

## ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Aktuelle Urbanisierungsdynamiken verursachen große Veränderungen und Transformationsprozesse in südasiatischen Städten. Hohes Bevölkerungswachstum, Modernisierungsstreben sowie Kommerzialisierungs- und Kommodifizierungsprozesse üben einen großen Einfluss, vor allem auf die Megastädte und ihre Infrastrukturen aus. Dadurch gerät das bauliche Kulturerbe dieser Städte, vor allem in den Innen- und Altstädten, unter einen enormen umbruchbedingten Landnutzungsdruck: Alte, traditionelle Stadtstrukturen scheinen (in der Wahrnehmung einiger Akteure) einer globalisierten Modernisierung im Wege zu stehen, und bestehende Landnutzungsrechte angestammter (lokaler) Nutzer werden zunehmend durch die Bedürfnisse und Entwicklungsvisionen neuer Akteure verändert. Dies führt dazu, dass städtisches Kulturerbe von zunehmendem Verfall und Verschwinden bedroht ist. Dabei trägt es als gebaute Geschichte und Kultur zentral zur sozialen und gesellschaftlichen Identität bei und besitzt sowohl wirtschaftlich als auch ästhetisch einen großen Einfluss auf die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von Städten im internationalen und nationalen Kontext.

Der Schutz dieses städtischen Kulturerbes liegt heute nicht nur in der Verantwortung öffentlicher Behörden, sondern ist eingebettet in komplexe Netzwerke aus öffentlichen und privaten, individuellen und kollektiven Akteuren, die auf verschiedenen Ebenen gemäß ihrer jeweiligen Interessen handeln. Vor diesem Hintergrund untersucht die vorliegende Studie am Beispiel Delhi den aktuellen Umgang mit städtischem Kulturerbe. In der indischen Hauptstadt haben verschiedene Epochen einer bewegten Geschichte ihre Spuren hinterlassen. Delhi verfügt über zahlreiche Denkmäler und Gärten sowie historische Stadtviertel und Gebäude. Im Zuge der jüngsten Globalisierungs- und Urbanisierungsprozesse nimmt die Stadt jedoch zunehmend die Gestalt einer globalisierten Metropole an und strebt danach, eine *Weltklasse-Stadt* zu werden. Diese, durch neoliberale Praktiken induzierte Entwicklung, belastet das räumliche und gesellschaftliche Gefüge der Stadt zunehmend.

Um die sektorale Perspektive zu überwinden, die die bestehende Forschung zum städtischen Kulturerbe im indischen Kontext dominiert, stützt sich diese Studie auf einen analytischen Governance-Ansatz. Der angewandte Forschungsrahmen, *Urban Cultural Heritage Governance*, basiert auf der Konzeptualisierung von drei *Governance-Orders*, Erste Governance-Order, Zweite Governance-Order und Meta-Governance-Order, die es ermöglicht, den Umgang mit städtischem Kulturerbe entlang der Ebenen Implementierung, Regulierung und vorherrschende Vorstellungen zu strukturieren.

Die detaillierte Analyse der drei *Governance-Orders* und ihrer wechselseitigen Verflechtungen folgt auf die Vorstellung von fünf exemplarischen Fallstudien, die über das Stadtgebiet Delhis verteilt sind. Die Analyse zeigt, dass gesellschaftliche und fachliche Diskurse über den Schutz städtischen Kulturerbes die Ausgestaltung

des den Denkmalschutz regelnden rechtlichen und institutionellen Rahmen entscheidend prägen. Darüber hinaus haben diese Diskurse großen Einfluss auf die Art und Weise der Umsetzung von Kulturerbeschutzmaßnahmen. Aufgrund einer bestehenden Unvereinbarkeit zwischen gesellschaftlichen Vorstellungen bezüglich städtischen Kulturerbes und der Ziele, die öffentlichen Kulturerbeschutzbemühungen zugrunde liegen, werden die derzeitigen Schutzstrategien in Delhi den lokalen und gesellschaftlichen Gegebenheiten nicht gerecht. Da in diesem Zusammenhang die Interessen und Bedürfnisse verschiedener Interessengruppen nicht ausreichend berücksichtigt werden, erfährt Kulturerbeschutz in Delhi kaum Unterstützung von Seiten der Zivilgesellschaft. Ein fragmentierter Rechtsrahmen verstärkt diese Situation noch. Sektorale Gesetze den Kulturerbeschutz betreffend und städtebauliche Planungsinstrumente sind nicht ausreichend aufeinander abgestimmt, sodass das städtische Kulturerbe nicht sinnvoll in die Stadtentwicklung integriert werden kann. Nicht-staatliche Akteure engagieren sich zwar zunehmend und versuchen, Diskurse aktiv zu gestalten und an der Umsetzung von Kulturerbeschutzstrategien mit zu wirken. Jedoch besitzen staatliche Akteure in Delhi nach wie vor die Deutungshoheit und geben den Weg vor, auf welche Art und Weise Kulturerbeschutz betrieben wird. In diesem Zusammenhang spielt die neoliberale Ausrichtung der Stadtentwicklungsaktivitäten eine wichtige Rolle, die dazu führt, dass der Schutz des kulturellen Erbes nicht zu den höchsten Prioritäten der Behörden in Delhi gehört.

In der vorliegenden Studie wird argumentiert, dass ein gemeinschaftlich von öffentlichen und zivilen Akteuren entwickelter *indischer Ansatz* für Kulturerbeschutz dazu beitragen würde, den aktuellen lokalen und gesellschaftlichen Gegebenheiten in Delhi gerecht zu werden und das reiche Kulturerbe der Stadt in Zukunft schützen zu können. Hierbei ist es wichtig, ein Gleichgewicht zwischen dem eurozentrisch geprägten Wunsch, historische Überreste zu erhalten, und den vielfältigen vorherrschenden gesellschaftlichen Vorstellungen über kulturelles Erbe in Delhi zu finden.

# 1 INTRODUCTION: STUDYING THE GOVERNANCE OF URBAN CULTURAL HERITAGE IN DELHI – FOCUS AND RELEVANCE

“Cities are places to live in, and to feel at home in. Cities are seats of culture and therefore a unique stimulus for the intellectual and cultural life of a people. A city is built history; it represents the collective memory of society, a nation, or a region. With its buildings, streets, roads, squares and parks, the city reflects the cultural traditions and hence the character of the people who live in it. Towns and cities are more than mere collections of houses linked by traffic routes. They are more than mere functional systems whose linkages need to be optimized” (Hall & Pfeiffer 2000: 317).

It is increasingly recognised that the cultural heritage of cities is of special significance for their attractiveness and their liveability. India is, due to its eventful history, extraordinarily rich in cultural heritage. Many Indian cities are literally dotted with historical sites like palaces, mosques, temples and tombs. Indian cities are vibrant, living entities where life on the streets and a sense of living history are palpable. Cultural objects and practices as well as cultural value, traditions, and ways of life are not only significant here with regard to economic development, in terms of the promotion of certain economic sectors, jobs, and capital and in regard to global competition, but they also play a crucial role for cultural solidarity, education, aesthetics, religion, spirituality, and for the creation of identity. A large part of the cultural heritage of these cities, however, is in a dilapidated state and threatened by deterioration and destruction. It is generally still perceived rather as a burden and an obstacle towards progress and development, than as a driver for the future.

As a research subject, *urban cultural heritage* and its role in contemporary and future urban development have only recently attracted a certain amount of attention in the Indian context. Profound studies on the subject are rare, however. The academic work that has been done so far is dominated either by (empirical) case studies of individual sites within cities (e. g. Taneja 2018), or by a sectoral analysis of specific subtopics (like heritage legislation (e. g. Shorey 2006)). Studies investigating how cultural heritage is dealt with at the urban level are so far lacking.

This study aims at broadening the perspective towards urban cultural heritage and doing justice to the fact that urban conservation takes place within the overlapping area of the cultural and the urban realms. Hence, the study explicitly includes the spatial element of urban cultural heritage into the analysis as well as motifs and imaginations that underlie conservation efforts.

The empirical research was conducted in Delhi, the capital city of India. Delhi looks back on 3,000 years of history, during which its importance has been constantly changing. Since the economic liberalisation of the Indian economy in 1991, however, the city has been experiencing enormous transformation processes.

Hence, on the one hand, Delhi is rich in cultural heritage, and on the other hand, it has to deal with the multiple challenges of a mega-city in the 21st century, including neoliberal aspirations, the effects of globalisation and massive urbanisation processes, population growth, in-migration, unplanned development, land-use conflicts, social inequalities and infrastructure problems. These phenomena exert an enormous pressure on Delhi's cultural heritage and make the safeguarding of it extremely complex.

In order to understand the challenges that conservation professionals, public agencies and other involved actors face in their attempts to safeguard urban heritage in a contemporary Indian mega-city, and to identify underlying causes, this study works towards answering the main research question

### How is Delhi's urban cultural heritage governed?

Following Bork-Hüffer (2012: 25), who argues that, in order to understand a research subject in an encompassing way, it is important to include as many aspects as possible in the empirical analysis, the research approach of this study allows for a holistic understanding of the present condition of urban cultural heritage and heritage related governance processes in Delhi. In this context it is of relevance to know which actors are involved in the governance of Delhi's cultural heritage and how their relationships are constituted. Furthermore, their ideas about urban cultural heritage and the way to protect it have a great influence on how urban cultural heritage is actually protected in Delhi. Besides, structural aspects play a role, including the legal framework or informal institutions that guide actors' behaviour. Moreover, practical problems and obstacles that emerge when conservation efforts are implemented influence the actual state of cultural heritage on the ground. *Urban Cultural Heritage Governance*, the research framework that has been developed for this study, provides the opportunity to include all these aspects and to systematically analyse the interlinkages between the different components. Looking through the governance lens assumes that management and negotiation of societal issues not only happen through public agencies, but rather in complex networks made up of public and private, individual and collective stakeholders representing their respective interests. Against this backdrop, the following research questions guided the empirical analysis of this study (cf. Box 1).

*Box 1: Research questions***Main research question: How is Delhi's urban cultural heritage governed?***Sub-research questions:*

Who are the actors involved in urban cultural heritage governance in Delhi, and which relationships and communication-patterns exist among them?

How is the institutional framework relevant for urban cultural heritage protection in Delhi constituted, and what are the implications of this institutional framework?

Which imaginations and discourses exist about urban cultural heritage and its protection, and which role do these imaginations and discourses play for the governance of urban cultural heritage in Delhi?

## Outline of the study

The thesis is structured into eight chapters. Chapter 2, following this introduction, gives insights into particular aspects of the research context within which this study was conducted. These aspects are relevant in order to understand the general and the regional context of this study. The chapter introduces the concept of *urban cultural heritage*, describes its origin and evolvement within the Western context, its development within international policy papers and its contemporary role in the Indian context.

The theoretical and conceptual approach is developed in chapter 3. After contextualising the term and the concept of *governance* in general, the two approaches *cultural governance* and *urban governance* will be introduced in more detail. As *urban cultural heritage governance* contains elements of both, it is important to know the specificities of these two approaches in regard to the conceptualisation of the empirical research framework. This research framework is introduced subsequently.

Chapter 4 introduces the materials and methods of this study. In order to understand the governance of urban cultural heritage, a qualitative approach was applied. The chapter contains an outline of the research design, a description of the way of data collection and description of the way of data collection. Further, the chapter outlines the processing and analysing of the empirical data and ends with a critical reflection on the research process.

The subsequent chapter 5 situates the case study by introducing the city of Delhi. To provide a detailed picture of the local conditions relevant to this study, the chapter gives an overview of Delhi's historic development and its present situation as well as aspirations for the city's future development. A special emphasis is put on the description of Delhi's built cultural heritage and last, the city's administrative and political set-up.

Chapter 6 presents the empirical analysis of the study. This chapter is divided into three parts. First, the actors involved in *urban cultural heritage governance* are introduced. Second, five illustrative case studies are presented in order to give insights into the great variety of aspects that play role in the context of safeguarding Delhi's cultural heritage. Third, based on these case studies, and by including further empirical data, the current status of *urban cultural heritage governance* in Delhi is presented according to the research framework of this study.

Chapter 7 contains the synthesis and discussion of the empirical results. It is divided into three parts: the first part is structured according to the research framework and synthesises and (re-)interprets the empirical results in comparison with the state of the art. The second part presents overarching insights against the backdrop of the theoretical conceptualisation of the study. The chapter closes with an outlook into the future of *urban cultural heritage* in Delhi and ends with three possible future scenarios.

A final conclusion including the evaluation of the research approach and the final synthesis of the empirical findings is presented in chapter 8.

## 2 CONTEXTUALISATION: URBAN CULTURAL HERITAGE – EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT

Although cultural heritage has grown from something that only concerned a small number of specialists and enthusiasts into an “omnipresent cultural phenomenon” (Harrison 2013: 3), there is still no clear concept about it.

“Heritage as a concept is constantly evolving and the way in which the term is understood is always ambiguous and never certain. (...) Older ideas about heritage and the nature of the past and present often persist alongside those ideas that have developed more recently” (ibid.).

Accordingly, there is no universal definition or shared understanding of what urban cultural heritage<sup>1</sup> is. The idea of how to conserve or safeguard the cultural heritage of cities has developed over time – and is still an ongoing process. The notion of cultural heritage in a society and the motivation to safeguard it, is a subject of historical, political, social and even economical circumstances. It is a matter of constant negotiation and a phenomenon in which various interests of different actors collide. Particular heritage sites can have manifold meanings that are socially constructed and are subject to permanent change. Cultural heritage as such remains a witness of the past, but the way in which it is dealt with is always an expression of current social, political and cultural circumstances and needs. In urban areas, built heritage structures are part of the everyday experience of the residents and the diverse ideas and imaginations of cultural heritage and its protection clash in an especially intense way (Graham et al. 2000: 1 ff., Kögler 2006: 6).

In order to understand how Delhi’s urban cultural heritage is governed today, knowledge about how the concept of urban cultural heritage evolved over time is important. Hence, the following chapter traces urban cultural heritage from its origins and its development in the Western context to its current application in international policy papers. Subsequently, the current academic consideration of cultural heritage from a constructivist perspective is described with a special emphasis on values-based approaches. Finally, its role and application in the Indian context will be examined more closely.

1 In academic literature, authors use both terms, *urban cultural heritage* and *urban heritage* to describe the same phenomenon. Hence, in this study the two terms are used interchangeably.

## 2.1 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE WESTERN CONTEXT

The *historic city* as a heritage category emerged only in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century / beginning 20<sup>th</sup> century, whereas the term *urban heritage* was introduced in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Urban conservation*, however, understood as the policies and planning practices aimed at safeguarding a city's cultural heritage, has gained a lot of attention only since around the turn of the millennium (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 6). Earlier, practices of heritage protection mainly concentrated on the preservation of individual buildings and monuments, and were aimed at preserving them as symbols of past traditions and cultures. However, the foundation for the modern idea of urban heritage was laid as early as the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century by several theoreticians, such as John Ruskin and William Morris, even if their early approaches did not directly focus on the historic city itself. With their so-called *romantic approach*, they called for the conservation of monuments in the state in which they appeared at a certain point in time. By doing so they were guided not only by aesthetic aspects. Rather, they attributed the significance of buildings to their age and their role as representatives of a nation's past achievements (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 6, Jokilehto 1986: 313, Menon 2003a, Nasser 2003: 468). In this way, they contributed to the emergence of the idea of the historic city being common heritage (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 6, Jokilehto 1986). However, Ruskin's romantic and nostalgic vision of heritage protection (which focussed on individual monuments) was challenged by Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-Le-Duc, who invented the theory of *stylistic restoration* (Jokilehto 1986: 277, Nasser 2003: 468). Viollet-Le-Duc applied his approach not only to single monuments, but also to urban complexes and argued that the purpose of restoring buildings should not be to preserve, repair or rebuild them. He aimed, rather, at reinstating them in a condition in which they may never have existed in the first place (cf. Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 6 f., Jokilehto 1986: 279, Piplani 2015b: 82). Nevertheless, the idea that the historic city itself contains an aesthetic value was formulated only at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Camillo Sitte (Sitte 1889). Sitte promoted the idea that, for the form and character of a city, it is not individual buildings and their forms that are important, but rather the quality of its urban spaces (Taylor 2012: 267). He influenced modern principles of urban conservation through his belief that the city is a historical continuum, emphasising that "the need to link urban conservation to a wider context and to the natural environment is at the heart of contemporary thinking on urban conservation" (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 15).

During the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Italian architect and urban planner Gustavo Giovannoni, was influential in the context of urban conservation in several ways (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 14, Jokilehto 1986: 351). Gustavo Giovannoni first coined the term *urban heritage*. He designed tools for urban conservation and understood the importance of the role that the historic city plays in modern societies. Besides, he further established the idea that it is necessary to include the built environment of historic monuments in the conservation process (Jokilehto 1986: 354). For him, *environment* was the urban fabric that represents the layers of time.

He formulated “a clear position against the ‘dismemberment’ of buildings” (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 15). On the grounds of his refusal of the “museum-like freezing of historic monuments” (ibid.), and the active inclusion of the complexity of the urban fabric into his approach, he can be called the “precursor of the conservation policies that were developed internationally (...) in the second half of the twentieth century” (ibid.).

The *Modern Movement* evolving in the 1920s and 1930s, however, marked a “big break in the vision and practice of architecture and urban planning” (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 15) and also influenced the field of urban conservation. In general, the *Modern Movement*, with Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe as some of its most prominent representatives, aimed for functional urban development. The Athens Charter 1933, which sets guidelines for the so-called *functional city*, was adopted at the *IV. Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM)*. In this charter, the historic city was tagged as a negative model, characterised by bad and unhealthy living conditions, which should be demolished and replaced by modern housing units and green spaces (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 20). After World War II and the emergence of mass industrial societies, the development of an urban design that could cope with the needs of this new form of society became highly important. Hence, a “radical departure from the approach to the historic city (...) [took place and an orientation towards the] creation of a new modern urban complex, based on high-density public housing, with functional and innovative housing typologies and elaborate transport infrastructure” developed (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 18 f.).

Parallel, however, induced by the major destructions of historic urban areas in European cities during World War II, awareness emerged that these areas, with their unique character, have a great value in the context of the urban reconstruction process. Controversial debates emerged about the way in which rebuilding activities should be carried out (Jokilehto 1986: 410). During the 1950s and 1960s, an increasing number of historic areas in Western European cities came under consideration (Steinberg 1996: 466). But, until the 1970s, the approach to heritage protection still focussed “on great monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous” (Taylor 2012: 268). In the post-war period in many European countries conservation policies prevailed which reflected the conservation objectives that had been developed in the first half of the twentieth century (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 37). They mainly focused on the conservation of the physical fabric and of single monuments within cities, recognising their relevance for society and as a means of preserving the values that are linked to identity and place<sup>2</sup>. In this way it was possible, in many cities, to safeguard big parts of the historic fabric. It was more difficult, however, to preserve cities’ social structure.

Since the 1980s/1990s, the approach of concentrating conservation activities mainly on monumental structures has been challenged. Gradually, an extended value system emerged and issues like cultural landscapes, intangible heritage,

2 Bandarin & Van Oers (2012) give the example of the *secteurs sauvegardés* (conservation areas) that were established in France 1962, the *Law for the Protection of the Historic Centres*, formulated 1973 in Italy and the *Civic Amenities Act* of 1967 in the United Kingdom.

living history, vernacular heritage, individual and social perceptions and community involvement became recognised in the heritage context (Leftwich 1993: 268). However, while various approaches towards urban conservation have been developed since the post-war period, a *common approach* has not emerged. Bandarin & Van Oers (2012: 36) call this the “evidence of the need to adapt theories and practice to the values of the context, to the forms of society’s appreciation of heritage, and to the pattern of social change”. What is seen as a common denominator today, however, is that the historic city is constituted by its structural aspects, its historic layering and interlinked collective and individual value systems (ibid.). Lowenthal (1998: 14) summarises the development in the field of urban conservation with the words: from the “elite and grand to the vernacular and everyday; from the remote to the recent; and from the material to the intangible”. This quote shows that different dimensions of change contributed to the current situation.

## 2.2 URBAN CULTURAL HERITAGE IN INTERNATIONAL CHARTERS AND CONVENTIONS

Even if a debate about cultural heritage has existed since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the objective of conservation developed in international discourse only from the 1960s (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012: 36, Chapagain 2013: 11, Hosagrahar 2013; cf. 2.1). During the post-war period, a number of major international governmental and non-governmental organisations have been established (e. g. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) in 1945, International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) in 1959 and International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in 1965), which participated in the formulation of charters and conventions concerning the safeguarding of *cultural heritage* (cf. Box 2). The first formal definition of the term emerged in 1972 with the adoption of the *World Heritage Convention*. In this convention, *cultural heritage* is defined as “monuments (...), groups of buildings (...) [and] sites (...) which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view”<sup>3</sup>. Since then, the definition and understanding of cultural heritage has been constantly evolving. In 1992, the category of *cultural landscape* was included as a category in the *World Heritage Convention*. The most prominent extension of the definition is represented by the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)*, which defines *immaterial cultural heritage* as “the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage”<sup>4</sup>.

3 UNESCO (1972): Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. (<https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>; access: 2018-09-22).

4 UNESCO (2003): Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. (<https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>; access: 2018-09-23).

Another major change within the international discourse is the recognition of a stronger culturally coined understanding of cultural heritage. It is currently discussed to what extent the protection of cultural heritage in the sense of preservation and conservation is suited to deal with historical elements within non-Western societies (Falser 2008: 130, Kraas 2002, Sullivan 2004, Winter 2014). A number of charters, declarations and publications have been formulated to overcome perceived inadequacies of international documents concerning the safeguarding of cultural heritage in ‘non-Western’ countries. While the *Venice Charter (1964)*<sup>5</sup> still promotes classic expressions of Western values towards heritage (Sullivan 2004: 49), the *Burra Charter (1979)*<sup>6</sup> already shows a broader perspective (Winter 2014: 123). However, the *Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)*<sup>7</sup>, marked an important step “towards a global respect for cultural diversity with increased flexibility for regional interpretations of authenticity” (Falser 2008: 130 f.). Beyond this, the 2013 revision of the Burra charter defines cultural significance as

“aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.”<sup>8</sup>

It mentions further, that “(c)ultural significance may change over time and with use” (ibid.). The enumeration above shows that the notion of *cultural heritage* has been continuously extended within international documents from a monument centric towards a broader concept (Chapagain 2013: 11). Lowenthal (1998: 14) summarises the different steps of this development as follows: “from historical monuments and sites to “districts” and landscapes, from high to vernacular culture, from a distant to an instant past, from the West to the rest of the world”.

In regard to the issue of *urban conservation*, the broadening of the understanding of cultural heritage within international charters described above plays a role as the notions of *urban heritage* changed accordingly over time. There are a number of international charters and conventions that explicitly refer to historic areas and their safeguarding. Box 2 introduces a selection of international charters and conventions that have been relevant in this context over time.

- 5 International Council in Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (1964): International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964). IInd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice, 1964. Adopted by ICOMOS in 1965. ([https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice\\_e.pdf](https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf), access: 2018-07-05).
- 6 ICOMOS (1979): Australia ICOMOS Guidelines for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter) ([https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Burra-Charter\\_1979.pdf](https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Burra-Charter_1979.pdf); access 2018-09-23).
- 7 ICOMOS (1994): The Nara Document on Authenticity. (<https://whc.unesco.org/document/116018>; access: 2019-09-23).
- 8 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (2013): The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013. ([http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31\\_10\\_2013.pdf](http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31_10_2013.pdf), access: 2018-07-05).