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Introduction

Urban planning and management in developing countries often disregards the value of historic zones ("historic city centres") and their buildings in favour of economic growth and exploitation of real estate. Especially in centrally located areas, the increase in land prices can be an unfairly strong opponent to the inhabitants and other users of historic, mostly neglected urban environments. The recognition by planners of the value (not only historic but also economic and social) of old structures is very important. They can be decayed old mansions, housing or even abandoned palaces, fortresses and other kind of buildings of historic value. Often they are occupied by the weaker sections of society, and lack of investment or even destruction can be very detrimental to poor communities inhabiting historic city centres and can mean their eviction. Urban planners and managers need also to act as ‘heritage managers’ and they will have to increase their insight into broad urban development issues related to urban conservation.

In particular, the implementation of conservation and rehabilitation projects of historic inner city zones will pose special challenges in terms of preparation of techno-financial feasibility studies for the preparation of ‘bankable’ projects, development of institutional frameworks for project implementation, public/private partnerships for financing and implementation of schemes, project and programme management (management of works and finance), and formulation of tools for progress monitoring and evaluation.

Neither the public nor the private sectors will be in a position to execute such projects alone. Urban conservation, as it is gradually being realised – will require a broad partnership approach in order to tap scarce resources and to forge these into a programme that is capable of re-interpreting the Past while it imagines the Future.
1 The Situation of Old Housing Stock and Historic Centres

During the past fifty years, the attention of most governments in the developing world (and of most international agencies) was focused on the problems of new settlements built through authorised and non-authorised (informal) processes. Typically, most of these housing areas grew rapidly and were characterised by overcrowding, lack of infrastructure, poor quality construction, bad sites, and so forth. Quantitatively, these housing areas usually overwhelmed the earlier city. By the 1970s the vast majority of the housing stock in most large cities in the developing world was less than twenty-five years old. The older housing stock was therefore considered insignificant in terms of the scale of the housing problem.

At the same time, the desire for "modernisation" by governments and top decision-makers in most developing countries often led them to believe that only new and "modern" housing was worthwhile. Anything old or in a traditional style was considered of little value and was torn down or, at best, ignored (Dix 1990; Batisse 1992; UNDP 1992). Older housing, normally concentrated in the inner parts of the city, was often kept in a state of physical deterioration, overcrowded and lacking in services. It was easy to label such areas as "slums", to be removed at the earliest convenient opportunity.

In addition, because of the rapid growth in the size of most cities in the developing world and the rapid transformation of their city economies, the whole spatial pattern of land uses and activities began to change. Inner cities became valuable territories for land uses other than housing, and economic pressures led to further elimination of the older housing stock.

For all of these reasons, most cities in the developing world have paid and continue to pay very little attention to their historic inner city areas and the housing areas within these. As a result, these areas continue generally to decline, with their physical and social and economic functions disrupted and their present potential contribution to the city's overall housing stock under-utilised.

Yet these areas are more significant and more important than is commonly realised. Almost all cities, even fast growing ones, have an older housing stock. Most large cities today have grown from a core which has existed for centuries, even if only at a small scale. In some cities, this older core is large and well-defined with a physically substantial housing stock. Occasionally, as in Shanghai (McCallum/Steinberg 1987 c; Shanghai Municipal Government; Steinberg 1996 c), Bombay (Dewan Verma 1995; UNCHS 1986; Muttagi 1989; Sundaram 1989), Mexico City (Rosas Matecon 1990), Lima (Harms et al1996, Harms 1997), Cuzco (Iberico/Degregori 1998), Quito
(Bromley/Jones 1995; Illustre Municipio de Quito 1992; Empresa del Centro Historico 1998; Peña 1998) and Havana (Goldberger 1998), the older housing stock is quantitatively very important, constituting a large percentage of the centrally located housing stock. In other cities, for instance Jakarta or Cartagena, the number of the residences of the colonial elite is smaller, and restricted mainly to "European" quarters built during the colonial era, with the “native” quarters being predominantly smaller, less permanent and a less well established construction.

But almost everywhere this older core exists. And almost everywhere the historic city centre represents a unique historic link with the past, a physical manifestation of the social and cultural traditions which have developed to give the modern city and society its meaning and character. This role is gradually being appreciated, although so far only on a limited scale (Richards 1952; Mukherji 1989; Muttalib 1989; Graber 1993; Menon 1989; Menon/Thapar 1988).

Equally, many cities now realise that it is often counter-productive to remove large areas of existing old housing stock, given the tremendous housing demand which exists and the clear inability of existing institutions (and financial schemes) to provide new housing on the scale desired. Instead, it is important to utilise these housing units, even if at present they are in poor condition (Feilden 1982; Feilden 1989; Dix 1987).

However, even if there are such changes in attitude it is not always clear what should be done (Abu-Lughod 1978; Martin 1978; Feilden 1985, King 1993). After so many years of hostility or indifference what should be the new approaches toward older housing areas? What strategies should be adopted? What can be done?

Although the concept of rehabilitation has seen increasing support in most of the industrialised countries, a very different situation exists in the developing countries (UNCHS 1991; Hardoy 1983). The concept is still new and unfamiliar in most places. Intellectually and professionally it has remained limited to heritage campaign groups, a small number of foreign-trained local professionals, and eventually a few external advisors. Politically, it has not yet generated significant support. The legal and administrative machinery for historic area conservation, where it exists, is largely prohibitive rather than constructive and is seldom effectively enforced (ICOMOS 1994; UNESCO 1972; UNESCO 1976; ICOMOS 1986). Older housing areas are still seen as “problems” rather than as important components of urban life. In some cases, the single-minded concern for a narrowly conceived “modernisation” has been carried so far that there is almost nothing left of the old cities (Cantacuzino 1987). Singapore is the best example, and only thanks to a recent shift in policy, through which conservation of a few, remaining historic zones has been initiated, can Singapore today boasts a few, newly renovated heritage zones (China Town, Little India, the Arab quarter) (Toyka-Seid 1998). The new conversation policy resulted in the revaluation of properties and boosting of new business initiatives in these heritage zones. Both real estate and tourism related shopping and hotel facilities have benefited most, whilst the few remaining residents of the heritage zones have mostly been resettled elsewhere.
2 HABITAT II and Issues of Conservation and Rehabilitation of Historic and Cultural Heritage

In the context of the HABITAT II Conference of 1996, issues of conservation and rehabilitation have been raised also in the Statement of Principles and Commitments and Global Plan of Action (see box below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Conservation and Rehabilitation of Historic and Cultural Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic places and objects of cultural, scientific, symbolic, spiritual and religious value are important manifestations of the culture, identity and religious beliefs of societies. Their role and importance, particularly in the light of the need for cultural identity and continuity in a rapidly changing world need to be promoted. Buildings, spaces, places and landscapes charged with spiritual values represent an important element of stable and human social life and community pride. Conservation, rehabilitation and culturally sensitive adaptive re-use of the urban, rural and architectural heritage are also in accordance with the sustainable use of natural and man-made resources. Access to culture and the cultural dimension of development is of the utmost importance and all people should be able to benefit from such access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions**

To promote historic and cultural continuity and to encourage broad civic participation in all kinds of cultural activities. Governments at the appropriate levels, including local authorities, should:

(a) Identify and document, whenever possible, the historic and cultural importance of areas, sites, landscapes, ecosystems, buildings, other objects and manifestations and establish conservation goals relevant to the cultural and spiritual development of society;

(b) Promote the awareness of such heritage in order to highlight the value and the need for its conservation and the financial viability of rehabilitation;

(c) Encourage and support local heritage and cultural institutions, associations and communities in their conservation and rehabilitation efforts and inculcate in children and youth an adequate sense of their heritage;

(d) Promote adequate financial and legal support for the effective protection of cultural heritage;
(e) Promote education and training in traditional skills in all disciplines appropriate to the conservation and promotion of heritage;

(f) Promote the active role of older persons as custodians of cultural heritage, knowledge, trades and skills.

To integrate development with conservation and rehabilitation goals. Governments at the appropriate levels, including local authorities, should:

(a) Recognise that the historic and cultural heritage is an important asset and strive to maintain the social, cultural and economic viability of historically and culturally important sites and communities;

(b) Preserve the inherited historic settlement and landscape forms, while protecting the integrity of the historic urban fabric and guiding new construction in historic areas;

(c) Provide adequate legal and financial support for implementation of conservation and rehabilitation activities, in particular through adequate training of specialised human resources;

(d) Promote incentives for such conservation and rehabilitation to public, private and non-profit developers;

(e) Promote community-based action for the conservation, rehabilitation, regeneration and maintenance of neighbourhoods;

(f) Support public and private sector and community partnerships for the rehabilitation of inner cities and neighbourhoods;

(g) Ensure the incorporation of environmental concerns in conservation and rehabilitation projects;

(h) Take measures to reduce acid rain and other types of environmental pollution that damage buildings and other items of cultural and historic value;

(i) Adopt human settlements planning policies, including transport and their infrastructure policies, that avoid environmental degradation of historic and cultural areas;

(j) Ensure that the accessibility concerns of people with disabilities are incorporated in conservation and rehabilitation projects.

3 Aspects Related to Urban Rehabilitation

Realistically, no one argues for total preservation of everything that is old in the city. Equally, few would quarrel with attempts to improve sanitation and water supply, reduce overcrowding, or otherwise improve the living conditions in older housing areas. Such improvements do provide a more satisfactory environment. But a better environment also implies a satisfying of social and cultural life for those who make use of the environmental resources. It is the human inhabitants who create and constitute the social-cultural and economic systems which give life to the physical environment.

The focus of revitalisation and rehabilitation of historic city centres therefore has to be on whole areas, not just individual buildings and on social communities, not just the physical environment. These older housing areas, typically in the inner parts of the city, are often home to lower-income families and they have physical, social, economic, and cultural values different from and beyond the perceptions of bureaucrats or planners.

Advocates of rehabilitation policies emphasise the importance of a comprehensive and integrated approach to planning for older areas and especially the need to consider complete conservation/rehabilitation areas, not just individual buildings (Hardoy/Gunman 1991). Of course, particular buildings of special historic and/or architectural interest should be preserved as part of the overall scheme. But the real focus is on the activities and uses of the buildings taken as a whole, and the need to upgrade selectively and adaptively.

This rehabilitation or ‘area conservation’ approach has to deal with and resolve a variety of crucial issues and questions (Steinberg 1996 a):

Political aspects:

- To stimulate and maintain political support for area conservation and rehabilitation schemes.

- To establish a national policy in support for conservation and rehabilitation of urban heritage.

- To encourage the affected population to participate in the formulation and execution of conservation and rehabilitation schemes.

Cultural aspects:

- To demonstrate that the rehabilitation of historic housing areas and monuments can contribute to the strengthening of indigenous cultural traditions and forms.
- To strengthen the role of historic city centres and of monuments, their physical characteristics and the social aspects of the local (or national) culture.

- To develop schemes around the touristic potential of historic monuments and city centres, and to channel benefits back to other non-remunerative conservation and rehabilitation activities.

**Social aspects:**

- To establish effective participation mechanisms in the rehabilitation process for the affected citizens and particularly the poor who generally comprise a majority of those living in the historic housing areas.

- To retain a substantial component of the original community of low-income residents in conservation/rehabilitation areas, despite changing land uses and values (and to support their relocation when this is unavoidable).

- To protect the low-income residents from the impact of "gentrification".

**Economic aspects:**

- To finance urban conservation and rehabilitation through innovative means.

- To apply combinations of private and public resources, i.e. public/private partnerships.

- To enable, through cross subsidisation and other mechanisms, the survival of older land uses and activities despite competition from new ones.

- To improve the economic role of the older inner city areas as land values and/or taxes increase.

- To incorporate tourism development in conservation strategies without making it a dominant feature.

**Urbanistic aspects:**

- To preserve the urban pattern and tissue of historic city areas in the face of necessary upgrading and land use changes.

- To adapt the historic urbanistic quality of the mixed use environment to modern conditions.
4 Partnerships for the Implementation of Urban Conservation Projects

As indicated above, the goal for urban planners and managers is to break the deadlock that surrounds the issue of conservation and rehabilitation of historic inner city areas of developing countries and to:

- elaborate relevant approaches, instruments and procedures for conservation and rehabilitation;
- seek viable partnership arrangements for preparation of feasible and 'bankable' heritage interventions;
- prepare an agenda for action for implementation of urban conservation and rehabilitation projects.

For many, the 'magic' formula as with many other critical urban management issues like urban environmental improvement is urban stakeholder partnership.

The principal idea of partnerships is that government (at central or local levels) establishes the regulatory mechanisms for a wider, if not very comprehensive private sector role in urban area conservation projects requiring substantial investments. In many cases this will lead to adaptive re-use of historic structures and whole neighbourhoods. Government's role can be limited to providing the adequate mechanisms which will help to mobilise lines of credit (through local or international financial institutions) and to laying new or upgrading existing trunk infrastructure as far as this is feasible. For the private sector, investment in urban area conservation projects is certainly a new line of activity. It can aim at the gentrification of inner city areas (which lay idle or under-utilised in a commercial sense) or aim at a more efficient exploitation of real estate potentials. A further driving force can be the expected image gains that can be associated with private sector's investment in urban conservation. While the above may hold true for the commercial private sector, something similar can be said also about the private home owner and 'absentee landlord' who could be stimulated to invest again in long abandoned (and ignored) property. These kinds of investors require political and ideological backing (for instance: 'heritage investments carry high cultural prestige value and are 'chic') and institutional financial support (tax incentives, soft loan packages). The resident communities (owners and renters alike) of historic neighbourhoods need also to be drawn into the process of a change of mindset. Their participation is required for the articulation of conservation programmes which are sensitive to the needs, potentials and limitations of the resident community, which are culturally sensitive, economically and socially appropriate. Their contribution can be an essential barometer of adequacy and feasibility of
interventions. Equally, the role of heritage campaigners and NGOs can be seen as that of providing guidance, helping to assess the impacts of certain schemes and assuming a critically constructive role during the implementation of urban conservation schemes. Their concern can (and normally will) focus on issues of feasibility (of housing costs, property values, service costs and social as well as economic impacts for those affected by conservation and those benefiting from it).

Experiences in urban conservation projects in developing countries which demonstrate innovative practices of government, or private sector involvement and partnerships, are still limited. However, a few examples deserve mention.

Most local and national governments as well as religious organisations, as world-wide experience shows, can not afford to conserve and improve a large majority of even their most precious monuments. This can be demonstrated in a number of cities like Cairo (Lewcock 1984; Abdel-Fattah/Abdelhalim 1984), Tunis (Micaud 1978), Delhi (Shafi 1989; Buch 1989; Saha 1995; Ribeiro 1996), Bombay (Narender 1995), Galle (Department of Archeology 1992; Dahanayake 1995) and Sana’a (UNESCO 1982; Serjeant/Lewcock 1983; Lingenau 1985/86). Efforts to improve the financial status of national archaeological institutes and to increase their portfolio have mostly been without success. Most governments seem to shy away from additional expenses for the preservation and rehabilitation of their monuments. Most countries do not have an adequate policy to charge for entrance fees to monuments; in many cases monuments remain inaccessible for the public and to tourists; or if they are accessible only a pittance of an entrance fee (or none at all) is being charged, as for example in most parts of India. Only very few cities have adopted a more progressive policy as the city of Bhaktapur which charges a (still nominal) lumpsum entrance fee from tourists for entering the historic conservation zone. Sri Lanka follows a similar approach in its "cultural triangle" of the historic cities of Kandy, Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa (and some enclosed sites), but has failed so far to do the same for the historic city of Galle.

The economic problems of financing the preservation and upkeep of monuments has stimulated a good deal of debate about the possibilities to finance this through the approach of 'adaptive re-use' and to invite the private sector (or non-governmental institutions) to lease historic buildings, complexes, palaces, castles etc. with commercially viable activities which can pay for the conservation and rehabilitation of these monuments and have an overall revitalising impact on the economic development of such areas. There are good number of examples of such an approach in India’s Rajasthan region (Neemrana 1992; Ghat-ki Guni 1997; Bagore ki Haveli Udaipur 1996), Quito, Cartagena, Rio de Janeiro (Freitas Pinheiro 1994), Tunis,

---

1 To name a few “heritage” NGOs: Bombay, “Save Bombay” and “Bombay First” (see A People’s Movement 1989); Delhi. Delhi Conservation Society (DCS) and Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) (Singh 1994); Singapore. Singapore Heritage Society (Gretchen 1984); Penang - Penang Heritage Trust (Khoo Si Nin 1993); Tunis. Association for the Safeguarding of the Medina; Indonesia - National Heritage Trust.

2 The Government of India’s policy statement “to promote vernacular architecture and to preserve the nation’s rich heritage in the field of human settlements” (Ministry of Urban Development 1992, 3) is a bit of an exception.
Sana'a, Penang (Pyman/König 1992), Shanghai (Zhu Xijin 1992; McCallum 1993) and Singapore to name a few.

Unfortunately, there are very few examples of an integrated area concept that strives for the revitalisation of whole historic city centres including (i) the revitalisation and modernisation of local economic activities and the required infrastructure, (ii) restoration of monuments, and (iii) rehabilitation of old housing stock which applies an integrated financing policy that pools together private individual, private commercial as well as public sector efforts and funds. To some extent this has been tried in Bhaktapur (though the private sector's contribution may be low in this particular case) (Becker-Ritterspach 1978; Haland 1982) and in Tunis's rehabilitation of the old Medina, but it has at least been proposed in quite a number of cases such as Cairo (Abdel-Fattah 1984), Quito (Empresa del Centro Historico 1998), Sana’a (UNESCO 1982), and Penang (Tyman/König).

Very few cities have, on the other hand, taken to the complete commercial path for area revitalisation. Singapore is one example in which the local re-development authority has acquired all the plots of the designated conservation areas and has been tendering these plots for rehabilitation-cum-redevelopment as commercial activities (shops, restaurants, hotels for tourism or offices for other activities) (Burton 1993; Kameier 1985-86). Another case in point is Cartagena which, after designating the conservation area, has only seen to it that historic properties are not demolished and that private investors conserve and rehabilitate the late medieval buildings for their private use. Practically all these renovations are taken up by high-income users who convert historic mansions into modern residences, offices or shops. In the case of Cartagena the local administration is very supportive to private investments in the historic town, and with some flexibility in the application of the permissible floor space indexes it has become possible to convert backyards into modern structures, and to increase the land use.

In the case of Bombay (Mehrotra 1993) and Rio de Janeiro (Pinheiro/del Rio 1993), the application of the (North-American) method of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) is being experimented with. The TDR can be applied to privately held or owned premises which are listed monuments, located in prime locations where there is lot of development pressure (for instance sky-rocketing land prices and development of high-rise buildings in the vicinity). To encourage owners of such monuments to invest in the conservation and renovation of such monuments and discourage them to aim only at the demolition of these buildings. They shall be offered alternative plots of land for development to compensate for the loss of development potentials in the plots occupied by the monuments and to compensate for renovation costs of these monuments. An indispensable pre-condition is of course the availability of government-owned land that can be bartered for under the TDR arrangement.

In the case of Havana, a world heritage city whose old housing stock is partly doomed to collapse soon, such possibilities of commercialisation and utilisation of the market forces do not (yet) exist, as the country is still dominated by socialist patterns of economy and state control of land and investment. Also China and its historic city centres are still facing problems of this nature although the trend of commercialisation and opening up of the housing and real estate sector will in due course contribute to
innovative financing mechanisms for rehabilitation of historic city centres (Lichfield 1989).

In the context of the modernisation of cities and their historic centres, there is also concern about the old, historic types of land uses. Most of these traditional economic activities (in cities like Cairo, Tunis, Sana'a, Old Delhi etc. these are almost 'medieval' style activities) will over time not be able to survive, and particularly not in locations where conservation and rehabilitation of historic city centres does have the impact of 'gentrification' (Smith/Williams 1986). But schemes like the Business Improvement Districts, known to have turned around dilapidated shopping and business areas in US cities can be initiated also in developing countries where the commercial elite has still been holding the tenure of substantial parts of old city centres, bazaars, medinas and the like.

As conservation and rehabilitation is being introduced, not only the land values of these areas increase, but also local revenues. Thus, such revenue increases can have an additional stimulating impact for the rehabilitation of infrastructure and other services in conservation areas. Thus, revitalisation of historic city centres will contribute both to the modernisation of the private commercial sector and to enhanced revenues. In conservation plans and concepts this aspect of increased land values and property values plays an important role which is fully taken into account, as demonstrated in the case of Tunis or Singapore (Kong/Yeoh 1994; Tan Teck Kiam 1991; Urban Re-Development Authority 1987). (Singapore proudly announces that property values in conservation areas have gone up about 8 times after rehabilitation of 'shophouses'). In other cities, such as Quito or Cartagena, the increase of property values in the historic city is not so much planned for, but seen as a likely outcome.

Tourism development has been mentioned before as an incentive for the conservation of monuments and the rehabilitation and revitalisation of historic city centres. To what extent the economic impact of tourism is felt city-wide or only within the historic city centre itself depends fully on the particular characteristics of each case and how area conservation/rehabilitation is being implemented. If tourism activities (such as hotels) could be charged a "heritage tax" this could also contribute to the sustainability of urban heritage by boosting the financial position of archaeological and other heritage related institutions.

---

3 INTACH, New Delhi has formulated in 1993 a Plan of Action regarding the Preservation of Cultural Heritage and Tourism. In other countries the tourism-heritage nexus is also highlighted (Burgess 1988).
5 Initiating Partnerships Schemes for Urban Conservation

From the above experiences there emerges a general pattern concerning the procedure and structure of a process for urban conservation projects and heritage interventions which shall be presented here. The sequence is based on the premise of seeking 'partnerships', citizen's participation and 'common goals':

6.1 Structuring the Process of Conservation Projects and other Heritage Interventions

The following strategic steps are suggested:
The process should be initiated with the establishment of a city-level conservation Task Force for planning and implementation of urban heritage projects with the following representatives:
- municipal corporations/urban local bodies
- urban development authorities
- nodal financing agency for urban development, infrastructure and housing
- private sector investors, developers etc.

To complement this Task Force it is recommended to also establish an Urban Heritage Committee for advice and monitor the implementation process, with the following representation:
- local heritage NGOs ('heritage campaigners') and other NGOs
- municipal corporations/urban local bodies
- urban development authorities
- concerned individuals and specialists.

Thus, the two functions of (i) planning and implementation (e.g. all that is related to executive functions of the programme, and (ii) monitoring and technical advice (on achievements of targets and desired quality) can be separated adequately.

To establish the working pattern of the two bodies or committees it is necessary also to develop guidelines for the working of the Task Force and Urban Heritage Committee as regards their tasks of advocacy, networking, management of information base, (action) planning, implementation and monitoring.

---

4 This structure emerged as a principle recommendation from an Indo-Dutch Workshop on Conservation and Rehabilitation of Urban Heritage held in New Delhi on 1-2 May 1996, documented in Shelter (Steinberg 1996 b) see also similar approaches in Mohit/Kammeier 1997 and Telang 1996.
At the beginning of a city-wide or area-wide process it is necessary to create awareness among the community about the need for conservation.

The next step will be to prepare a comprehensive list of buildings and precincts or heritage zones which merit conservation.

A further, important, but certainly more medium term task of advocacy and planning work is to establish the urban heritage zone status for the concerned conservation area in accordance with the respective Town Planning Act(s).

The awareness campaign, in its second stage, has to encourage owners and occupants of heritage buildings/zones to collaborate with the Task Force and Committee in matters concerning listing, preparation of interventions and finally the implementation of interventions.

The Task Force and Committee shall be the main actors to identify and formulate action plans for the following sorts of demonstration projects:

- 'adaptive re-use' projects in significant buildings [so called "landmarks"] (this can involve private and/or public sector investments);

- land-based 'remunerative' development projects which cross-subsidise other 'non-remunerative' heritage conservation/rehabilitation projects;

- tourism development projects which generate profits that can be channelled to finance other interventions/investments;

- home improvement loans for home owners/renters [there is a need to find methods to mitigate impacts of Rent Control Act(s) (for instance through the formation cooperatives of renters, as it has been tried out in Bombay's programme of repair of Shaws, i.e. workers mass housing complexes)];

- infrastructure schemes for heritage zones [there is a need to clarify to what extent existing financial mechanisms/schemes of existing urban financial institutions can be geared towards urban heritage zones].

While implementing the above steps it is pertinent to pursue the following objectives:

- to create partnerships and commitments among all relevant stakeholders and actors who have an interest in the concerned conservation area(s);

- to support private investments through tax incentives;

- to ensure financial and economic viability, create 'bankable' projects (via conventional urban financial institutions/programmes);

- to ensure technical assistance (via urban financial institutions, urban heritage campaign organisations/NGOs, state governments and other concerned organisations) to heritage conservation projects/interventions;

- to define mechanisms for support schemes which stimulate replication and ultimately to move from demonstration projects to replication.
In order to achieve all this it is important to apply the following tactical steps:

to route development proposals concerning the heritage zone through the Urban Conservation Committee to exert some sort of control and coordination, but bureaucratic procedures must be avoided;

- to frame and apply special development controls;
- to organise public hearings on specific development proposals which have wider impacts for the overall future of the heritage zone;
- to entrust the Committee with the monitoring of the actual implementation of development projects.

Ultimately this (or a similarly) structured process shall lead from demonstration projects to comprehensive development plans (*Master Plans*) for heritage zones, to a definition of clear goals of an integrated conservation policy and political acceptance.

6 The Prospects for Partnerships in Urban Conservation

While the general picture today may not yet be so encouraging, there have been some (small-scale) efforts in a growing number of developing countries. Often these have only focused on the most "profitable" projects such as historic areas with touristic potential. The lower income residents have still been ignored (at best) or pushed out by existing renewal policies.

There is an urgent need for rehabilitation approaches which maintain, or better "sustain" the typical and essential qualities of the historic city areas and of the environments of the resident communities, but which can also adapt these physical structures and economic activities in accordance with the needs of the present society and economy. A continuous and organic approach of revitalisation is needed, the type of approach which characterised all urban areas in the pre-industrial era and which has given form to older urban areas everywhere. Adaptation of form and function can proceed, however, within a stable matrix of buildings and urban patterns. Selectivity is crucial. This implies, for example, a choice of new design concepts and relevant new technologies to enable older buildings and areas to successfully adapt to modern needs but without destroying existing urban form.

To achieve effective partnerships for urban conservation, it will be necessary to change the attitudes of professionals, of economists, architects, planners, developers and administrators. It will be necessary to create a changed political environment in which historic centres are rehabilitated according to their true value and that policies and practice of government are modified accordingly. Institutions must be developed and economic and administrative instruments for control and promotion of investments must be worked out.

Civic authorities should pay attention to rehabilitation and re-use of old and historic properties which are not under government protection and use. These properties should be listed and their rehabilitation and re-use promoted. Those under public ownership could be brought to appropriate community or private sector uses. In the case of privately owned properties, owners should be provided incentives such as property tax exemptions and transfers of floor space indexes if they rehabilitate and conserve old and historic properties and put them to new economic uses (such as residences, hotels, restaurants, shops, offices etc.).

For ‘partnerships’ with the private sector to succeed it will be necessary to develop policies and projects that demonstrate how a clear concern for affordability (of the less wealthy citizens and businesses in historic city centres) can be combined with a commercial orientation of conservation. More specifically, private sector project concepts which are based on principles of Build, Operate, Transfer (BOT), Build, Operate, Own (BOO) or Build, Finance, Transfer (BFT), need to be worked out for
application in the urban conservation context. To make it happen an enabling legislation and framework is required, and an opening of the market (including the removal of rent controls which have frozen developments in many historic city centres). Open minded city management can support this process through the provision of guidelines, model documents/contracts etc. in order to generate the right confidence and investment stimulus. An orientation to create the 21st Century City has to take into account the historic city centres, attempt their revitalisation and equip them for the challenges of globalisation and environmental viability.

There remains great opposition to such changes towards area conservation and rehabilitation. Landowners/landlords, speculators, government administrators, big construction companies, and many public agencies have vested interests in demolition and re-development (instead of conservation and rehabilitation) and will fight to protect their stakes for "modernisation". These groups have their political allies as well. But, a counter-movement to this is growing. This can lead to substantial change and indeed change is required if anything is to be done about the sustainability of urban heritage. A wider spectrum of alliances for urban conservation and new "partnerships" needs to be sought and more resources and investment capacity need to be brought forward to freeze the deadlock and to mobilise an age old process: the continuous renewal and rehabilitation of cities, representing the dialectics of "tradition" and "change", of "continuity" and "modernisation".
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