cultural identities of cities and a significant stimulus for the development of urban society. It is important that the complete range of values pertaining to a specific historic urban area is studied from an interdisciplinary perspective. Namely, such an in-depth study gives insight into the way past generations identified with these places and into the social role they play in today's social relations.[39] Understanding reasons for the gap between the cultural tradition and the (dis)continuity in the identity in Slovenian historic urban areas is a prerequisite for successful management. Since in management of historic urban areas, not only decision-makers but other stakeholders (for example non-governmental organisations and wider public) participate, as well. These need to be involved in the working processes in an organised way, such as workshops, working groups, round tables, residents' assemblies, questionnaires, and other forms of organised collective planning and co-operation on strategies, methods, goals and measures.

Fig. 3: *Workshop following the World Café method in Novo mesto (Photo: Boštjan Pucelj, 2015). As cultural heritage sites are increasingly understood as a social process we must know why and how people individually and collectively value these spaces and what are the discourses that they meet. Practice shows that without a pre-developed proposal of a vision of development and protection of a cultural heritage site we cannot expect the collaboration and understanding of stakeholders and the general public. Cultural heritage valuation for preparing and then amending the management plan is very effectively done through World Café workshops.*

Kos underlines that, due to inefficiency of state institutions, the impact and legitimacy of the organised civil society increases. The civil society to a greater extend represents public interest of the postmodern society. Kos believes the reason for it lies in the new modus operandi of the postmodern society which is no longer "compatible with the linear, hierarchical centralised state. In place of the central government, regional and local levels regain their power."[40] In this regard, Bandarin and Van Oers comment that city authorities are closer to inhabitants than the national government and more sensitive towards their social and cultural needs.[41] In making their decisions, decision-makers are confronting prominent individualism at all levels of society that manifests itself in

31 Golob, T. (2016). Upravljanje varovanih zgodovinskih mestnih območij v Sloveniji. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta.

32 Uršič, M., Hočevar, M. (2007). Protiurbanost kot način življenja. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, no. 27.

33 Ibid., p. 17.

34 Lefebvre, H. (1974). The production of space. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

35 Uršič, M., Hočevar, M. (2007). Protiurbanost kot način življenja. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, no. 27, pp. 8–9.

36 Strassoldo, R. (1990). Lokalna pripadnost in globalna uvrstitev. In: Družboslovne razprave, no. 10, pp. 64–76.

37 Uršič, M., Hočevar, M. (2007). Protiurbanost kot način življenja. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, no. 27, pp. 10–11.

38 Durnik, M. (2010). Pojav protiurbanosti. In: Urbani izziv, no. 21/1, pp. 70–72.

39 Araoz, G. (2009). Protecting Heritage Places Under the New Heritage Paradigm & Defining its Tolerance for Change: a Leadership Challenge for ICOMOS.

40 Kos, D. (2003). Postmoderno prostorsko planiranje? In: Teorija in praksa, no. 40/4, p. 648.

41 Bandarin, F., Van Oers, R. (2012). The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century. Chichester: Wiley Ⓤ Blackwell, p. 97.

more flexible institutional ways of acting in temporary interest networks,[42] and consequently also in an increased need to involve all interested stakeholders in management processes and to formulate methods to assess diverse interests.

4 Management and governance of historic urban areas

This is where the protection service meets political science and communication studies, both with a largely developed scientific apparatus that makes distinction between such terms as government, governance, and management. The term governance has become established in political science and communication studies as a name for the reversed processes of government and management where the boundaries between the civil society and the state are mostly erased,[43] and during public policy formulation and their implementation.[44] Generally speaking, governance is a set of processes where various public and private actors attempt to arrange matters of public interest.[45] In protection efforts, governance is understood as a new type of collective decision-making and responsibility in this area. Thus, governance is in synch with the modern protection paradigm. The paradigm states that integrated conservation of cultural heritage is successful only when the conservation results from a socially accepted decision or a wide social consent. Governance should be transparent, participative, open, and effective. That makes governance a process which also involves decision-makers.[46] The governance process aims to pass a public policy (or some other decision) that is suitable to all its stakeholders while management is linked to the implementation of a particular public policy. Governance is a process (rather than a structure) that also involves the authorities and other decision-makers.[47]

Then, the question arises on how to interpret management and the manager in the public sector. Is the administrative process in the public sector similar to the private sector? A corporate board is seen as the body making decision on strategic business policies, and governance as making decisions regarding property.[48] Virant's conclusion is that the society, same as a business company, first determines its goals and needs that are expressed as public interest in political decisions. The purpose of the process of recognising public interest and defining public policy is to bring together all stakeholders with the goal of tackling an issue, while the process of public policy implementation refers to the coordination of all stakeholders with the goal of servicing citizens.[49] Formu-

lation of public policies is the domain of governance, but their implementation is a matter of public management. Political decision-making (the public policy formulation process) is not management but rather part of governance. In contrast to government, governance is characterised by inclusion of stakeholders and stockholders, decentralisation, participation.[50] Since these principles have also been embraced by new public management, the term governance is often mistranslated as management. Namely, in the governance process the dialogue partner is the citizen (or a group of citizens or a specific organisation, in accordance with the modern meaning of the term stakeholder) while in management the dialogue partner is the user.[51]

Some sociologists cast more light on the meaning of the term stakeholder; they warn against appropriation of the term (together with the term of governance) by the so-called neo-liberal Newspeak.[52] Turnšek Hančič points out that the term stakeholder, although at first sight welcome in stressing the desire and need for democratic involvement of the individual in public decisions, actually brings confusion and an opportunity to legitimise all actors that, for a number of reasons and even arbitrarily, take the role of participants in democratic decision-making processes.[53]

In economy and business, stakeholders are all persons affected by goals of a company; put otherwise, stakeholders are now everybody who can impact the realisation of those goals.[54] In this regard, Turnšek Hančič determines that Freeman and others "do not put forward the dimension of legitimate inclusion but rather the dimension of the power of influence – stakeholders of a company are those who the company must take into account in order to reach its goals, and not those that should be taken into account due to the legitimacy of their demands".[55] It is not difficult to translate the thesis of Freeman and his colleagues into understanding the present role of the wider public which, although formally able to take part in the processes of environment protection and spatial planning, is feeble in these very areas in comparison to financial and political interest.

Kos sees an additional problem for proactive inclusion of the public in the above-mentioned processes in the fact that the classic comprehensive spatial planning that had marked European and also Slovenian urbanism before the 1980s, has been replaced by postmodern decentralised and less hierarchic system of managing social affairs.[56] Because spatial planning is increasingly proj-

42 Mlinar, Z. (1994). Individualizacija in globalizacija v prostoru. Ljubljana: SAZU.
43 Splichal, S. (2011). Javnost in javna sfera v dobi globalnega vladanja. In: Toplak, C., Vodovnik, Ž. (Eds.) Nov(o) državljan(stvo). Ljubljana: Založba Sophia, pp. 189–218.
44 Bevir, M. (2007). Public Governance. London: Tohusand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
45 Rosenau, J., Czempiel, E. O. (1992). Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
46 Bačlija, I., Červ, G., Turnšek Hančič, M. (2013). »Governance«: vladanje, upravljanje, vladavina ali vladovanje? In: Družboslovne razprave, no. 29 /73, pp. 99–119.
47 Ibid., p. 108.
48 Rozman, R. (1996). Kako prevesti »management« v slovenščino: management, menedžment, upravljanje, poslovodenje, vodenje, ravnanje? Organizacija, no. 29/1, pp. 5–18.
49 Virant, G. (2009). Javna uprava. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za upravo.

50 Government is closed, autocratic, hierarchically structured management and decision-making, and its essence is directly oposite to governance. (Bačlija, I., Červ, G., Turnšek Hančič, M. (2013). »Governance«: vladanje, upravljanje, vladavina ali vladovanje? In: Družboslovne razprave, no. 29 /73, pp. 99–119).
51 Ibid.
52 Bourdieu, P., Wacquant L. (2003). Neoliberalni novorek: zabeležke o novi planetarni vulgati. In: Družboslovne razprave, no. 19 (43, pp. 56–63.
53 Turnšek Hančič, M. (2011). Pasti novoreka: Kritična refleksija prenosa termina »deležniki« iz ekonomskega v politični diskurz. In:Časopis za kritiko znanosti, no. 39/244, pp. 148–156.
54 Freeman, R. Ed., Wicks, A., Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder Theory and »The Corporate Objective Revisited«. In: Organization Science, no. 15/3, pp. 364–369.
55 Turnšek Hančič, M. (2011). Pasti novoreka: Kritična refleksija prenosa termina »deležniki« iz ekonomskega v politični diskurz. In: Časopis za kritiko znanosti, no. 39/244, p. 152.
56 Kos, D. (2003). Postmoderno prostorsko planiranje? In: Teorija in praksa, no. 40/4, p. 652; see also:

ect-oriented, spatial and/or developmental visions are presented to the public only as variant project solutions. Kos describes the present form of spatial planning as a social practice which coordinates interested actors and makes possible their participation in creating strategies, policies, and plans.[57] This poses the question who and how can pursue their spatial interest and at whose expense. Kos also asks "whether participation in spatial planning by those (in)directly affected actually contributes to more emancipated management of one of the most elementary dimensions of life, or whether participation is, as a rule, an abused instrument and in reality, merely a mechanism for legitimisation of partial interests.[58] In addition, stakeholders are facing low legitimation on the part of decision-makers who lack satisfactory communication and interpretation skills to, by using plain intelligible language, better acquaint the affected or interested public with proposed solutions.[59] Particularly in spatial planning, environment protection, and also historic urban area rehabilitation it is of great importance that the proposed measures are acceptable to the public regardless of their legal, technical, developmental, protection, social, transport, or other foundations and options.

In cultural heritage management, two organisational approaches exist, to paraphrase Kovač et al., otherwise characteristic to the business-economic sphere: the organizational development and organisational transformation one.[60]

Organisational development is linked to gradual changes. In immovable cultural heritage, structures and sites that are subject to such slow and typically controlled changes are those with religious and symbolic significance, and monuments and protected areas with a pronounced didactic role. For other types of heritage such as historic urban areas, the norm is that the economic value of heritage must also support its cultural significance, and vice versa: the cultural significance of heritage must be a source of additional economic interest.[61] The need to recognise the social and developmental role of cultural heritage forces decision-makers to transform its significance and to make strategic changes; as regarding organisation, these take the following forms:[62]

➔   Changes are usually proposed by owners, managers, experts, or decision-makers, but frequently by other, external stakeholders, as well;

➔   Proposed changes are typically revolutionary and not evolutional, arising from a new developmental vision;

➔   They stem from dissatisfaction with the current developmental strategy and the state of the living, working, and leisure environment;

➔   Changes start at the top of the management structure (top down).

If cultural heritage management is to be able to meet needs of the modern society, it must be goal- and project-oriented. Measures must be measurable, environmental impacts and demands studied and taken into account as much as possible. Both positive and potentially negative dimensions of planned changes must be made clear to stakeholders, and responsibilities for various phases of management processes set. Therefore, cultural heritage managers should be skilled in communication, interpretation, and management.[63] In order for management to be successful, it must comply with the rules and play the part of an intermediate between set goals and their realisation. One of the modern instruments in historic urban area management is the position of the city manager; in Slovenia as well, its importance in integrated rehabilitations of urban centres is becoming increasingly recognised. In 2012, the Chamber of Small Business and Trade of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce ended its TCM (Town Centre Management) pilot project where three Slovenian cities (Ljubljana, Koper, and Celje) in cooperation with Austrian experts from CIMA GmbH, developed methods for safeguarding and improving the economic, social, and cultural development of city centres. Based on results of analyses of housing situation, economic structure, workshops with businesses and city stakeholders, and meetings at ministries and development agencies, a city marketing model was prepared to be used, in the form of a formal or informal public-private partnership, to professionally run city centres. The project aimed to, in cooperation with businesses, strengthen the marketing of small businesses, tourist offer, management of vacant premises, and forge a link between the city, business owners, and tourism.[64] The key tasks of city managers – since 2015, Novo Mesto has one, too – are to coordinate tasks and projects between city services, inhabitants, and other stakeholders who undertake economic activities in the city centre. The aim is to create public space where commerce, culture, cuisine, social interactions, and cultural and leisure activities join together into an interesting living milieu that is friendly to all participants. Apart from that, they also follow the pace of life in the city, the needs of its inhabitants, day trippers and overnighting tourists, as well as other city users and commuters. With such an approach to organisation and content, ideas are quickly developed and turned to life since the journey from wishes, proposals and demands to realisation has been shortened.[65]

Mušič, B. V. (2004) Mesto in urbanizem med teorijo in prakso. In: Teorija in praksa, no. 41/1-2, pp. 309–331.

57   Ibid.

58   Kos, D. (2010). Prostorsko urejanje med »stroko« in »piarom«. In: Teorija in praksa, no. 47/2-3, p. 417.

59   Kos also writes about questions relevant for meta-language and the role of public-relation services in these fields. Kos, D. (2003). Postmoderno prostorsko planiranje? In: Teorija in praksa, no. 40/4, pp. 655–656.

60   Kovač, J., Mühlbacher J., Kodydek G. (2012). Uvod v management sprememb. Kranj: Moderna organizacija v okviru Fakultete za organizacijske vede.

61   The World Bank (2001). Cultural Heritage and Development: A Framework for Action in the Middle East and North Africa, pp. 43–44.

62   Adapted from Kovač, J., Mühlbacher J., Kodydek G.. (2012). Uvod v management sprememb. Kranj: Moderna organizacija v okviru Fakultete za organizacijske vede, p. 32.

63   Golob, T. (2016). Upravljanje varovanih zgodovinskih mestnih območij v Sloveniji. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani: Filozofska fakulteta, pp. 220–221.

64   Available online: https://www.gzs.si/podjetnisko_trgovska_zbornica/Novice/ArticleId/42212/www.gzs.si/www.gzs.si/dogodki.

65   Golob, T. (2016). Upravljanje varovanih zgodovinskih mestnih območij v Sloveniji. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani: Filozofska fakulteta, pp. 245–248.

Fig. 4 *(a–k collage): The conservation plan for revitalising the Novo mesto historic centre encouraged new formats of public participation. After the setting-up of the working group and the successful workshop with the residents, entrepreneurs joined together under the "Grem v mesto" institute to revive and develop the city centre as a trademark. To date, they have held several full-day, well-visited events under the name Noč nakupov ("Late-Night Shopping") with many outdoor events, local cuisine on offer, and shops, bars and cultural institutions open until midnight (Photo: https://www.facebook.com/gremvmesto/).*

5	**Conclusions**

The relationship between values and tangible and intangible heritage properties has become an increasingly dynamic process influenced by the factor of time and the cultural context of a place. Experts can study the amount and intensity of change in a specific urban society only by involving stakeholders in the processes of integrated conservation and heritage management. Consistent application of guidelines and recommendations of international spatial planning and heritage documents, together with statutory powers and organisational competence to put together managerial structures based on mutual trust and efficient communication among the stakeholders, are key components of a successful operationalisation of integrative approaches and active public participation in the complex areas of spatial planning and (especially urban) heritage protection. Involvement of stakeholders in the management processes of a historic urban area fosters their sense of responsibility and belonging to that city. Therefore, historic urban area management should be a goal-oriented participatory process that needs to be well-grounded methodologically even before development programmes, projects, and management plans start to be developed. The management-oriented approach requires constant co-ordination between development trends, diverse urban population needs, and protection conditions. In parallel, managers need to keep urban population informed and raise its awareness of heritage values and development opportunities, which means that the city must provide efficient city marketing. In many cities, city managers take over the task of co-ordinating interests and needs of urban population with development capacity of the city. They encourage stakeholders towards joint efforts geared to revitalise urban centres, they organise events, courses, workshops, and consultations with inhabitants. Above all, they constantly follow spatial changes, inform competent bodies and the public about them, and propose measures. To be efficient, they need a certain degree of power to make decisions and a direct access to city authorities.

At present, city authorities can hardly imagine effective management of historic urban areas and the realisation of projects without well-established communication among stakeholders. Achieving trust among partners is a prerequisite for regular, open, and constructive communication. Kovač distinguishes personal and systemic trust. The former forms among individuals and groups, the latter between individuals and institutions. The basic trust-building tool is communication.[66] Doppler and Lautenburg claim that informing is inferior to communication, and that it is essential to establish a dialogue among participants, as well as to deliver timely and correct information to all involved.[67] People – usually city managers – who coordinate the management process or a project release and obtain information to and from stakeholders. They need

to define communication channels between stakeholders, for example in the form of meetings, consultations, workshops, and the like, as well as other ways of informal communication. It is important that communication is regular, open, innovative, and adaptable. Institutions in particular need to reach an agreement with other stakeholders on formal and informal communication, so that the administrative procedure merely confirms what has already been agreed upon. Working groups and other formats of collective planning and development of strategies, methods, goals, and measures also fall under informal organisations. A working group involved in historic urban area management is given the task to understand the overall dynamics of challenges, define the basis for political solutions, and enable decision-makers such as the mayor, city manager, and expert services to adopt adequate policies and assure their implementation.[68]

Dayton strictly separates government and governance.[69] As pertains to working groups, his findings can be summed up into a thesis that governance is actually a partnership that relies on trust between those in a working group who are members of the public and those who make decisions. Putting it differently, first comes the role of an expert with some authority powers and a decision-maker in the management phase (implementation of planned measures), and in the second phase comes governance (coordination of necessary measures). Working group members need to act on equal footing. The role of the working group is also to support, encourage, or contradict decision-makers.[70] The basic task of representatives of non-governmental organisations and the general public in a working group is to elaborate strategies, methods, and measures for reaching previously defined goals. Adoption of management strategies and operational goals falls into the remit of local or national political authorities while local managers are responsible for their implementation. On the other hand, Dayton claims that, within the management process, an increasingly blurred line between managerial and governance responsibilities has recently become evident.[71] What used to be a clear division has been replaced by concepts of cooperation, partnership and solutions adapted to specific situations. A model fitting every circumstance no longer exists.[72] For example, external group members are also tasked with convincing the interested public about the appropriate measures. Because they are respectful and influential members of the community, they are usually more successful in this than the decision-makers.

To conclude, while management primarily concentrates on a certain problem, it should approach the historic urban areas mainly from the aspect of ensur-

66 Kovač, J. (2004). Instrumentalni pomen zaupanja v organizaciji. In: Rudi Rozman, Jure Kovač (Eds.). Zbornik referatov 5. znanstvenega posvetovanja o organizaciji: Zaupanje v in med organizacijami (združbami), Brdo pri Kranju. Ljubljana: Društvo organizatorjev Slovenije, Fakulteta za organizacijske vede Kranj, UM, Ekonomska fakulteta UL, pp. 41–47.

67 Doppler, K., Lauterburg C. (2008). Change Management: Den Unternehmenswandel gestalten. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag GmbH.

68 Golob, T. (2016). Upravljanje varovanih zgodovinskih mestnih območij v Sloveniji. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani: Filozofska fakulteta, p. 262.

69 Dayton, K. N. (2001). Governance is Governance. Washington D.C.: Independent Sector. Available online: https://independentsector.org/resource/governance-is-governance/.

70 Noteboom, L. J. (2003). Good Governance for Challenging Times: The SPCO Experience. In: Harmony: No. 16, pp. 29–46. Available online: https://www.esm.rochester.edu/iml/prjc/poly/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Good_Gov_Noteboom.pdf.

71 Dayton, K. N. (2001). Governance is Governance. Washington D.C.: Independent Sector. Available online: https://independentsector.org/resource/governance-is-governance/.

72 Noteboom, L. J. (2003). Good Governance for Challenging Times: The SPCO Experience. In: Harmony: No. 16, pp. 29–46. Available online: https://www.esm.rochester.edu/iml/prjc/poly/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Good_Gov_Noteboom.pdf.

ing public interest as the decisive part of the integrated conservation, starting from the evaluation of protected cultural heritage areas and their development potential and concluding with the evaluation of impacts of executed measures and activities. Methods and tools for managing environmental, social, and economic changes in cultural heritage areas should be adapted to the local (cultural) context, and locally and socially conditioned conservation/rehabilitation of both material and living heritage put in place, while constantly keeping an eye on the (unstable postmodern) social significance of space.