ENCYCLOPEDIA OF UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS - Springer Sustainable Development Goals Series

Vol. 11 - Sustainable Cities and Communities

Urban heritage conservation and development
Dr. Elena Battaglini

Giuseppe Di Vittorio Foundation, Urban and Regional Economics Research Unit, Rome, Italy.
E-mail: e.battaglini@fdv.cgil.it

1. Synonyms
Value-based resource; tangible, intangible and digital stock supply.

2. Definition
Urban heritage is a complex and often dissonant social issue that addresses preservation and development approaches characterized by high levels of complexity and ambiguity, as it involves different social actors and communities with divergent values, interests, meanings, and perspectives. While initially applied to traditional urban planning measures, regional studies and sustainability scholars and practitioners have increasingly utilized new lens in approaching it. Their growing efforts aim at (1) describing, if not explaining, how the multiple dimensions of many sustainable issues perceived in heritage, valued at the place-based level, can easily transcend urban boundaries with complex retroactions, and (2) exploring new ways of addressing policies in much broader regional contexts, and even trying to find new alliances between cities on the international level.

3. Main text

Introduction

Urban heritage conservation and development
The term *heritage* is of Latin origin, deriving from *hereditare*, which is also the source of *heir* and *hereditary*. It refers to events or processes that have a special meaning in group memory, and thus to valued objects and qualities, such as historic buildings and cultural traditions that have been passed down from previous generations (Oxford Dictionary 2006).

Numerous international heritage policy instruments developed between the 1930s and the end of the twentieth century have played a key role in creating and sustaining a 'positivist' conception of heritage linked to the idea of innate and immutable cultural values and defined by concepts of historical monuments, monumentality, aesthetics, authenticity, conservation, and expertise. The 'innate' importance of a monument is based on its materiality and authenticity, expressed by its historic and aesthetic values. This process of cultural signification relies on the specialized work of experts who must transfer these values without distorting their meaning to future generations through practices of conservation, restoration, and excavation (Venice Charter 1964, art. 9–15).

Through these concepts, heritage defines a static witness of the past by assigning common, universal values to works of art that need to be revealed, conserved, and communicated. Similar discursive elements are present in a series of policy texts developed before 2000 by ICOMOS, UNESCO, and the Council of Europe with the aim of safeguarding, protecting, conserving, and managing various aspects of the heritage of Europe and the world. These all strongly focus on the conservation of heritage for its own sake, with little recognition of its actualization and use as a resource.

Due to the cultural turn away from positivist empiricism, these policy constructs related to heritage have been criticized by scholars, and the signs, symbols, and meanings assigned to artifacts and to landscape have gained academic interdisciplinary relevance. This shift also emphasized the importance of practices and experiences, rather than of mere things, and called for the consideration of social reproduction and context in the process of cultural heritage creation, questioning the role of history and memory.

If a national and local society can be understood as a community connected by memories and obliviousness (Renan 1995), then history becomes a multilayered process also made of memory transfer and transformation practices. There are two main traditions in memory research: one focused on *who* remembers, and the other dealing with *what is to be remembered*. Both are closely connected in their efforts to understand and interpret the process of memorizing and recalling the past. In Ancient Greek, there were two concepts defining memory: *mnèmè* and *anamnèsis*. The first describes a memory as something that comes passively and unwilled, while *anamnèsis* refers to a recollection as a result of searching, remembering, and recalling. In this perspective, heritage has been reframed as valued objects and events, both in terms of having a memory of them and searching for them. This cognitive and pragmatic dualism is reflected in memory's claim to be 'true', which needs to be confronted with historical and more objective sources (Ricoeur 2009).

The question now is what is a 'true' memory for urban or postindustrial contexts between the forces of globalization and the practices of local cultures. The relationship between collective memory and history has often been treated as oppositional (Nora 1989) where behind the so-called burden of history lay uses and abuses of memory, manipulated and blocked memory, ordered forgetting, and the myriad abuses of historical reappropriation (Lowenthal, 1998; Hall 2005; Assmann, 2006).

Connerton (1991) claimed a new approach in framing history and memory, in contrast with the dominant paradigms of modernity. This perspective on the understanding of the past in the present time addresses the changing nature of identities and their perception, more broadly in European and in global contexts. In fact, memory is not the simple activation of digital stored data or information, but is actively engaged in the construction of individuals' identity and

biography, and all the other factors that contribute to stability and continuity. Hence, history and memory are also reinterpretations of what in the past is meaningful for the present.

Thus, selecting particular narratives about the past to conserve is necessarily a matter of continuous negotiation between social actors (Mondale 1994) and among collective identities, as part of the imaginary field (Anderson 1991). Heritage can thus be understood as the cultural process of negotiating, selecting, and managing 'what to remember and what to forget', in order to build new memories (cf. Harrison 2013).

Within the field of 'critical heritage', the concept of 'new heritage' has emerged (Fairclough 2008), along with new paradigms reading heritage and history (Berkhofer 1997; Smith 2006). Heritage forges identities, and supports and creates memory, both individually and collectively; it has both tangible and intangible manifestations, even in everyday life. This new way of framing and practicing heritage conveys the importance of the role of informing places and political and community interactions, which affect everyone, and which in that sense are more 'true' than a distant World Heritage Site visited as a 'lifetime leisure experience' . This dimension of critical heritage theory has a substantial academic literature and growing case evidence (Fairclough 2008; Harrison 2013; Fairclough and Auclair 2015).

Critical heritage theory also questions the constructs of memory and history, where the past is represented at heritage places that often invoke dissonant collective memories and create tensions within official accounts of heritage. In this perspective, Ashworth and Tunbridge (1996) claim controversial dissonances in the heritage creation process, focusing not only on 'what' is interpreted but also on 'how' heritage is interpreted and by 'whom' it legitimizes some other's sense of place and identity. Dissonant or difficult heritage (Logan and Reeves 2008; Macdonald 2010) stresses its contested nature because the interpretation of any heritage may be uncomfortable to someone depending on the meanings it conveys and on the social legitimization and power of the interpreter, whether policy maker or expert.

Critical heritage scholarship and practice have contributed to heritage being increasingly addressed, not simply as a collection of static forms in need of preservation, but contextualized in broader societal, political, and cultural frames that denote its role in forging individual and collective identities and in framing political action. The critical debate on this construct and further policy agreements led to the Faro Convention. This was adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 13 October 2005, and was opened for signatures to member States in Faro, Portugal on 27 October of the same year. To date, 17 member states of the Council of Europe have ratified the Convention and five have signed it.

The Faro Convention is considered a milestone in acknowledging the plurality of meanings attached to heritage, as well as the idea that, through plural affiliation, multiple perspectives, intercultural dialogue, and democratic participation, heritage could be used in peace-building processes and as prerequisite for sustainable development (Fairclough et al., 2014).

Urban heritage, sustainable development, and culture

The New Urban Agenda (NUA; United Nations, 2016) recognizes cultural heritage as an important factor for urban sustainable development. Many of the issues raised highlight the role of cultural heritage (both tangible and intangible) in the urban sustainable development.

Culture should be taken into account in promoting and implementing sustainable consumption and production patterns (point 10). It is considered a key element in the humanization of cities and human settlements (point 26), playing an important role 'in

rehabilitating and revitalizing urban areas, and in strengthening social participation and the exercise of citizenship' (point 38).

Furthermore, the NUA highlights the role of cultural heritage in developing vibrant, sustainable, and inclusive urban economies, and in sustaining and supporting urban economies in progressive transitions (points 45 and 60).

Culture is thus recognized 'as a priority component of urban plans and strategies in the adoption of planning instruments' that safeguard a diverse range of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and landscapes; it is therefore necessary 'to protect them from potential disruptive impacts of urban development' (point 124).

As Throsby (2008) argues, cultural heritage consists of a stock of cultural capital that has been inherited from previous generations and can be handed on to future ones. Since economic, social, cultural, and environmental systems are 'interconnected' (Throsby 2010), cultural heritage can be considered the 'glue' between the different dimensions of sustainable development (UCLG 2010) or the 'heart' of sustainable urban development (Duxbury et al. 2016).

Within the research literature, a growing number of scholars are highlighting how heritage approaches sustainability for its cultural dimension and how 'cultural sustainability' integrates the concept of sustainable development (Soini and Birkenland 2014; Horlings 2014; Stylianou-Lambert et al. 2014; Albert, 2015; De Beukelaer et al. 2015; Duxbury and Jeannotte 2015; Fairclough and Auclair 2015; Hristova et al. 2015; Lähdesmäki, 2016). Heritage should be understood and adequately responded to in undertaking sustainable development efforts, especially regarding the complexity of its issues. Urban heritage sustainability thus includes the following crosscutting issues:

1. The embeddedness of dissonant values and conflicts in heritage.

Political representations are embedded in the construction process of heritage, together with stress and tensions. The perceptions, attitudes, and meanings attributed to heritage may also reveal an us-versus-them rhetoric, particularly when handling a past that is marked by turbulent history. Taking into account culture as an inner dimension of sustainable heritage may unveil and disclose tensions, narratives, values, and interests in managing heritage imbued with trauma and pain, in order to overcome past conflicts, nationalisms, and colonialisms. Understanding the dissonant values embedded in heritage makes a place for the sustainability of multiple voices, rather than singular ones, in order to construct and manage artifacts and cultural events that reinforce and forge a common sense of belonging and continuity for the generations to come (Daković et al. 2015; Kisić 2013).

2. Heritage as selection of past values related to the present-day needs of life.

Scholars agree that heritage should not burden or limit a good living environment made up of the needs, aspirations, freedom, and creativity of present daily life. This means selecting those past values that are associated with management policies enhancing a cohesive social context—especially in world heritage cities, where the influx of tourists and workers brings additional complexity. The focus on the art-historical value of protected buildings and monuments should be adapted into a broader social approach, selecting memories that can be inspired by current local cultural values in order to give the potential for the creation of social and cultural identities informing future generations (Palazzo and Pugliano 2015; Mišetić and Ursić 2015; Leus and Kosatka, 2015). Present needs also relate to environmental sustainability, inclusive social

development, inclusive economic development, and the fostering of peace and security. Loach et al. (2018) address and analyze these needs as the four policy dimensions on which the heritage policy is currently based on the international level.

3. The social impact of cultural heritage as a process

Empirical evidence supports the idea that sharing existing heritage strengthens relations between communities, neighborhoods, and generations. Making people aware of the values, of the local and global influences preserved by heritage, enhances social inclusion and well-being. By educating groups and communities to value heritage as resource, by enabling diverse groups of people to explore common values, perspectives, and the multiple and plural creative experiences conveyed by artifacts and cultural events, we support and reinforce respect for diversity, helping to change frames of reference and points of views. Several case studies have offered insight into the process of constructing individual future and collective future identities by virtue of deciding what to retain from the past, what to care for, and what to leave for future generations (Auclair 2015; Hertzog, 2015; Johnson 2015; Tõnu et al. 2015; Czepczyński, and Czepczyński 2015; Birkenland 2015).

4. The sustainability of heritage.

Scholars see culture as an important ingredient of sustainability, especially in urban contexts (Hawkes, 2001; Anheier, Isar and Hoelscher, 2012). Urban heritage associated with sustainable development is linked to the pursuit of people-centered, rather than object-centered, approaches to heritage conservation. The 'critical theory' conveyed in the Faro Convention frames heritage as a continuing and iterative cultural and social process of defining and using cultural aspects of inheritance and change. Cultural action heritage is rooted in space-and-time-specific contexts, which means that it is place-based, site-specific, locality-sensitive, and community-contextualized. Instead of being valued for its intrinsic worth, as decided by experts and policy makers, heritage as a social and cultural process has been understood by scholars as valuable in conflict resolution, economic and social regeneration, and as a method, tool, and practice for sustainable development. Memories and creativity bridge different social values to create a common milieu, bonding identities, and the sense of place (Auclaire and Fairclough, 2015).

Paths forward

In addition to descriptive and analytical discussions of the concept, much of the sustainable development research literature discusses urban heritage, framed as a resource for dealing with innovative approaches and new ways of thinking to effectively address sustainability in the face of the global environmental challenges being dealt with by modern societies. Some suggested guidelines for building the capacity to effectively address the complexities associated with the preservation and sustainable development of urban heritage include:

1. Heritage as a place-based sustainable development process

Massey (1993) argues that global phenomena are grounded and emplaced. Furthermore, global risks, in the words of Beck (2016), require evolution, metamorphosis and the transformation of policy horizons, beginning with the 'factuality' of the effect of the capitalistic development paradigm and of climate change. In fact, they distribute forms of social inequality that often escape traditional perspectives of the mainstream economy and that, avoiding crucial

categories such as space and time, are expected to be applicable in any place and at any time. In this sense, adopting a local scale, place-based action and perspective is crucial. The risks assume, in fact, different geographies in relation to the different social inequalities involved (Beck 2016: 87).

Places are thus relevant in the following ways:

1) as alternative strategies of localization (Escobar, 2001) or agency that can alter the very mechanisms of the global itself (Massey, 2004). A place is endowed with meaning and values: people perceiving tangible and intangible heritage as resources are experiencing a place and attribute values to places. Cultural geographers in particular have emphasized that place remains fundamentally important to our sense of identity, our sense of community, and our humanity (Vanclay 2008).

2) As site of policy interventions. Increasing attention is being paid to place-based policies for sustainable development, which require new modes of innovation, including giving recognition and power to grassroots innovation actors and processes, and involving them in inclusive multiscale innovation politics. (Horlings, 2016).

Despite a body of studies that, until the first half of the twentieth century, had not taken into account the variables of time and space in their analysis of development, places are taken in their specificity as the founding element for describing (and for some authors, interpreting) the constraints and opportunities of regions for their historical, cultural, and socioeconomic conditions. The neoclassical theory of growth that expunges the spatial variable has been gradually questioned in favor of the so-called endogenous regional development approach (Stimson et al. 2011).

Some authors have framed regional endogenous development as a process of territorialization. This highlights the spatiotemporal dimension of development and the ways in which people use local heritage as resource. Culture, in its coevolution with nature, influences the ways in which people shape their territories. It mediates practices and institutions, but also the senses, as expressed in subjective perceptions, sense-making, and the construction of narratives and place identities, pointing to how people assign value to their resources and thus affect sustainable local and regional development. Culture further influences the ways of life and human intentionality, providing insights into why people would contribute to change. Regional endogenous development and territorialization practices are understood as a coproduction of nature and culture in which both have agency. They rely on the concept of affordances (Gibson 1986) to underpin the agency of material and intangible resources, and on the concepts of cognitive, affective, and selective values (Kluckhohn 1951) to stress the role of culture in development. This approach shows that access to heritage considered as local resource, as well as the type, quality, and characteristics of the heritage, act to afford and define social practices, while also having effects on medium-term and long-term processes of development (Dessein, Battaglini, and Horlings, 2016).

Framing sustainable development within this perspective means recognizing in places—whether urban, rural, or other types of territorial unit—their 'ecologically sensitive cultured' dimensions, thus emphasizing the regeneration of place-based contexts and new commitments with cultural traditions and collective memories. Through renewed relationships with either the cultural heritage or the natural environment, social actors may more effectively face the new global challenges. (Schofield and Szymanski 2010; Hristova et al., 2015; Chiesi 2015).

2. Participatory planning of heritage

Participatory projects that sustain human relations, bonds of trust, and thus social capital can lead to shared heritage cultural policies (Dragićević Šešić 2006). These are collective actions that can contribute to the sustainability of places, increasing civic pride and creating collective cultural memories, which are indispensable for 'livable' places. Empirical observations of heritage participatory processes show their key role in reconciling tensions and conflicting interests attributed to local resources, thus constructing individual and collective identities and a sense of place crucial for confronting global challenges (Assman and Czaplicka 1995; Hristova et al. 2015).

Cultural planning is either a perspective that (1) emphasizes place-specific heritage and uses culture as a tool to further the social aims generated by the citizens themselves (Bianchini 1993); or (2) a method of overcoming existing borders between different sectors, within the public sector on one hand, and in the private and civic sectors on the other (Mercer 2002).

Many tools and techniques of cultural planning systems belong to the category of cultural mapping (*ex ante* assessment) and cultural impact (*ex post* assessment) carried out before and after any major development activity or intervention is undertaken in a city. (Duxbury et al. 2016).

Culture-based urban planning strategies have been internationally criticized for allowing a market-oriented discourse to gradually dominate public policy-making (McGuigan 2004; Stevenson 2004; Stevenson, Rowe and McKay 2010). Yet other authors have framed cultural planning as community practices of codesign that can foster a 'bottom-up appropriation of space' through collective and deliberate intentions ascribed to it. These methodologies, which are a type of participatory action research, could improve territorial planning at any level of scale by increasing the degree of congruence between the conceptual world of planners and designers and that of users and citizen, thus promoting place-attachment (Chiesi and Costa 2015).

Revisiting the notion of 'community' in the field of heritage and examining the varied ways in which tensions between different groups and their aspirations arise and are mediated, some authors have applied a critical focus to the range of popular, political, and academic attempts to define and negotiate memory, place, identity, and cultural expression. They are therefore proposing more critical practices of community engagement (Pendlebury et al. 2004; Waterton and Smith 2010).

As a young field that is still being defined and shaped, heritage management and planning suffers from a lack of the broad overviews that are common in more mature disciplines. More empirical cases of heritage place-based sustainable development in tourism would be an interesting applied area for research (Richards and Hall 2000; Hampton 2005).

3. Resilient urban policies towards community-led local development of heritage

The emphasis on place-based solutions and local resources promotes the valorization of traditional local knowledge in many urban areas, where various inherited forms and practices are integral to a city's cultural landscape and heritage. Many traditional occupations and crafts, drawing on traditions of ecosystem management, natural resource extraction, and local materials, are capable of supporting sustainable trajectories. Many of them require lower levels of technology, energy, and investment while enabling and encouraging the intangible heritage and traditional occupations, and so can generate sustainable livelihoods and contribute to place-based sustainable development (Duxbury el al. 2016).

Many historic quarters and towns already have their own equilibrium, with the affordances of local resources and local environment having been stratified over their history. Encouraging

the continuation of that order and the adaptive reuse of the existing built fabric can deter haphazard new development. There is widespread consensus on the benefits obtained through the sustainable conversion adaptation of existing buildings. The benefits and aspects of sustainable conversion adaptation exist through the whole lifecycle—from inception, planning, and design, to procurement, construction, and management and operational issues. Traditional building technologies and materials may still be available and useful, if resource-efficient. Culture provides local knowledge for contextualized resilience by emphasizing locality and historical continuities, which are key elements in the fight against climate change and natural hazards such as earthquakes and floods. Culture raises awareness of the impact of our ecological footprint, the need to transform production and consumption patterns (e.g., the Slow Food movement, 0 km products, etc.), and our collective responsibility to reorient our values towards a more harmonious balance with the environment, as shown in the many worldwide empirical qualiquantitative case studies highlighted in Amoêda et al. (2010).

Cultural and creative industries that are preserving, innovating, and thus valorizing local heritage are seen as a new growth sector, providing opportunities for green local jobs based on training that can be provided within the community or region (Sacco 2011). Preservation reduces landfill waste, demolition energy use, and new construction, while favoring adaptive reuse concepts. Renovations involving less energy use, maintenance, and type of use also affect the sustainability of heritage building. By applying circular economy principles to renovations combining energy and material use, quality and adaptability, and sustainability can be enhanced while the integral sustainability of heritage buildings can be measured (Wilkinson and Remøy 2018).

Beyond urban heritage sustainable development

Many sustainability scholars contend that innovation, creativity, and imagination should play a role in urban sustainable development construction projects that combine legislation, political decision-making, and forms of civic participation that go beyond the boundaries of individual cities. 'Nowhere other than in world cities and their informal and formal connections is the opportunity to shape the potential for indignation, the power of the anticipated catastrophe into institutional, democratic political forms so palpable' argued Beck (2016: 171). In addition, the role of city initiatives in policy-making processes to adequately address climate change is increasing day by day. Bulkeley et al. (2012) in fact list more than sixty different transnational initiatives that have arisen in recent years, tracing the path for new institutional mechanisms to respond to the environmental and climate challenges of the current model of development. In this sense, city policy responses to these material challenges could have more weight than abstract norms and 'ideas' of the future of global climate governance. A transformation of the regulatory environment in the field of urban rights and justice, currently restricted within the framework of the reproduction of social and political order, is essential to open up their transformative potential. This is particularly a reason why alliances between cities in the world are new spaces for innovation: no other institutional form is more effective for experimenting, constructing, and implementing new multilayered decision-making architectures for the problems of the twenty-first century (Beck, 2016).

Accordingly, given the complexity of the problems of cities in relation to the globalized risks affecting heritage, it is necessary to consider the deadlock in policies, their 'unintended consequences', the changing amounts of resources and interests they mobilize. New actors, civic movements, citizens, and stakeholders have entered the policy arena proposing innovative

visions of community and alternative models of production, distribution, exchange, consumption, saving, and use of heritage that often escape the conceptual tools and perspectives of both social scientists and policy makers. They ought to be recognized, if not institutionalized, in new patterns on science-policy interface.

Participatory processes of sustainable heritage may gather renewed consensus if framed with the terms of references proposed by *implementation research theory* in assessing policies (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973; Wildavsky 1979) and the subsequent debate on *policy feedback theory* (Beland 2010; Mettler and Mallory 2014). Questioning the rational choice theory associated with the so-called rational comprehensive model of assessing (and implementing) public policies, this deliberative approach considers policies as intervention cycles. It therefore evaluate policy measures 'in the making' and not through the effects of political premises and assumptions. What is important here is to define (and evaluate) policies not so much in terms of the causal relationship between the input and output of the measure they implement, but rather through the ways in which the various social actors, even new ones, perceive the costs and benefits, the interactions between actuators and policy arenas, the congruence and consistency of the premises, and the implementation of the specific policy.

Applying this perspective to heritage policy and urban innovation means dealing with a) all the actors involved, whether public or private, who take that measure in their actions, decisions, and strategies, b); the ways issues and problems are dealt with by different actors who implement the various proposed actions; c) the bias, the effects induced by other concomitant processes, and the constraints posed by policy arenas or, more generally, by the decision-making system; d) the communication used between the different actors; and e) any variations in the pre-established system of roles.

Sustainable heritage policies must be able to deal with unexpected complexities and with new urban social actors that can be recognized as representing the problem, the social demand being taken on board. As in experimental studies, it is possible to discover unexpected data that require a redefinition of hypotheses and cognitive systems. As in scientific research, even in social processes and in the implementation of policies, it is precisely this taking charge of the unexpected that allows effective outcomes. It is precisely the unexpected that is the driver of what Kuhn (1962) calls 'paradigm shift', which is crucial for these historical transitions, even in reference to 'new ways' of doing politics.

A useful tool in this sense is the Social Impact Assessment or SIA (Vanclay et al. 2015), which allows the purposes of social development in urban interventions to be clarified, with reference to their specific territorial characteristics and to the capacities, expectations, and needs of the communities involved in the design and the hypothesis of the intervention.

With these international principles, the collective work of numerous scholars and academics emphasizes the need to consider social impact assessment as a process, rather than an 'outcome'—a stable outcome, the result of an evaluation by a set indicators that consider the importance for the entire life cycle of the intervention or urban policy of the 'compliance' of the effects, of the design of the mitigation strategies, and of the monitoring measures. This tool therefore allows identification of the actions needed to coproduce, with local communities, knowledge and methods of managing heritage, as well as the benefits of policies, in order to strengthen their resilience.

Conclusions

Facing the complexities of global challenges, the sociologist Ulrich Beck stated that: 'We need new ways of seeing the world, being in the world and imagining and doing politics' (Beck, 2016:181). Accordingly, such a 'new' conceptualization of heritage helps explain why complex social issues, such as valuable resources, their affordances, the limits on their use, their preservation, and innovation cannot be solved using expert-driven, centralized, and rational–technical approaches. Community-led value-centered heritage problems are highly resistant to resolutions using rational choice approaches, since it expunges culture from its frame of references. Instead, they require a transformation or a metamorphosis in the way we conceptualize and approach them through public policies.

4. Crossreferences

Social innovation, path dependencies …

5. References

Albert, M-T., 2015. Perceptions of Sustainability in Heritage Studies. Berlin, Walter De Gruyter.
Amoêda, R., Lira, S., Pinheiro, C., Eds. 2010. Heritage 2010 - Heritage And Sustainable Development. Green Lines Institute.
Anderson B. (1991). Imagined Communities, London: Verso.
Anheier, H.K., Isar, R., Hoelscher, M., Eds, 2012. Cities, Cultural Policy and Governance. London, Sage.
Ashworth, G., Tunbridge, J., 1996. Dissonant Heritage. The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict. Chichester, Wiley.
Assmann, A., 2006. Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik, Műnich, C.H. Beck.
Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., 2015. Living between past and future. An introduction to heritage and cultural sustainability. In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 1 - 22.
Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds, 2015. Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future. London, Routledge.
Auclair E. (2015a). Ordinary heritage, participation and social cohesion: the suburbs in Paris. In Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 25-39.
Auclair E. (2015b). Ordinary heritage, participation and social cohesion: the suburbs of Paris. . In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 25-39.
Beck, U., 2016.The Metamorphosis of the World. Cambridge, Polity Press.
Béland, D., 2010. Reconsidering Policy Feedback: How Policies Affect Politics. Administration and Society, Vol. 42, pp. 568–590.
Berkhofer, R.F., 1997, Beyond the Great History: History as Text and Discourse. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Bianchini, F., Parkinson, M., 1993. Cultural Policy and Urban regeneration. The West European Experience. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
Birkenland I. (2015). The potential space for cultural sustainability: place narratives and place-heritage in Rjukan. Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable

Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 161-175.

Bulkeley et al., 2012. Governing Climate Change Transnationally. Assessing the Evidence from Database of Sixty Initiatives. Environment and Planning C, Vol. 30(4), pp. 591-612.

Czepczynski M. and Czepczynski M. (2015). Heritage resurrection: german heritage in the Southern Baltic cities. Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 132-146.

Chiesi, L., Costa, P, 2015. One strategy, many purposes. A classification for cultural mapping projects. In Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry (MacLennan, D., Garrett-Petts, W.F., Duxbury, N., Eds.), London, Routledge.

Chiesi, L., 2016. Territoriality as appropriation of space. How «engaging with space» frames sociality. In Cultural Sustainability and Regional Development. Theories and practices of territorialisation (Dessein J., Battaglini, E., Horlings, L., Eds.). London, Routledge.

Dragićević Šešić, M., 2006. Shared policies. The Future of Cultural Development. In Dynamics of Communication. New Ways and New Actors (Cvjeticanin, B. Ed.). Zagreb, Culturelink, pp. 103-111.

Connerton, P., 1991. How Societies Remember. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

De Beukelaer, C., Pyykkönen, M., Singh, J.P, 2015. Globalization, culture and development. The Unesco convention on cultural diversity. Palgrave, Macmillan.

Duxbury, N. and Jeannotte, M.S., 2015. Making It Real: Measures of Culture in Local Sustainability Planning and Implementation. In Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement (MacDowall, L., Badham, M., Blomkamp E. and Kim Dunphy, Eds.). Pagrave, MacMillan.

Dessein, J., Battaglini, E., Horlings L., Eds, 2016. Cultural Sustainability and Regional Development. Theories and practices of territorialisation. London, Routledge.

Duxbury, N., Hosagrahar, J., Pascual, J. 2016.Why must culture be at the heart of sustainable urban development? Agenda 21 Culture. United Cities and Local Government UCLG, Available at :
http://www.agenda21culture.net/sites/default/files/files/documents/en/culture_sd_cities_web.pdf

Daković, N., Mijatović, L. R.; Nikolić, M., 2015. From Dissonance to Resilience: The Heritage of Belgrade's Staro Sajmiste. In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 190-201.

Escobar, A., 2001. Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. Political Geography, Vol. 20(2), pp. 139-174

Fairclough, G., 2008. New Heritage, an Introductory Essay: People, Landscape and Change. In The Heritage Reader (Fairclough, G., Harrison, R., Schofield J., Jameson, J.H. Jr.), London, Routledge, pp. 297-312.

Fairclough, G. et al., 2014, The Faro Convention, A New Paradigm for Socially - and Culturally - Sustainable Heritage Action? Култура/Culture, Vol. 1(8), pp. 9-19. Available at: <https://journals.cultcenter.net/index.php/culture/article/view/111>.

Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge.

Gibson, J., 1986. The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception. New York & Hove, Taylor & Francis Group.

Hall, S., 2005.Whose Heritage? Un-settling 'The Heritage', Re-imagining the Post-nation. In The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of 'Race' (Littler, J., Naidoo, R., Eds.), London, Routledge, pp. 21-31.

Hawkes, J., 2001. The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability. Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning. Melbourne, Common Ground Publishing/Cultural Development Network.

Hertzog A. (2015). The challenge of cultural sustainability in city muesums: showing the city and selecting the past in Noyon. In Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 84-95.

Horlings, L.G., 2014. The inner dimension of sustainability: personal and cultural values. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, Vol. 14, pp. 163-169.

Horlings, L.G., 2016. Connecting people to place: sustainable place-shaping practices as transformative power. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, Vol. 20, pp.32–40

Hosagrahar, J., 2017. A History of Heritage Conservation in City Planning. In The Routledge Handbook of Planning History (Hein, C., Ed.). London, Routledge.

Hampton, M. P., 2005. Heritage, Local Communities And Economic Development. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 32 (3) pp. 735–759.

Harrison, R., 2013. Heritage. Critical Approaches. Abington and New York, Routledge.

Hristova, S., Dragićević Šešić, M., Duxbury, N., 2015. Culture and Sustainability in European Cities: Imagining Europolis. London, Routledge.

Johnson H. (2015). Language revitalisation, sonic activism and cultural sustainability: voicing linguistic heritage on Jersey. In Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 117-131.

Kisić, V., 2013. Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies. European Cultural Foundation. Cultural Policy Research Award. Available at: https://www.europanostra.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Governing_Heritage_Dissonance.pdf

Kluckhohn, C., 1951. Values and value-orientations in the theory of action. An exploration in definition and classification. In Toward a General Theory of Action (Parsons, T., Shils, E., Eds). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, pp. 388–433.

Kuhn, T.S., 1962. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Lähdesmäki, T., 2016. Scholarly discussion as engineering the meanings of a European cultural heritage. European Journal of Cultural Studies, Vol. 19 (6), pp. 529-546.

Loach, K., Rowley, J.; Griffiths, J., 2017. Cultural sustainability as a strategy for the survival of museums and libraries. International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 23 (2), pp. 186–198.

Larsen, P.B., Logan, W., Eds., 2018. World Heritage and Sustainable Development. New Directions in World Heritage Management. London, Routledge.

Logan, W., Reeves, K., 2008. Places of Pain and Shame. Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage'. London, Routledge.

Lowenthal, D., 1998. The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Leus, M. , Kosatka, L., 2015. Social sustainability in historic city centres: the Grand Place in Brussels. In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 96-114.

Macdonald, S., 2010. Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond. London, Routledge.

McGuigan, J., 2004. Rethinking Cultural Policy. Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Massey D.1993. Power geometries and a progressive sense of place. In Mapping the futures: local cultures, global changes (Bird, J., Curtis, B., Putnam, T., Robertson, G., Tickner, L., Eds.). Routledge London, 1993.

Massey, D., 2004. Geographies of responsibility. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, Vol. 86 (1), pp. 5-18.

Mercer, C., 2002. Towards Cultural Citizenship. Tools for Cultural Policy and development. Stockholm, Bank of Sweden tercentenary Foundation.

Mettler, S., and SoRelle, M., 2014. Policy Feedback Theory. In Theories of the Policy Process. (Sabatier, P.A., Weible, C.M., Eds). Boulder, CO, Westview Press, pp. 151–181.

Mišetić, A., Ursić, S., 2015. The role of memory in the culturally sustainable development of Dubrovnik (Croatia). In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 69-83.

Mondale C. (1994). Conserving a Problematic Past. In M. Hufford (ed.), Conserving Culture: A New Discourse on Heritage, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Nora, P., 1989. Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. Representations, 26(Spring), pp.7-24.

Oxford Dictionary of English (First edition 1998, 2006 reprinted). Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press.

Palazzo, A., Pugliano, A., 2015. The burden of history: living heritage and everyday life in Rome. In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. Between Past and Future (Auclair, E., Fairclough, G., Eds.). London, Routledge, pp. 54-68.

Pendlebury, J., Townshend, T., Gilroy, R., 2004. The Conservation of English Cultural Built Heritage: A Force for Social Inclusion? Journal International Journal of Heritage Studies, Vol. 10 (1), pp. 11-31.

Pressman, J., Wildavsky, A., 1973. Implementation. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Renan, E., 1995. What is Nation? In The Nationalism Reader (Dahbour, O., Ishay, M.R., Eds.). Amherst, NY, Humanity Book, pp. 143-155.

Richards, G., Hall, D., 2000. Tourism and Sustainable Community Development. London, Routledge.

Ricoeur, P., 2009. Memory, History, Forgetting. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sacco, P.L., 2011. Culture 3.0. A New Perspective for the EU 2014-2020 Structural Funds Programming. on behalf of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC).

Produced for the OMC working Group on Cultural and Creative Industries. Available at: http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2577.pdf

Schofield, J., Szymanski, R., Eds., 2010. Local Heritage, Global Context, Cultural Perspectives on Sense of Place. Farnham, Ashgate.

Smith, L., 2006. Uses of Heritage. London, Routledge.

Soanes, C., Stevenson, A., Eds, 2006. Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press.

Soini, K.; Birkeland, I., 2014. Exploring the scientific discourse on cultural sustainability. Geoforum, Vol. 51, pp. 213–223.

Stevenson, D., 2004. 'Civic Gold' rush. Cultural planning and the politics of the third way. International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 10(1), pp. 119-131.

Stevenson, D., Rowe, D., McKay, K., 2010. Convergence in British Cultural policy. The social, the cultural and the economic. Journal of Art Management, Law and Society, Vol. 40(4), pp. 248-265.

Stimson R.J., Stough R.R., Njikamp P.J. (eds.) 2011, Endogenous Regional Development: Perspectives, Measurement and Empirical Investigation, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar. Assmann J., and Czaplicka J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. New German Critique (65) 125-133.

Vecco, M., Srakar, A.; 2017. Breaking Boundaries - Building Dimensional Relations. On why and how to include culture as a fourth dimension of sustainable development. In Creative Economy Report. Geneva, UNCTAD.

Stylianou-Lambert, T., Boukas, N. and Yerali-Christodoulou M., 2014. Museums and Cultural Sustainability: Stakeholders, Forces and Cultural Policies. International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 20(5), pp. 566-587.

Throsby, D., 2008. Linking ecological and cultural sustainability. The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations, Vol. 8(1), pp. 15-20.

Throsby, D., 2010. The Economics of Cultural Policy. Cambridge UK, University Press.

United Cities and Local Government - UCLG, 2013. Culture, a crucial dimension of development and a key tool for the success of the Post-2015 Agenda. Available at: https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/LG%20Brief%20on%20Culture%20and%20Development%20-%20January%202013%20_2_.pdf

United Nations, 2016. Draft Outcome Document of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III). New York, United Nations. Available at: http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Draft-Outcome-Document-of-Habitat-III-E_29556.pdf

Vanclay, F., 2008. Place matters. In Making Sense of Place (Vanclay, F., Higgins, M., Blackshaw, A., Eds.). Canberra, National Museum of Australia Press, pp. 3-11.

Vanclay, F., Esteves, A.M., Aucamp, I., Franks, D., 2015. Social Impact Assessment: Guidance for Assessing and Managing the Social Impacts of Projects. International Association for Impact Assessment, Fargo ND. Available at: http://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SIA_Guidance_Document_IAIA.pdf

Venice Charter (1964). https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf

Viik T., Kaljundi L., Printsmann A. and Palang H. (2015). Sustainability though alteration: Eastern Baltic manors in the Estonian tradition. In Fairclough, G., Auclair, E., 2015. Heritage and Sustainable Development: Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability. London, Routledge: 147-160.

Waterton, E., Smith, L., 2010. The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. International Journal of Heritage Studies, Vol. 16 (1-2), pp. 4-15.

Wilkinson, S.J, Remøy, H., Eds, 2018. Building Urban Resilience through Change of Use. Hoboken, New Jersey, Wiley-Blackwell.