

Appendix

Extracts from: Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites by B.M. Feilden and J. Jokilehto

*Sir Bernard Feilden is a consultant architect, educator and conservator. Besides his work in the field of urban planning and the maintenance of a large number of historic Churches he is the author of several books including *The Conservation of Historic Buildings* (1982), *An Introduction to Conservation* (UNESCO 1980) and a *Manual for Management of World Cultural Heritage Sites*. He is a Fellow of the University College London, a Fellow of the British Institute of Architects, was named Director, Emeritus of ICCROM in 1983 and was a former President of the United Kingdom Committee of ICOMOS. He is the recipient of the Europa Nostra Silver Medal (1982) an Aga Khan Award (1986) and the Gazola Prize at the ICOMOS General Assembly in Colombo 1993.*

Jukka Jokilehto is an architect, and urban planner and educator. He is currently the Chief of Architectural Conservation Programme at ICCROM in Rome and President of ICOMOS International Training Committee.

Treatments Related to Authenticity in Material

Authenticity in material is based on values found in the physical substance of the *original heritage resource*. Emphasis should be given to the protection, conservation and maintenance of the original fabric - whether related to a single building or historic area. The aim of treatment is to prolong the life span of original materials and structures, to keep them in their original position in the construction and on the site (in situ), to preserve the age value and the patina of age of the resource, and to retain the traces of its history, use or changes caused over time.

The question of material authenticity in relation to plants and historic gardens requires a different specification, considering that this is living material, which needs to be replaced according to required cycles. In fact, in the case of gardens, the question should be rather raised of their integrity, and whether or not this integrity exists, and what actions are considered feasible to maintain a proper balance with the historic features of the garden. Authenticity should be referred mainly to the physical layout and features of non-organic materials.

Preventive action includes the provision of regular maintenance and making necessary repairs before damage is caused. It also implies anticipating potential threats so as to prevent damage through planning and direct intervention. In the case of a ruin that has lost its protective envelope weathering and decay is exacerbated; protective action may therefore include covers or roofs to shelter fragile or endangered parts. This must be carried out unobtrusively and with sensitivity towards the character of the monument and the values of the site. An extreme action could be removing decorative parts from the monument and to conserve them in a museum; such action should be considered temporary, and it is advisable only if no other

means of protection are available. It is, in fact, in conflict with the principle of keeping historically significant material in its original context.

Replacement of original elements. Once material has been cut and used in a construction, it has become historic and is linked with the 'historic time line' of the object. Although restoration by replacement of decayed materials and structural elements will reduce material authenticity in the monument, it can be acceptable within the limits of potential unity if it is vital for the survival of the remaining original structure. When appropriately executed with similar materials and workmanship, the result should be compatible with the original character of the structure. The replacement of original elements should be strictly limited in extent, and carried out in a way that it does not diminish the value of the original substance.

Consolidation and reinforcement: When the strength of materials or structural elements is reduced to the extent that it can no longer survive anticipated threats consolidation or reinforcement may be advisable. Such treatment will, however, reduce the authenticity of the resource because the original substance is altered. The combination of traditional materials and modern industrial products can also cause conflicts.

The use of modern industrial products for the consolidation of traditional building materials, can physically or chemically transform the original to the extent that its material authenticity may be lost, although the appearance may still be the same. Such treatments should be decided only after a careful, critical assessment of the implications in each case. One should also keep in mind that treatments such as injections and grouting may be difficult or impossible to reverse if they are unsuccessful. Prior to undertaking such interventions, a proper balance between

protection and consolidation should be found through careful scientific analyses of the character and consistency of the original material, the environmental context and the proposed cure. In no event should historical evidence be destroyed.

The treatment itself should be properly tested for its effectiveness, and its appropriateness for the material in question must be *proven over an extended test period* before large scale application.

The testing period must be long, since failures sometimes occur even after ten or fifteen years. It is important to keep an accurate record of all treatments in historic buildings and ancient monuments, and to make regular inspections on their behaviour, followed up by written reports. Research on conservation treatments should refer to these historical records.

Concerning the fabric of an historic area, one should carefully identify and define what should be conserved in order not to lose the authenticity. The historic value of towns or traditional settlements lies in their structures and fabric. Therefore conserving only fronts or elevations of historic buildings, and replacing the fabric with new constructions means a loss of authenticity and historical continuity. The aim should be conservative rehabilitation of the original fabric whenever possible.

Treatments Related To Authenticity In Workmanship

Authenticity in workmanship is related to material authenticity, but its emphasis is on keeping evidence of the workmanship, and to guarantee that this is not falsified by contemporary interventions.

Conservation. The Value of authenticity in workmanship is best understood through a systematic identification, documentation and analysis of the historic production and treatment of building materials, and methods of construction. This research will provide a necessary reference for the compatibility of modern conservation treatments.

Consolidation. In the case of structural consolidation or reinforcement, the integrity of the historical structural system must be respected and its form preserved. Only by first understanding how an historic building acts as a whole - that is, as a "structural-spatial environmental system"³⁴ - is it possible to introduce appropriate new techniques, provide suitable environmental adjustments, or devise sensitive adaptive uses.

Maintenance. The repair of heritage resources using compatible traditional skill and materials is of prime importance. However, where traditional methods are inadequate, the conservation of cultural property may be achieved by the use of modern techniques. These should be reversible, proven by experience, and appropriate for the scale of the project and its climatic environment.

In the case of **vernacular architecture**, which often consists of short-lived or vulnerable materials (such as reeds, mud, rammed earth, unbaked bricks and wood), the same type of materials and traditional skills should be used for

the repair or restoration of worn or decayed parts. The preservation of design intentions and details is just as important as the preservation of original materials. In many cases, it is advisable to use temporary measure in the hope that some better technique will be developed, especially if consolidation may diminish resource integrity and prejudice future conservation efforts.

Treatments Related To Authenticity In Design

Authenticity in design is related to the architectural, artistic, engineering and functional design of the monument, site, historic town, traditional settlement, or landscape, and the relevant setting. The commemorative value of a monument is also related to the authenticity of its design, and depends on the legibility of this intent.

The aim is to preserve original material and structures in which the design is manifest, and when feasible to carry out restorations or other appropriate treatments that will reveal values that may have been obscured through alterations, neglect or destruction.

Restoration. The aim of restoration is the reinforcement and eventual reintegration of the potential unity so far as this is possible without artistic or historic deception. Restoration actions may range from minimum treatment, necessary for the conservation and protection of the resource, to more radical intervention required to reveal its architectural and aesthetic values. Systematic survey, recording, and documentation are necessary for an assessment of the physical condition of the resource and the evaluation of its integrity as a whole and in its parts.³⁵ In relation to historic gardens or landscapes, the retention and sensitive management of historic plant material is indispensable.

Historical stratigraphy. A restoration aimed at the recreation or reconstruction of the object in a form (style) that existed previously but has been lost would presuppose that time is reversible; the result would be a fantasy, and is referred to as "stylistic restoration". This approach implies the elimination of parts relating to specific periods of history. Although stylistic restoration was considered an acceptable practice in the past, contemporary restoration strategies should be based on the condition of the resource at the present moment, so that the valid contributions and additions of all periods of its "historic time line" are acknowledged.

In the case of *superimposed historical phases of development*, underlying layers in the historical stratigraphy of a resource can be displayed for the purpose of study and documentation. Any display of later phases should be discrete, and carried out in a manner that does not undermine their contributing values and conservation. Removal of elements representing the historical phases of a monument should only be carried out in exceptional circumstances, such as 'when what is removed is of little interest and the material which is brought to light is of great historical, archaeological or aesthetic value, and its state of preservation good enough to justify the action.'³⁶ These are hard conditions to satisfy.

Modern *reintegration of lost parts (lacunae)* is generally acceptable so long as a potential unity exists and provides a sound basis for the operation. Treatment of *lacunae* is based on the evaluation of their context, and these should be reintegrated on the basis of factual evidence. If the reintegration does not enhance the potential unity of the whole, or if the *lacunae* cannot be reintegrated due to the extent, position, or the artistic character of losses, this action would not be appropriate.³⁷ If losses can be reintegrated in an appropriate manner, however, treatment should be carried out following international guidelines.

Although the aim of reintegration in historic buildings or other resources is to establish harmony with the original design in terms of its colour, texture and form, any replacement should at the same time 'be distinguishable from the original (at least at close inspection) so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence'.³⁹ In differentiating new elements from old, care should be taken to ensure that their contrast is not excessive. The objective is to indicate the distinction, not to emphasize the difference between new and old. In addition, the extent of new parts should be small relative to the original fabric.

If losses *cannot be reintegrated* in an appropriate manner, as is generally the case with ruined structures where the potential unity of the monument has been lost either due to lack of factual evidence or extensive damage, the principal aim of the treatment should be to maintain the existing state of the ruins. Any reinforcement or consolidation should then be carried out as a minimum intervention to guarantee the stabilization of the resource, without compromising the appreciation of its aesthetic or architectural values. The interpretation of the history of such sites and the aesthetic values of associated monuments should then be developed from available evidence on the site itself; it can be presented through publications, scale models and/or fragments in a site exhibition or museum.

Anastylosis. Where dismembered original elements still exist at the site, anastylosis can be an acceptable treatment if it is based on reliable evidence regarding the exact original location of these elements. This may contribute to making the original design, intent and artistic significance of the monument clearer to the observer. However, it should be kept in mind that disassembled elements that have weathered on the ground are often decayed to the extent that they have lost their delineated form and are not suitable for an anastylosis.

Accurate anastylosis is difficult to achieve, as experience on many important sites will confirm. Such works should therefore be limited in extent; they should also be reversible and fully documented. If taken too far, anastylosis can make an historic site look like a film set and will diminish its cultural value. Reconstruction using new material implies that the result is a new building, and this means that the historical authenticity is lost in this regard. Reconstruction, particularly when extensive, may result in misinterpretation.

There are, however, cases when renewal is part of a traditional process which in itself has acquired special

significance. This is the case with the periodical redecoration or even reconstruction of Japanese Shinto temples. Such ceremonial renewal should be understood outside the 'modern' restoration concept. While the aim of conservation is the '*mise-en-valeur*' of historic monuments, ensembles or sites as part of modern society without losing their significance or meaning, this does not mean going against living cultural traditions, if these have been maintained in their authenticity as part of society.

Concerning historic areas of special significance (and in particular World Heritage cities), priorities need to be clearly established in order to guarantee the protection and conservation of the entire fabric and infrastructure of the area. Any changes and eventual new constructions that need to be carried out as part of rehabilitation processes should make clear reference to the historical and architectural continuity of the areas concerned.

Treatments Related To Authenticity In Setting

Authenticity in setting is reflected in the relationship between the resource as maintained and its physical context. This includes landscape and townscape values, and also the relationship of man-made constructions to their environmental context. The preservation of the monument *in situ* (in its original place) is a basic requirement in preserving these values. The question of contextual setting is addressed through conservation planning, and implies the anticipation of changes.

Treatment of a site will affect the overall setting and values that have been formed and evolved through the historical process. A *ruined monument* has usually acquired specific cultural values and has become part of its setting in the ruined form. This is especially true when the ruin has gained special significance as part of a later creation, such as the ruined mediaeval Fountain's Abbey in the setting of the eighteenth-century *landscape garden* Studley Royal. Similarly, the remains of ancient monuments of Greek or Roman Antiquity, recognized as part of our culture in their ruined form, require a strict policy of conservation as ruins. The decision to proceed with an anastylosis should always be related to the historical-physical contact of the site and to the overall balance of its setting.

Landscapes are an important issue in themselves. Such is the Lake District in England, which has attracted attention from poets and artists over the centuries, the Japanese concept of '*borrowed landscape*' extends the visual values of a designed garden beyond its boundaries (e.g. in the Imperial garden of Katsura). One can define entire territories as a *cultural landscape* which has matured as a testimony of an harmonious interaction between nature and human interventions over a long period of time. Such a cultural landscape may have acquired specific spatial qualities through successive phases of cultivation and use; it may have particular archaeological significance; it may contain traditional types of settlements, and still foster forms of compatible activities. All these can only survive if given due attention and are appropriately documented as a basis for integrated conservation planning and legislative

protection.

Encroachment and intrusive commercial development are typical threats that must be addressed by those responsible for conservation management. In addition, well-intentioned reuse and introduction of new services and infrastructures may detract from the often fragile original historic features and their contextually significant setting. Any reception, informational areas, and exhibition facilities

need to be carefully planned so as to guarantee the integrity of the site. *Buffer zones* of sufficient size should be established in order to protect the landscape or historic town context from intrusive elements that diminish cultural values. Planning at local and regional level should take into account the '*genius loci*' and the enhanced status of a World Heritage site, and ensure that negative threats of all types are prevented or strictly controlled.

³⁴ Feilden, 1982

³⁵ Brandi, 1963

³⁶ Venice Charter, Art. 11.

³⁷ The theory of treatment of losses (*lacunae*) in works of art has been developed at the Istituto Centrale del Restauro,

Rome.

³⁸ See: Brandi, 1963, the Venice Charter of 1964, and Unesco Recommendations.

³⁹ Venice Charter, Art. 12.