

# ICOA1404: INTEGRATING CULTURAL HERITAGE IN URBAN TERRITORIAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

## Subtheme 01: Integrating Heritage and Sustainable Urban Development by engaging diverse Communities for Heritage Management

**Session 2:** Management, Documentation

**Location:** Stein Auditorium, India Habitat Centre

**Time:** December 13, 2017, 16:15 – 16:30

**Author:** Luigi Fusco Girard, Francesca Nocca

*Luigi Fusco Girard is professor at University of Naples in evaluation of plan/ project, in National Council of Research of Italy – IRISS and adjunct Professor in the University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia. He is President of International Scientific Committee on Economic of Conservation (ISCEC) of ICOMOS and VICE President of Italy National Committee of ICOMOS.*

**Abstract:** The paper will propose these items:

- A. Which is the role of cultural heritage in the Agenda 2030 and in the NUA?
- B. How can ICOMOS contribute to the achievement of the many SDG's of the Agenda 2030 and the NUA through the heritage/landscape integrated conservation?
- C. Which new tools for the implementation? Which indicators? Which Action Plan for the Italian Committee of ICOMOS?

The importance of the Agenda 2030 will be analysed through the 16+1 SDG's (that represent a *vision* about the desirable future of humanity in the XXI century) and through the New Urban Agenda. These SDG's can be implemented in the territory/ city systems.

The New Urban Agenda recognizes in the article 124 culture as a “priority component of urban plans and strategies”, thus representing the entrance point of culture into SDGs (where it is substantially ignored). The New Urban Agenda can open the perspective of new humanistic/ ecological paradigm based on critical thinking, holistic approach, relationship between human beings and between human beings and ecosystems.

How can we pass from principles to actions? Which tools regarding in particular the implementation of UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape Approach?

The paper will propose a new original set of indicators and evaluation tools for improving conservation/ development choices.

Cultural Heritage is interpreted as a good example of commons that evokes a community that is able to identify management/ organizational rules founded on self-organization and self-government. The principle of subsidiarity is assumed as a starting point for implementing innovative public private social partnership. At the same time, this commons approach suggests new forms of economy: cooperative economy, solidarity economy, social economy and, more in general, circular economy.

**Key words:** *new paradigm, circular economy, subsidiarity, responsibility, social inclusion.*

## **Introduction: towards a “new paradigm”**

Today we are facing with important challenges (characterizing both developed and non-developed countries) related to economic, social and environmental crisis and referred to three great changes: demographic changes (population growth), structural changes (globalization) and environmental changes (climate change, pollution, etc.). Population aging, unemployment, growing fragility of social ties and precariousness are only some features characterizing our society.

As United Nations have recognized, “billions of our citizens continue to live in poverty and are denied a life of dignity. There are rising inequalities within and among countries” (point 14 SDGs).

The United Nations recognized the centrality of human being in the achievement of sustainable development, committing to ensure that “all human beings can fulfil their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environment” (United Nation, 2015).

The reduction of inequality is a specific goal of the United Nations that are committing “to reduce inequalities within and among countries” (SDG n. 10), “creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion” (United Nation, 2015).

In the New Urban Agenda (United Nations, 2016) “the persistence of multiple forms of poverty, growing inequalities and environmental degradation” are recognized as the major obstacles to sustainable development, with social and economic exclusion and spatial segregation (art. 3, NUA).

Economic processes have a specific responsibility in this growing division between wealth and poverty in the city.

Recently, the traditional economy is showing its limits: particular interests are prevailing on the general ones, generating the triumph of a few people on the suffering of many. San Francisco, Boston, New York are some well-known examples of cities characterized by increasing divided between islands of wealth and sea of poverty.

The traditional economy is able to produce benefits in the short time but, to the increase in economic wealth correspond, in the long time, social and environmental costs; furthermore, a growing state of malaise is spreading. This is linked, for example, to the accessibility to services and job. The traditional economy needs to be re-shaped/re-generated in order to be more respectful to social environment and human being and to become more productive in a multiple dimensional space.

In this framework, cities play a central role. They are the place where most of the wealth is produced through concentration of clusters (of activities, industries, talents, etc.) as starting points for new synergies, innovations and greater productivity. Today the economic development is urban/city-led: it is spatially connoted. To stimulate the economic development strong investments in physical, technological, digital, institutional, cultural infrastructures are required. But cities are also generators of entropy. They are the places where negative impacts on environmental (pollution, environmental degradation, loss of biodiversity etc.) and on social capital (inequalities, social fragmentation, negative impacts on health and wellbeing, etc.) are produced and concentrated.

The city performances depend on the economic, geographical, technological factors, but also on cultural ones. The economic crisis is the tip of an iceberg that on the bottom has a real problem: the cultural crisis ([www.labsus.org](http://www.labsus.org)).

There is an emerging need for a “new paradigm” moving the concept of development towards a more humanistic and ecological point of view (Hosagrahar et al., 2016).

This paper is focused on the role that cultural heritage can play in the achievement of the new paradigm at the basis of circular urban economy. In particular, the attention is focused on the analysis of the role of cultural heritage in building social capital and in contributing to social cohesion providing a framework for participation and engagement.

### **The contribution of cultural heritage to social capital**

The traditional capitalist (individualistic) economy has shown its weakness, becoming un-sustainable, producing environmental degradation and reduction of social cohesion and pursuing the particular interest and not the general one. It is not able to combine the production of wealth with the environmental and social sustainability. This recalls for a “new economy” beyond the traditional one.

The “new economy” is based on the circularization of processes and aims at reducing social and environmental externalities and greenhouse impacts, recognizing the central role of the relationships/ synergies/ symbioses and the importance of medium-long time (compared to the short time). It is necessary to trigger organizational processes able to promote relationships and symbiotic bonds.

In this framework, cities need to be re-organized according to the logic of this “new circular economy” which is increasingly de-carbonized, ecological and inclusive.

The model is inspired by the nature’s one, based on the circularization of processes, in which “nothing is waste” and a product of an element becomes a nutrient for another one. The circular economy aims to close the loops and to extend the lifetime of resources over time. It is based on relationships/ bonds that are able to trigger new synergies and symbioses and to activate “new chains of value creation” (Fusco Girard et al., 2017).

The challenge today is to transform the traditional economy into another one able to spread prosperity and, at the same time, to produce benefits for environmental and social capital, focusing on human beings and relationships.

Because of the weakness that traditional economy is showing in terms of not inclusion, marginalization/inequalities, etc., new forms of economy, as social/ civil economy, are spreading, that are based on circular processes. In these processes you give, you receive and then you give back. These circular economy processes can support the traditional urban economy. They are able to activate virtuous cycles among cultural, social and economic value production. But circular economy is also able to contribute towards a new culture: a culture of cooperation/ collaboration/ synergies.

In the shift towards the new paradigm, based on the concept of development in a more humanistic and ecological terms, cultural heritage/ landscape can play a fundamental role. Furthermore, in a world

characterized by growing fragility of social ties, cultural landscape can contribute to “sew” the relationships broken by human beings.

There are a lot of good practices demonstrating that cultural heritage conservation/ valorisation is able to produce benefits in multiple dimensions: economic, environmental, social and cultural benefits (Nocca, 2017).

As recognized in the New Urban Agenda, culture can be considered a key element in the humanization of cities and human settlements (point 26), playing an important role “in rehabilitating and revitalizing urban areas, and in strengthening social participation and the exercise of citizenship” (point 38). Culture is a “priority component of urban plans and strategies” and can represent a “leveraging for sustainable urban development”, also stimulating participation and responsibility (points 124 and 125)

Cultural heritage, as highlighted from European Commission (European Commission), represents a particular example of common good. It is characterized from an intrinsic and social value and can be acknowledged as a strategic resource for sustainable development, a key element in the global competition. The values of cultural heritage are based on a complex vision, considering not only the cultural and economic components, but also the social and environmental ones (Fusco Girard, 1987). It is integral part of life of communities and it is involved in social, economic and environmental processes.

The decay of common goods (both tangible and intangible) is an obstacle to the development of the human wellbeing as the quality of life depends also on the quality of common goods. In this perspective, taking care of common goods means indirectly taking care of people who can “enjoy” it. These common goods are localized in public urban spaces and places. The regeneration of these common goods as public hybrid spaces makes cities more inclusive, resilient, sustainable and safe, if self-management processes are implemented. Through self-management in taking care of these specific common resources, cooperation and integration of own self-interest with the general interest is stimulated. The rights are interpreted in relational perspective. Self-management promotes resilience, vitality, sense of belonging to a system and thus micro-communities.

Cultural heritage is able to evoke community that takes care and valorise its common goods identifying management/organizational rules founded on self-organization and self-government.

In this perspective, cultural heritage can be interpreted as generator/ re-generator of community, relationships and bonds. Cultural places are the places where micro-communities can organize and aggregate and are able to create networks among themselves. People, taking care of the common good, contribute to physical conservation of the good itself and, at the same time, to generate/ re-generate community, fostering bonds and producing social energy: social responsibility, social capital and sense of belonging.

There are some good practices demonstrating that micro-communities can arise from cultural heritage, on the base of the subsidiarity principle. Aiming at the conservation/ valorisation of cultural heritage, they contribute to social inclusion and cohesion, producing benefits on quality of life (European Commission 2014, 2015; CHCfE, 2015).

In this sense, cultural heritage is able to build social capital and to contribute to social cohesion providing a framework for participation and engagement and also fostering integration (European Commission 2014, 2015; EAHTR, 2007; Department for Culture Media & Sport, 2016; CHCfE, 2015).

It has positive impacts on social capital, revitalizing synergies, bonds and collaborative relationships. It is able to encourage associations, crowd funding projects, etc. that contribute to local economic productivity.

Heritage has the power to strengthen communities (Hosagrahar et al., 2016). It “produces” attachment to place and, at the same time, it becomes an entry point for cultural dialogue, mutual knowing and comparison among different communities.

The experience of the conservation/ valorisation of the portico of Bologna (Italy) ([www.unpassopersanluca.it](http://www.unpassopersanluca.it)) is, for example, a good practice of conservation of a common good fostering social cohesion and cooperation/ relationships among members of the local community. The Portico of San Luca, the main monument of the city, has been restored thanks to a crowd funding campaign, promoted by the municipality and local associations.

The city of Bologna supports the idea that the community should support public authorities in taking care, maintain and regenerate part of city in a collaborative perspective.

In some countries, taking care of common goods is so important that there are a lot of non-governmental bodies playing an active role. They contribute to create micro-communities and community networks, as in the case of the National Trust in UK that is a charity that gathers a large community around the same idea: the importance of cultural heritage and open spaces and the necessity to preserve them for everyone to enjoy.

Citizens, engaging together to the same objective, build community, going beyond the mere conservation and enhancement of the quality of the good. In this way, the economic goals are achieved together with the social ones; community bonds are strengthened, developing synergies based on trust and producing social capital that, in turn, is an important factor for local economic development.

Citizens, taking care of common goods, share resources (as time, skills, etc.) and responsibilities with other citizens and public administrations. In fact, in this way, they become responsible of the care of the good together with the public administration.

### **Subsidiarity and circular economy**

A significant example is the Italian experience of Labsus ([www.labsus.org](http://www.labsus.org)), that is a Laboratory for subsidiarity aimed at the shared management and valorisation of common goods, including cultural heritage, through which organize a bottom-up local development. It brings together citizens to carry out activities of general interest (the management of common goods) on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity. It is a good practice of building community and community networks starting from common goods.

It doesn't mean that private individuals are actively replacing the public bodies. It is based on a model of society characterized by the presence of active and responsible citizens that are allied with the public

administrations in taking care of all the common goods. It is a Laboratory that aims to implement the principle of subsidiarity, in order to elaborate ideas, collect experiences and report initiatives.

This Laboratory is based on a “pact of collaboration” (real technical-juridical solutions showed on the web) between citizens and administrations, supporting the activation of bottom-up processes of regeneration and management.

As the experience of Labsus demonstrates, the cooperation is able to move different resources and produce new solutions for the care of the common goods (i.e. “SapriCondivisa” project, “AbitarePaduli” project, the recovery of Dolmen Chianca in Lecce, Italy).

It represents an innovative way to generate/re-generate relationships and bonds, starting from common goods. It contributes to “create community” in a circular perspective, in a society in which the competitive liberalism is instead increasing divisions and inequalities.

There are other significant experiences based on the same principles of Labsus, as LABoratory for the GOVERNance of the City as a Commons (“LabGov”), focusing on the involvement of citizens in taking care of common goods and in co-production of programmes, ideas, projects.

There are some good practices also outside of Italy, as the redevelopment of St. Fagan’s Open Air Museum in Wales or Helsinki Central Library, that represent significant examples of sharing of responsibility, skills and ideas in decision making and co-production processes.

Therefore, cultural heritage becomes a place generating micro-community and relationships. These relationships are able, in turn, to create bonds, synergies and symbioses and thus new value chains.

Cultural heritage is fundamental for community/ social cohesion as it expresses values and identity and organizes communities and their relationships through its powerful symbolic and aesthetic dimensions.

The involvement of citizens not only in cultural activities, but also in management of cultural heritage can produce a lot of benefits. Taking care of common goods goes beyond the positive effects on improving its quality that citizens will enjoy thanks to their intervention. This solidarity activity (citizens act consciously that others who have not acted will enjoy the results) also produces benefits on strengthening community bonds, by developing mutual relationships based on trust and producing social capital. This capital, in its turn, is a factor of economic development.

However, there is still a substantial lack of empirical evidence about the specific indicators of “glue” value of cultural heritage in terms of social cohesion promotion.

An analysis of 40 case studies about cultural heritage conservation/regeneration projects have been carried out in order to extract the indicators assessing the impacts that cultural heritage is able to produce on city productivity (Nocca, 2017). A matrix of 177 multidimensional indicators have been processed subdividing them in the following 9 categories (and 27 sub-categories): tourism and recreation, creative, cultural and innovative activities, typical local productions, environment and natural capital, social capital/cohesion and inclusion, real estate, financial return, cultural value of properties/landscape, wellbeing.

According to this analysis, the indicators related to the contribution of cultural heritage to social cohesion are only 8 out of 28 belonging to the social capital/ cohesion and inclusion category and out of 177 belonging to all other categories (15%).

Further indicators assessing, for example, the number of crowd funding projects, the number of participants in crowd funding initiatives, amount of donations for cultural heritage and municipal bonds/ crowd funding incomes for heritage projects should integrate those deduced from the case studies. Some case studies deal with these benefits only at theoretical level, without quantifying them.

## **Conclusions: the contribution of social capital to economic development and circular economy**

In order to build a more desirable future, a balance among the different dimensions (economic, ecological and social) and between general and particular interest are necessary.

In the implementation of the new economic model, based on “we” and not on “I”, trust and responsibility play a crucial role. They are fundamental to generate/ regenerate synergies and bonds. A system based on shared values enables pursuit of economic goals by focusing on social issues too.

Cultural heritage/ landscape can play a key role in building social links. It can represent a hub that provides opportunities for create relationships and networks among different groups of people and micro-communities and thus the new urban paradigm in the local development, but also to synergize businesses, to stimulate solidarity economy and also to contribute to circular local economic development.

Social relationships and social capital generated from cultural heritage management can represent the cultural infrastructure able to enhance the economy based on clusters.

As emerged from the 40 case studies, the social and environmental dimensions are in most cases leaving out from the analyses (even though they are related to sustainability) that are mainly focused on the economic dimension.

Therefore, as also European Commission highlighted, cultural heritage requires an integrated approach in order to consider its different values and dimensions. This calls for more indicators able to better assess the “glue” value of cultural heritage in social cohesion terms. There is a need of a suitable set of indicators to integrate the evaluation methods considering much more the social issue, to date scarcely included in projects/ programmes evaluations. An open field for future research is thus related to the development of tools for better evaluating the relationships between cultural heritage and social inclusion, and thus implementing the circular local economic new model.

## **Bibliography**

CHCfE Consortium (2015). *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe*. Krakow, Poland.

Department for Culture Media & Sport (2016). *The Culture White Paper*. ISBN 0262160935.

European Association of Historic Towns and Regions (EAHTR) (2007). *INHERIT Investing in Heritage – A Guide to Successful Urban Regeneration*.

- European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. (2015). *Getting Cultural Heritage to Work for Europe – Report of the Horizon 2020 Expert Group on Cultural Heritage*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2014). *Communication from the Commission to The European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe*. European Commission, COM (2014) 477 final.
- Fusco Girard, L. (1987). *Risorse architettoniche e culturali: valutazioni e strategie di conservazione*; Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Fusco Girard, L., Cerreta, M., De Toro, P. (2017). “Towards a Local Comprehensive Productive Development Strategy: A Methodological Proposal for the Metropolitan City of Naples”. *Quality innovation prosperity*. 21/1, pp. 223-239.
- Hosagrahar, J., Soule, J., Fusco Girard, L., Potts, A. (2016). Cultural Heritage, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and the New Urban Agenda. *ICOMOS Concept Note United Nations Agenda 2030 Third United Nations Conf. Hous. Sustain. Urban Dev. (HABITAT III)*
- Nocca, F. (2017). “The role of cultural heritage in sustainable development: multidimensional indicators as decision-making tool”. *Sustainability*. 9(10), 1882; doi:10.3390/su9101882
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*.
- United Nations (2016). *Draft outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III)*.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2013). *Creative economy report: Widening development pathways*. ISBN 9780981661902
- www.labsus.org. (2017). Laboratory of subsidiarity. [online] [Accessed October 30, 2017]
- www.unpassopersanluca.it. (2017). Un passo per San Luca. [online] [Accessed October 30, 2017]



# ICOA1404: INTÉGRER LE PATRIMOINE CULTUREL DANS LE DÉVELOPPEMENT TERRITORIAL URBAIN DURABLE

## Sous-thème 01: Intégrer le patrimoine et le développement urbain durable en engageant Diverses communautés pour la gestion du patrimoine

**Session 2:** Le management, documentation

**Lieu:** Stein Auditorium, India Habitat Centre

**Date et heure:** 13 Décembre, 2017, 16:15 – 16:30

**Auteur:** Luigi Fusco Girard, Francesca Nocca

*Luigi Fusco Girard est professeur à l'Université de Naples où il enseigne l'analyse de plans et de projets, au Conseil national italien de la recherche-IRISS et professeur associé à l'Université de Nova Gorica en Slovénie. Il est président du Comité scientifique international de l'ICOMOS sur l'économie de la conservation (ISCEC) et vice-président du Comité national italien de l'ICOMOS.*

**Résumé:** L'article se propose d'aborder les points suivants:

D. Quel est le rôle du patrimoine culturel dans l'Agenda 2030 et dans le Nouvel Agenda Urbain (NAU)?

E. Comment l'ICOMOS peut-il contribuer à la réussite des nombreux objectifs de développement durable (ODD) de l'Agenda 2030 et au NAU à travers la conservation intégrée du patrimoine et du paysage?

F. Quels nouveaux outils pour la mise en œuvre? Quels indicateurs? Quel plan d'action pour le Comité italien de l'ICOMOS?

L'importance de l'Agenda 2030 sera analysée à travers les 16+1 ODD (qui représentent une *perspective* sur l'avenir de l'humanité souhaitable au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle) et à travers le Nouvel Agenda Urbain. Ces ODD peuvent être mis en œuvre dans les systèmes territoriaux et urbains.

Le Nouvel Agenda Urbain reconnaît, dans l'article 124, la culture comme une « composante prioritaire des plans et stratégies urbains », constituant ainsi le point d'entrée de la culture dans les ODD (dans lesquels elle est substantiellement ignorée). Le Nouvel Agenda Urbain peut ouvrir la perspective d'un nouveau paradigme humaniste et écologique basé sur une pensée critique, une approche holistique, une relation entre les êtres humains et entre ceux-ci et les écosystèmes.

Comment passer des principes aux actions? Quels outils concernant en particulier la mise en œuvre de l'approche de l'UNESCO centrée sur le paysage urbain historique?

La communication proposera un nouvel ensemble original d'indicateurs et d'outils d'évaluation pour améliorer les choix de conservation et de développement.

Le patrimoine culturel est interprété comme un bel exemple d'espace collectif qui suggère une communauté capable d'identifier des règles de gestion et d'organisation fondées sur une autonomie d'organisation et de gouvernance. Le principe de subsidiarité est censé être le point de départ pour la mise en œuvre d'un partenariat social public-privé innovant. En même temps, cette approche collective suggère de nouvelles formes d'économies: économie coopérative, économie solidaire, économie sociale et, plus généralement, économie circulaire.

**Mots-clés:** communauté, durabilité, développement, participation