

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1982-1983

28 May 1982

DOCUMENT 1-206/82

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture,
Education, Information and Sport

on the protection of the architectural and
archaeological heritage

Rapporteur: Mr W. HAHN

At its meeting of 10 December 1980 the Bureau of the European Parliament authorized the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to draw up a report on the protection of the architectural and archaeological heritage.

At its meeting of 28 January 1981 the committee appointed Mr HENCKENS rapporteur: at its meeting of 23 and 24 September 1981 it subsequently appointed Mr HAHN to replace him.

The committee also decided to consider within the framework of this own-initiative report the following motions for resolutions referred to it by the European Parliament:

- on the financing of a project to renovate, improve and protect the Trulli in the region of Puglia (Doc. 1-566/80)
- on the archaeological excavations at Skyllation (Doc. 1-876/80)
- on safeguarding the historical and artistic centres of Orvieto and Todi (Doc. 1-912/80)
- on saving the cultural and architectural heritage of the Campania and Basilicata regions, which were hit by the earthquake (Doc. 1-52/81)
- on environmental damage in Eleusis and the destruction of ancient archaeological sites (Doc. 1-363/81)
- on measures to preserve the walls of Lucca (Doc. 1-504/81)
- on the protection of valuable Bronze Age sites in the Netherlands (Doc. 1-680/81).
- on the need for intervention by the European Community to protect the sites and monuments of the Acropolis in Athens (Doc. 1-557/81),

The Committee on Budgets, the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection were each asked to deliver an opinion on a number of these motions for resolutions. The Committee on Budgets subsequently decided not to draw up an opinion.

As part of its work on the report the committee held a hearing with Mr Oddo BIASINI on 19 May 1981 in Brussels and subsequently at its meeting of 20 and 21 October 1981 in Sorrento with Mr Vincenzo SCOTTI, pro tempore Italian Ministers for Cultural Assets.

On 20 October 1981 the committee visited the excavations at Pompei to see work on the salvaging and restoration of excavation work damaged by the earthquake in southern Italy.

At its meeting of 28 January 1982, the committee organized a hearing on this matter with Professor I. CLAYES-BOUUAERT, author of a study commissioned by the Commission of the European Communities on 'The fiscal problems of stately homes in the Member States of the European Community'.

The present motion for a resolution was considered by the committee at its meetings of 1 and 2 December 1981, 28 and 29 January 1982, 29 and 30 March 1982 and 27 and 28 April 1982. At this last meeting it was adopted unanimously with one abstention.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Beumer, chairman; Mr Schwencke, vice-chairman; Mr Hahn, vice-chairman and rapporteur; Mr Arfé, Mr Bøgh, Miss Brookes, Mr Cottrell, Mr Fanti, Mrs Gaiotti di Biase, Mr Gerokostopoulos, Mr Hutton, Mr Marck (deputizing for Mr Pedini), Mr Papageorgiou, Mr Papapietro (deputizing for Mr Bucchini) and Mrs Viehoff.

The opinions of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	5
B EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	11
<u>Annexes:</u>	
I. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Cariglia (Doc. 1-566/80)	27
II. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Almirante and others (Doc. 1-876/80)	29
III. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Filippi and others (Doc. 1-912/80)	31
IV. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Lezzi and others (Doc. 1-52/81)	33
V. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Weber and others (Doc. 1-363/81)	35
VI. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Romualdi and others (Doc. 1-504/81)	37
VII. Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (Doc. 1-680/81)	39
VIII. Motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke (Doc. 1-557/81)	41
Opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee	46
Opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	50

The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the protection of the architectural and archaeological heritage

The European Parliament,

A. having noted the following motions for resolutions:

- on the financing of a project to renovate, improve and protect the Trulli in the region of Puglia (Doc. 1-566/80)
- on the archaeological excavations at Skyllation (Doc. 1-876/80)
- on safeguarding the historical and artistic centres of Orvieto and Todi (Doc. 1-912/80)
- on saving the cultural and architectural heritage of the Campania and Basilicata regions, which were hit by the earthquake (Doc. 1-52/81)
- on environmental damage in Eleusis and the destruction of ancient archaeological sites (Doc. 1-363/81)
- on measures to preserve the walls of Lucca (Doc. 1-504/81)
- on the protection of valuable Bronze Age sites in the Netherlands (Doc. 1-680/81),
- on the need for intervention by the European Community to protect the sites and monuments of the Acropolis in Athens (Doc. 1-557/81),

B. acknowledging the remarkable work of the Council of Europe, and in particular the European Architectural Heritage Charter and the Amsterdam declaration of 1975, which was European Architectural Heritage Year, and the outcome of the European Congress held under the joint patronage of the Council of Europe and the Community in Brussels in 1980 on the subject of the preservation of the architectural heritage, and UNESCO's recommendations on the world-wide protection of monuments and the priorities it set for this purpose,

C. concerned at the dangers confronting the European architectural and archaeological heritage in the form of decay, modern traffic planning, the construction of new buildings, the impact of technical and industrial developments and the destruction of historical settings and the environment,

D. whereas the architectural and archaeological heritage to be protected includes not only urban and rural architectural works but also archaeological monuments and sites,

- E. aware of the importance of the architectural and archaeological heritage for our European culture and awareness of our European identity, in conformity with the declaration issued by the Heads of State or Government in Copenhagen on 15 December 1973 'concerning European identity',
- F. aware of the moral obligation to ensure that future generations inherit a humane world marked by culture,
- G. aware of the need for the pursuit, at both Member State and Community level, of a genuine overall conservation policy,
- H. acknowledging the interest shown by large sections of the populations of all the Member States in the protection of the architectural and archaeological heritage and their desire to be able to visit these monuments,
- I. recalling that the restoration of monuments and connected activities create jobs for young people too, particularly in small and medium-sized craft undertakings, and that they also require little investment and consume very little energy,
- J. considering that the protection of old cities and city areas can stimulate tourism and create new jobs and sources of income,
- K. whereas efforts must be made to achieve a more satisfactory inter-relationship between tourism with the increasing construction of hotels, restaurants and infrastructure, and the conservation of the cultural heritage, an essential aspect of which is the appropriate rural and regional planning,
- L. aware that public resources must be made available and private incentives introduced for this purpose;
- M. recalling its previous reports of
 - 13 May 1974 on measures to protect the European cultural heritage (Doc. 54/74)¹,
 - 8 March 1976 on Community action in the cultural sector (Doc.542/75)²,
 - 18 January 1979 embodying the opinion of the European Parliament on the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council³ on Community action in the cultural sector (Doc.1-325/78)⁴,

¹OJ No. C 62, 30.5.1974, p.5

²OJ No. C 79, 5.4.1976, p.6

³Doc. 437/77 - OJ No. C 34, 10.2.1978, p.2

⁴OJ No. C 39, 12.2.1979, p.50

- N. having regard to Articles 2, 128 and 130(a) and (c) of the EEC Treaty,
- O. having regard to the Resolution of the Council of the European Communities and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council of 17 May 1977 on the continuation and implementation of a European Community policy and action programme on the environment¹
- P. having regard to the report by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and the opinions of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, (Doc. 1-206/82),
1. Calls for the creation of a 'European Historical Monuments and Sites Fund' for the preservation of the European architectural heritage;
 2. Hopes that in the meantime the Commission of the Community will use the resources available under the European Social Fund (which could use conservation work as a means of combating unemployment) the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, the European Monetary System and the New Community Instrument (Orto) Facility) in this field;
 3. Supports the Council of Europe's proposals as set down in the European Architectural Heritage Charter and the Amsterdam declaration and refers to not only the urban and rural heritage but also archaeological monuments and sites;
 4. Points out that it is essential for effective measures to be taken to improve the quality of the environment in areas of architectural interest, for example by creating pedestrian precincts and parks, placing restrictions on advertising, protecting the grounds of stately homes, eliminating sources of pollution etc., thus making it possible to improve the quality of life and protect public health at the same time;
 5. Asks the governments of the Member States, if they have not already done so, to enact effective laws for the protection of monuments, and in particular, to draw up lists of monuments to be preserved, protected and used on their territory for social purposes, and to make the destruction or alteration of such scheduled monuments subject to agreement by the authority responsible for the protection of monuments;

¹ OJ No. C 139, 13.6.1977

6. Calls for the coordination of the activities of the Member States in the Community with a view to protecting the architectural and archaeological heritage and hopes that a meeting of the Ministers of Culture of the Member States within the Council of the Community will be held as soon as possible;
7. Appeals to governments and to regional and local authorities where this is not already the case to assume responsibility for the protection of architectural works in their area of responsibility, and to seek the advice of monument protection experts at an early stage in any planning procedures;
8. Recommends the creation at national level of a 'supreme authority' which, in the event of any dispute, could make recommendations on restoration, preservation or demolition;
9. Expresses its support for increased financial aid from the Community for the training centres whose work serves to protect architectural monuments, viz:
 - the European Centre for the training of craftsmen for the preservation of the architectural heritage in Venice,
 - the 'Centre d'Etudes Nucléaires' (Centre for Nuclear Studies) Grenoble,
 - the (Centre d'Etudes pour la conservation du patrimoine urbain et architectural' (Centre for urban and architectural heritage preservation studies) Catholic University, Louvain,
 - the architectural conservation course at the international study centre for the conservation and restoration of cultural works in Rome,
 - the new course for head gardeners for historical parks and gardens, in Munich;
 - the Hellenic Institute for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice.
10. Calls on the Commission and Council to expedite the recognition at Community level of professional and academic qualifications and titles and recommends that, as part of the training activities financed by the Social Fund, the fullest possible support be given to training courses for restoration workers;
11. Appeals to the governments of the Member States to draw up a plan for the protection of the rural architectural heritage;
12. Looks to the governments to pay particular attention to the surviving schemes and examples of early industrial development which are crucial to our understanding of the origins of our technology and industry and have hitherto not received sufficient attention;

13. Decides to select each year, on a proposal from the Commission, a historical monument especially worthy of aid in one of the Member States in turn, from a list drawn up jointly with the Council of Europe, and to subsidize the restoration and maintenance of this monument from the budget of the European Community, which will require the creation of a special budgetary line;
14. Requests the Commission to draft a recommendation providing for adequate protection of archaeological sites and solving the problem of financial compensation for losses suffered by owners as a result of such sites being temporarily scheduled during archaeological exploration work;
15. Asks the Commission to draw up a recommendation providing for tax arrangements for privately-owned architectural works in the Member States which will enable the owners to restore and maintain these monuments; provision should be made for special aid for architectural works which are accessible to the public. These arrangements should encompass estate duties, income tax and the financial aid to be granted;
16. Also asks the Commission to provide a Community solution to the serious problem caused by the VAT imposed on goods and services used in preservation work;
17. Is pleased to see that the European Investment Bank has given its agreement in principle to the granting of loans for preservation activities qualifying as projects within the meaning of Article 130(a) and (c) of the EEC Treaty but greatly regrets the fact that the Bank has not yet applied this agreement and insists most positively that it should forthwith put this agreement into practice;
18. Asks the Commission of the Community to:
 - (a) commission a group of experts to work out a study which would help national and local authorities to assess easily and precisely the costs and benefits of any conservation work which they are contemplating;
 - (b) formulate and finance a research programme on the many as yet obscure aspects of the sulphation of limestone, marble and brick - its causes, mechanisms, prevention and treatment;
19. Supports restoration efforts, since, far from being a cultural luxury, they constitute an investment and generate new jobs using modern technology and reviving traditional, disappearing, professions;
20. Stresses that the maintenance and restoration of historic houses and districts, where craftsmen traditionally have their homes and workshops, can give the protection of the architectural heritage real cultural dimension provided that they enable the 'natural' inhabitants of such districts to continue living or to return there and are conducive to the development of more intense human and social relationships

in towns thus rendered more attractive, more lively and safer;

21. Believes that a more prominent place must be given in the Community's regional policy to constructive support policy for the architectural and archaeological heritage, since this is vital to the expansion of active cultural tourism and provides a diversity of profitable activities;
22. Calls for continued support to be given to the activities of international organizations devoted to the preservation of the European architectural and archaeological heritage; this applies in particular to the 'Europa Nostra' association and organizations which appeal to young people such as the 'Union des associations de chantiers pour la réhabilitation et l'entretien des monuments et du patrimoine artistique' (Union of associations for monument restoration and maintenance work sites) and the 'Jeunesse et Patrimoine' (Youth and Heritage) association;
23. Hopes that measures coordinated at Community level will serve to encourage, in each Member State, patronage of the arts and particularly the preservation of the architectural and archaeological heritage, for example by adapting national legislation governing foundations active to the demands of such preservation work;
24. Considers it necessary that the public in the Member States should be informed about the problems connected with the protection of architectural works systematically and periodically and recommends, in this connection, the closest possible cooperation with the Council of Europe; this information campaign should be directed towards:
 - experts specializing in the protection of architectural works;
 - officials responsible for this sphere at regional and local level;
 - the public at large;
 - youth, and particularly schoolchildren;
25. Asks the Ministers of Education to give greater importance, in school syllabuses, to the idea of protecting the architectural heritage and the environment, so that young people are educated to understand the importance of the architectural and archaeological heritage;
26. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the governments of the Member States of the Community, the Council and Commission of the European Communities and the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTPRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS1. Scope of the report

Your rapporteur fully appreciates the difficulty of defining what is meant by architectural and archaeological heritage before turning to the question of how to protect it which is the subject of this report. Some might indeed prefer the idea of architectural and archaeological 'assets' rather than that of heritage because it seems more specific and conveys a legal connotation, namely the idea of physical assets which are in the possession of a person or a group and can be passed on to their successors.

However the idea of a cultural asset seems more fashionable in its currently used sense which tends to refer less to the historical privileged values of a particular social and cultural group and increasingly if not exclusively to cultural factors only. In a report which does not set out to be a learned treatise it does not matter whether we prefer one expression or the other, the purpose of this report being to identify the areas in which difficulties arise and to indicate a few solutions.

Nor is it the task of your rapporteur to define the criteria by which a specific cultural asset or 'monument' comes to form part of the architectural and archaeological heritage. In any case such criteria vary according to time, taste, sensibility, and the values common to a given society. We shall use these expressions in their commonly accepted sense without considering whether a particular monument, building or site should be regarded as part of the architectural and archaeological heritage because it is so many years old or meets certain criteria. We shall leave it to the experts to decide whether the United Nations building in New York or the Palais de l'Europe in Strasbourg should now be regarded as part of that heritage.

Frequently, the notion of an architectural and archaeological asset conjures up in people's minds the idea of an ancient monument which leads on to the subject of promoting archaeological excavations and underwater archaeology¹.

It should be noted that European Architectural Heritage Year (1975) and the European charter for the architectural heritage rightly placed as much stress on the rural as on the urban heritage. This illustrates the present tendency to view the architectural heritage in much wider than conventional terms.

¹ See 'The cultural heritage of the sea-bed', Report by the Council of Europe's Committee on Culture and Education, rapporteur: John Roper, 1978.

Industrial buildings are also included under this heading. The industrial revolution wrought a radical and in some cases irreversible change not only in human relations but also in whole tracts of land, by creating what can be described as industrial landscapes: factories were followed by other complexes such as working-class districts and workers' housing, railway stations, pumps, warehouses, mines and other industrial plant and associated machinery which goes to make up this landscape. This legacy of the industrial civilization deserves to be remembered when taking any protective measures, so that the specimens which are the most important and most representative of technical development as well as those of artistic and historical value can be preserved. Nowadays, one often finds that factories have fallen into disuse because technical progress has made them obsolete (as in the case of windmills in the Netherlands and Flanders). These buildings are worth preserving for their architectural value alone, but also as reminders of a past civilization.

Furthermore the idea of cultural assets or heritage does not relate only to the object of historical and artistic interest viewed in isolation from its context according to historical or subjective criteria. Indeed a given monument should be seen against the historical background of the town of which it is a product. Historic monuments in their original setting can give today's generation an idea of the society and time that created them¹.

2. Growing public and media interest in cultural assets

Heritage as a factor in European cultural identity

What your rapporteur wishes to stress in these preliminary considerations is the fact that our society, so often accused of indifference and materialism, is showing a growing interest in cultural assets and an increasing appetite for culture. A cultural asset is not only an object of aesthetic contemplation but it is an expression of a whole set of values contributing to the individual and collective enrichment of society. The architectural and archaeological heritage is therefore one, but not the least, component of society's cultural past and present. In becoming aware of this heritage, society discovers the constituent parts of its own cultural or other identity. This cultural identity today constitutes one of the essential focal points for the perception and even definition of European identity.

Although usually regarded as originating in the civilization of one country or one region, cultural assets reflect the universal values of art which cannot be reduced to purely nationalist terms. But this does not prevent us from using the general expression of European cultural identity or European culture since we are dealing in this case with our entire

¹See the 'Amsterdam declaration', which emerged from the 1975 congress on the European architectural heritage organized by the Council of Europe

continent. This is why we insist that awareness of European culture is essential if we are to define and give substance to European identity.

It is in no way inconsistent with the foregoing to reaffirm that the architectural and archaeological heritage is a universal asset. It tells us about the past and constitutes a legacy handed down to us by previous generations who themselves in many cases received it from those who went before them. It is the duty of our whole civilization to enjoy it and to pass it on for the cultural benefit of the whole world.

3. The deterioration of the architectural and archaeological heritage Towns and their historic centres

All too often we find architectural assets in a state of decay or even in ruins. It is our duty to restore, safeguard and protect these assets and to see that they are used by the greatest number of persons for the good of society as a whole.

The idea of an architectural and archaeological asset brings together two distinct concepts: the first is that of 'total conservation'. For example it is impossible to restore or conserve an historic monument in a given place and to destroy the minor buildings which also form part of the same place.

The other concept concerns human needs and the environment. To save a monument while destroying its natural surroundings would be a hypocritical form of conservation. For example, it would be absurd and criminal to restore a town house or villa while cutting them off from the historic grounds with which they were created.

In many cases groups of buildings, temples or historic sites constituting a harmonious whole with their surroundings have been ruined by the hideous buildings of invading suburbs or are being attacked and progressively disfigured by the pollution created by our civilization of industry and machines.

To restore monuments attacked by pollution, and also to prevent such pollution in the first place, we must find out more about the causes and processes of the sulphation of limestone, marble and brick. Detailed research in this field should be carried out at Community level by the Commission; fundamental (e.g. microbiological) research would thus be encouraged at European level and would find broader and more profitable applications in the protection of architectural assets.

Nor should it be forgotten that some modern buildings - even though they are not always universally considered to be architectural and archaeological assets - will in the not-too-distant future become part of the architectural heritage handed down by our century. The problem of maintenance is as relevant for these new buildings as it is for old ones since it is better to preserve today than restore tomorrow.

The subject of the protection of the architectural heritage automatically leads on to the problem of town planning in our historic towns, their social rehabilitation and the social environment¹. Historically, the town was the natural and generally, though not exclusively, preferred centre where architecture of a high historical and cultural value developed.

The destruction of our towns in the second world war had a big effect on the urban architectural and archaeological heritage. To compound the serious mistakes made before the war², faults were made in the reconstruction work as planners often took the war damage as a pretext for the further destruction and alteration of the urban fabric of the towns.

Added to this there were serious town planning programming errors and speculation which, while claiming to restore or revive, in fact gutted mansions and historic houses and converted them into luxury apartments - with the local authorities turning a blind eye or even lending their assistance - for the benefit of the wealthy few or the prestigious head office of privileged undertakings in the tertiary sector, thereby helping to empty the town of its inhabitants.

This lack of feeling in town planning for culture and humanism has in many cases transformed our historic town centres into a jungle of tertiary sector buildings whose natural inhabitants have been forced to move out into hideous suburbs which lack all kinds of basic urban amenities.

This unending cancer of suburban growth and the 'tertiarisation' of historic city centres or at best their conversion into ghost towns represents a shameful example of a development which we must remedy if it is still possible.

¹ See the Architectural Heritage Charter and the Amsterdam Declaration.

² For example the destruction in Rome of the mediaeval township surrounding St. Peter's Square to build the 'via della Conciliazione' bordered by new and sham period houses or the work on the 'via dei Fori imperiali' which buried archaeological remains and spoiled this incomparable site.

It should not be overlooked, however, that increased awareness on the part of authorities and citizens alike in the last few years has led to greater care in restructuring. Successful examples of renovation of old town centres, where the buildings restored were put to a harmonious blend of individual, public and private sector uses, are also to be welcomed.

In the past the city was the expression - etymologically too - of civilization and citizenship; but many cities have become, both externally and internally, a reflection of **social planning errors, mistaken choices of cultural models and a lack of civic sense.** Instead of **developing towns as the natural centres for harmonious relations between cultural, economic and social elements, architecture and town planning have together wrought a profound alteration if not the complete destruction of their social fabric.**

The town has ended up reflecting the political, social and economic contradictions of our modern society; it should be reconceived on the model of the towns of the past. Especially as regards its architecture, we should strive for the complete preservation of its historical monuments bearing in mind the social value of the utilization of the recovered assets.

As the situation varies from one country to another and sometimes from region to region within the same country, it is difficult - and would be outside the scope of this report - to offer standard solutions.

To take one country as an example, one could cite the difference in the historic centres of cities such as Milan, Palermo and Naples. Milan is a typical example of the city whose historic centre has been 'tertiarized'. The well-to-do people of Palermo have preferred to move to residential districts outside the city centre rather than live in abandoned town houses and ensuring their survival by maintaining and restoring them. The unaffected inhabitants of Naples still live in the town centre, in the 'Spanish quarters' where the social and economic fabric of the 'Vicoli' is still largely intact. But this harmonious architectural heritage is in such a state of disrepair - aggravated by the earthquake - that one must fear for its collapse or even demolition by speculators.

Your rapporteur has cited the example of a number of Italian towns since they present a symptomatic picture of the 'pathology' of our towns. The arguments would be the same if we took Brussels instead of Milan, or cited Metz or Nancy ... The old Latin saying 'Quod non fecerunt Barbari, fecerunt Barberiri' still holds good today.