

CONSERVATION
PRINCIPLES
POLICIES AND GUIDANCE
FOR THE SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT



ENGLISH HERITAGE

FOREWORD

The sustainable management of the historic environment depends on sound principles, clear policies and guidance based on those principles, and the quality of decisions that stem from their consistent application. We need a clear, over-arching philosophical framework of what conservation means at the beginning of the 21st century; and to distil current good practice in casework, given the impending reform of legislation and the need for more integrated practice.

These *Principles, Policies and Guidance* for the sustainable management of the historic environment have been developed through extensive debate and consultation, both within English Heritage and with colleagues in the historic environment sector and beyond. Our main purpose in producing the *Principles, Policies and Guidance* is to strengthen the credibility and consistency of decisions taken and advice given by English Heritage staff, improving our accountability by setting out the framework within which we will make judgements on casework. Our success will also be measured by the extent to which this document is taken up more widely in the sector.

Over time, and in conjunction with legislative reform and improving capacity in the sector, we hope that the document will help to create a progressive framework for managing change in the historic environment that is clear in purpose and sustainable in its application – constructive conservation.



Lord Bruce-Lockhart

Chairman
English Heritage
April 2008

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

Using this document	7
---------------------	---

INTRODUCTION

Aims	13
Terms and concepts	13
Relationship to other policy documents	15
Correlation with current and proposed legislation	16

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: The historic environment is a shared resource	19
Principle 2: Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment	20
Principle 3: Understanding the significance of places is vital	21
Principle 4: Significant places should be managed to sustain their values	22
Principle 5: Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent	23
Principle 6: Documenting and learning from decisions is essential	24

UNDERSTANDING HERITAGE VALUES

Preamble	27
Evidential value	28
Historical value	28
Aesthetic value	30
Communal value	31

ASSESSING HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

Preamble	35
Understand the fabric and evolution of the place	35
Identify who values the place and why they do so	36
Relate identified heritage values to the fabric of the place	37
Consider the relative importance of those identified values	38
Consider the contribution of associated objects and collections	38
Consider the contribution made by setting and context	39
Compare the place with other places sharing similar values	39
Articulate the significance of the place	40

MANAGING CHANGE TO SIGNIFICANT PLACES

Preamble	43
Establish whether there is sufficient information	44
Consider the effects on authenticity and integrity	45
Take account of sustainability	46
Consider the potential reversibility of changes	46
Compare options and make the decision	47
Apply mitigation	47
Monitor and evaluate outcomes	48

ENGLISH HERITAGE CONSERVATION POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Preamble	51
Routine management and maintenance	51
Periodic renewal	52
Repair	52
Intervention to increase knowledge of the past	54
Restoration	55
New work and alteration	58
Integrating conservation with other public interests	60
Enabling development	62

CONCLUSION

Applying the <i>Principles</i>	67
--------------------------------	----

DEFINITIONS

71

Using this document

- 1 English Heritage sets out in this document a logical approach to making decisions and offering guidance about all aspects of England's historic environment. This will help us to ensure consistency in carrying out our role as the Government's statutory advisor on the historic environment.
- 2 As the **Introduction** (pages 13-16) explains, we have avoided using the terminology of current heritage designations. Instead, we have adopted the term 'place' for any part of the historic environment that can be perceived as having a distinct identity.
- 3 The **Conservation Principles** (pages 19-24) provide a comprehensive framework for the sustainable management of the historic environment, under six headlines:
 - Principle 1: The historic environment is a shared resource
 - Principle 2: Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment
 - Principle 3: Understanding the significance of places is vital
 - Principle 4: Significant places should be managed to sustain their values
 - Principle 5: Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent
 - Principle 6: Documenting and learning from decisions is essential
- 4 We define *conservation* (under Principle 4.2) as the process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations.
- 5 **Understanding the values** (pages 27-32) describes a range of *heritage values*, arranged in four groups, which may be attached to places. These are:
 - Evidential value: the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
 - Historical value: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present – it tends to be illustrative or associative.
 - Aesthetic value: the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
 - Communal value: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

- 6 Assessing heritage significance** (pages 35-40) sets out a process for *assessing the heritage significance* of a place:
- Understand the fabric and evolution of the place
 - Identify who values the place, and why they do so
 - Relate identified heritage values to the fabric of the place
 - Consider the relative importance of those identified values
 - Consider the contribution of associated objects and collections
 - Consider the contribution made by setting and context
 - Compare the place with other places sharing similar values
 - Articulate the significance of the place.
- 7 Managing change to significant places** (pages 43-48) explains how to apply the *Principles* in **making decisions** about change to significant places by:
- Establishing whether there is sufficient information to understand the impacts of potential change
 - Considering the effects on authenticity and integrity
 - Taking account of sustainability
 - Considering the potential reversibility of changes
 - Comparing options and making the decision
 - Applying mitigation
 - Monitoring and evaluating outcomes.
- 8 English Heritage Conservation Policies and Guidance** (pages 51-63), a series of *Policies* specific to some common kinds of action, followed by associated *Guidance* on their interpretation. While some of these policies have a close relationship to particular principles, it is important that they are interpreted in the context of the *Principles* as a whole. These policies, which English Heritage will follow, are that:
- 9** The conservation of significant places is founded on **appropriate routine management and maintenance**.
- 10** **Periodic renewal** of elements of a significant place, intended or inherent in the design, is normally desirable unless any harm caused to heritage values would not be recovered over time.
- 11** **Repair** necessary to sustain the heritage values of a significant place is normally desirable if:
- a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impact of the proposals on the significance of the place; and
 - b. the long term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future; and
 - c. the proposals are designed to avoid or minimise harm, if actions necessary to sustain particular heritage values tend to conflict.

- 12 Intervention in significant places primarily to increase knowledge of the past involving material loss of evidential values, should normally be acceptable if:
- a. preservation *in situ* is not reasonably practicable; or
 - b. it is demonstrated that the potential increase in knowledge
 - cannot be achieved using non-destructive techniques; and
 - is unlikely to be achieved at another place whose destruction is inevitable; and
 - is predicted decisively to outweigh the loss of the primary resource.

This policy most commonly applies to research excavation.

- 13 Restoration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:
- a. the heritage values of the elements that would be restored decisively outweigh the values of those that would be lost;
 - b. the work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the place, and is executed in accordance with that evidence;
 - c. the form in which the place currently exists is not the result of an historically-significant event;
 - d. the work proposed respects previous forms of the place;
 - e. the maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable;
- 14 New work or alteration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:
- a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place;
 - b. the proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed;
 - c. the proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future;
 - d. the long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future.

- 15** Changes which would **harm the heritage values of a significant place** should be unacceptable unless:
- a. the changes are demonstrably necessary either to make the place sustainable, or to meet an overriding public policy objective or need;
 - b. there is no reasonably practicable alternative means of doing so without harm;
 - c. that harm has been reduced to the minimum consistent with achieving the objective;
 - d. it has been demonstrated that the predicted public benefit decisively outweighs the harm to the values of the place, considering:
 - its comparative significance,
 - the impact on that significance, and
 - the benefits to the place itself and/or the wider community or society as a whole.
- 16** **Enabling development** to secure the future of a significant place should be unacceptable unless:
- a. it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting
 - b. it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place;
 - c. it will secure the long term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose;
 - d. it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid;
 - e. sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source;
 - f. it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests;
 - g. the public benefit of securing the future of the heritage asset through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies.
- 17** We conclude with a general statement about **Applying the Principles** (page 67), acknowledging that the cultural and natural heritage values of significant places, including those reflected in landscape designations, should be managed in parallel, fostering close working relationships between cultural and natural heritage interests. Finally, we provide a set of key **Definitions** (pages 71-72).

INTRODUCTION

Aims

- 18** The historic environment is central to England's cultural heritage and sense of identity, and hence a resource that should be sustained for the benefit of present and future generations. English Heritage's aim in this document is to set out a logical approach to making decisions and offering guidance about all aspects of the historic environment, and for reconciling its protection with the economic and social needs and aspirations of the people who live in it.
- 19** The *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* are primarily intended to help us to ensure consistency of approach in carrying out our role as the Government's statutory advisor on the historic environment in England. Specifically, they make a contribution to addressing the challenges of modernising heritage protection by proposing an integrated approach to making decisions, based on a common process. The *Principles* look forward to the consolidated framework of heritage protection proposed in the White Paper *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century* (March 2007), but their application is not dependent upon it.
- 20** The *Principles* will inform English Heritage's approach to the management of the historic environment as a whole, including the community engagement, learning and access issues addressed under Principle 2. The *Policies and Guidance* will specifically guide our staff in applying the *Principles* to English Heritage's role in the development process, and in managing the historic sites in our care. We hope, of course, that, like all our guidance, the *Principles* will also be read and used by local authorities, property owners, developers, and their advisers. In due course, the *Principles, Policies and Guidance* will be supported by further, more detailed guidance about particular types of proposal or place, and current English Heritage guidance will make specific reference to them as it is updated.

Terms and concepts

- 21** The practice of recognising, formally protecting and conserving particular aspects of the historic environment has developed along parallel paths, trodden by different professional disciplines. The lack of a common, 'high level' terminology has been a barrier to articulating common principles, and using them to develop a more integrated approach. We have therefore deliberately avoided the specialised terminology of current law and public policy relating to heritage designations, such as 'listed building' and 'scheduled monument'. We use the word 'place' as a proxy for any part of the historic environment, including under the ground or sea, that people (not least practitioners) perceive as having a distinct identity, although recognising that there is no ideal term to cover everything from a shipwreck to a landscape.

- 22 The term 'place' goes beyond physical form, to involve all the characteristics that can contribute to a 'sense of place'. It embraces the idea that places, of any size from a bollard to a building, an historic area, a town, or a region, need to be understood and managed at different levels for different purposes; and that a particular geographical location can form part of several overlapping 'places' defined by different characteristics. Similarly, we have stretched the concept of 'fabric', commonly used to describe the material from which a building is constructed, to include all the material substance of places, including geology, archaeological deposits, structures and buildings, and the flora growing in and upon them. 'Designation' embraces any formal recognition of heritage value, including registration, listing, scheduling and inscription.
- 23 Our approach anticipates the proposed consolidation of national cultural heritage protection and, more importantly, avoids the suggestion that the *Principles* are concerned only with places that meet the particular thresholds of significance necessary for formal international, national or local designation. Beyond heritage designations, in the wider framework of environmental management and spatial planning, an understanding of the heritage values a place may have for its owners, the local community and wider communities of interest should be seen as the basis for making sound decisions about its future.
- 24 Sustainable management of a place begins with understanding and defining how, why, and to what extent it has cultural and natural heritage values: in sum, its significance. Communicating that significance to everyone concerned with a place, particularly those whose actions may affect it, is then essential if all are to act in awareness of its heritage values. Only through understanding the significance of a place is it possible to assess how the qualities that people value are vulnerable to harm or loss. That understanding should then provide the basis for developing and implementing management strategies (including maintenance, cyclical renewal and repair) that will best sustain the heritage values of the place in its setting. Every conservation decision should be based on an understanding of its likely impact on the significance of the fabric and other aspects of the place concerned.

- 25 Our definition of conservation includes the objective of sustaining heritage values. In managing significant places, 'to preserve', even accepting its established legal definition of 'to do no harm', is only one aspect of what is needed to sustain heritage values. The concept of conservation area designation, with its requirement 'to preserve or enhance', also recognises the potential for beneficial change to significant places, to reveal and reinforce value. 'To sustain' embraces both preservation and enhancement to the extent that the values of a place allow. Considered change offers the potential to enhance and add value to places, as well as generating the need to protect their established heritage values. It is the means by which each generation aspires to enrich the historic environment.

Relationship to other policy documents

- 26 Planning Policy Statement 1 *Delivering Sustainable Development* (2005) includes the explicit objective of 'protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment'.¹ In these *Principles, Policies and Guidance*, we provide detailed guidance on sustaining the historic environment within the framework of established government policy. In particular, the document distils from Planning Policy Guidance note (PPG) 15 *Planning and the Historic Environment* (1994) and PPG16 *Archaeology and Planning* (1990) those general principles which are applicable to the historic environment as a whole. It also provides a structure within which other current English Heritage policy and guidance should be applied. The *Policies and Guidance* will be updated to refer to and reflect new heritage legislation and government policy as they emerge, and in the light of experience in use.
- 27 At the international level,² the *Principles* reflect many of the presumptions of the *World Heritage Convention*, with its call to give all natural and cultural heritage a function in the life of communities. The *Principles* are consistent with the *Granada Convention* on the protection of the architectural heritage, and the *Valletta Convention* on the protection of the archaeological heritage, both ratified by the United Kingdom. The *European Landscape Convention*, also ratified by the United Kingdom, has been influential, not least for its definition of a landscape as 'an area, as perceived by people...', and its references to the need to consider sustaining cultural values in managing all landscapes, as well as the importance of public engagement in that process.

¹ See paragraphs 5, 17-18

² *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (UNESCO, 1972)
Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada: Council of Europe, 1985, ETS 121)
European convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Valletta: Council of Europe, 1992, ETS 143)
European Landscape Convention (Florence: Council of Europe, 2000, ETS 176)

Correlation with current and proposed legislation

- 28** The White Paper *Heritage Protection for the 21st Century* (March 2007) proposed a single national *Register of historic buildings and sites of special architectural, historic or archaeological interest*, which will include all those places currently on the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest and the schedule of monuments, the non-statutory registers of historic parks and gardens and of battlefields, and World Heritage Sites (although the latter are designated internationally). 'Historic asset' is the proposed shorthand for registered places, although marine 'historic assets' will remain outside this system. Conservation areas will continue to be designated at local level, alongside non-statutory local designations, and much of the archaeological resource will continue to be managed by policy, rather than designation.
- 29** In the proposed new national system of cultural heritage protection, 'reasons for designation' will set out why each 'historic asset' is above the threshold for designation for its 'architectural, historic or archaeological interest'. Grounds for designation will necessarily be confined to specific values under these headings, directly related to published selection criteria. The statutory basis of designation will, however, be sufficiently broad to embrace the range of values which the *Principles* identify as desirable to take into account in the management of significant places.

Equalities impact assessment

Public bodies are legally required to ensure that their plans, policies and activities do not unfairly discriminate against a group protected by equalities legislation. It is the responsibility of those public bodies for whom we provide advice to ensure that that they have conducted any relevant Equalities Impact Assessment that may be required when implementing the advice of English Heritage.

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

I The historic environment is a shared resource

- I.1** Our environment contains a unique and dynamic record of human activity. It has been shaped by people responding to the surroundings they inherit, and embodies the aspirations, skills and investment of successive generations.
- I.2** People value this historic environment as part of their cultural and natural heritage. It reflects the knowledge, beliefs and traditions of diverse communities. It gives distinctiveness, meaning and quality to the places in which we live, providing a sense of continuity and a source of identity. It is a social and economic asset and a resource for learning and enjoyment.
- I.3** Each generation should therefore shape and sustain the historic environment in ways that allow people to use, enjoy and benefit from it, without compromising the ability of future generations to do the same.
- I.4** Heritage values represent a public interest in places, regardless of ownership. The use of law, public policy and public investment is justified to protect that public interest.
- I.5** Advice and assistance should be available from public sources to help owners sustain the heritage in their stewardship.

2 Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment

- 2.1** Everyone should have the opportunity to contribute his or her knowledge of the value of places, and to participate in decisions about their future, by means that are accessible, inclusive and informed.
- 2.2** Learning is central to sustaining the historic environment. It raises people's awareness and understanding of their heritage, including the varied ways in which its values are perceived by different generations and communities. It encourages informed and active participation in caring for the historic environment.
- 2.3** Experts should use their knowledge and skills to encourage and enable others to learn about, value and care for the historic environment. They play a crucial role in discerning, communicating and sustaining the established values of places, and in helping people to refine and articulate the values they attach to places.
- 2.4** It is essential to develop, maintain and pass on the specialist knowledge and skills necessary to sustain the historic environment.

3 Understanding the significance of places is vital

- 3.1** Any fixed part of the historic environment with a distinctive identity perceived by people can be considered a place.
- 3.2** The significance of a place embraces all the diverse cultural and natural heritage values that people associate with it, or which prompt them to respond to it. These values tend to grow in strength and complexity over time, as understanding deepens and people's perceptions of a place evolve.
- 3.3** In order to identify the significance of a place, it is necessary first to understand its fabric, and how and why it has changed over time; and then to consider:
- who values the place, and why they do so
 - how those values relate to its fabric
 - their relative importance
 - whether associated objects contribute to them
 - the contribution made by the setting and context of the place
 - how the place compares with others sharing similar values.
- 3.4** Understanding and articulating the values and significance of a place is necessary to inform decisions about its future. The degree of significance determines what, if any, protection, including statutory designation, is appropriate under law and policy.

4 Significant places should be managed to sustain their values

4.1 Change in the historic environment is inevitable, caused by natural processes, the wear and tear of use, and people's responses to social, economic and technological change.

4.2 Conservation is the process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations.

4.3 Conservation is achieved by all concerned with a significant place sharing an understanding of its significance, and using that understanding to:

- judge how its heritage values are vulnerable to change
- take the actions and impose the constraints necessary to sustain, reveal and reinforce those values
- mediate between conservation options, if action to sustain one heritage value could conflict with action to sustain another
- ensure that the place retains its authenticity – those attributes and elements which most truthfully reflect and embody the heritage values attached to it.

4.4 Action taken to counter harmful effects of natural change, or to minimise the risk of disaster, should be timely, proportionate to the severity and likelihood of identified consequences, and sustainable.

4.5 Intervention may be justified if it increases understanding of the past, reveals or reinforces particular heritage values of a place, or is necessary to sustain those values for present and future generations, so long as any resulting harm is decisively outweighed by the benefits.

4.6 New work should aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued both now and in the future. This neither implies nor precludes working in traditional or new ways, but should respect the significance of a place in its setting.

5 Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent

- 5.1** Decisions about change in the historic environment demand the application of expertise, experience and judgement, in a consistent, transparent process guided by public policy.
- 5.2** The range and depth of understanding, assessment and public engagement should be sufficient to inform and justify the decision to be made, but efficient in the use of resources. Proportionality should govern the exercise of statutory controls.
- 5.3** Potential conflict between sustaining heritage values of a place and other important public interests should be minimised by seeking the least harmful means of accommodating those interests.
- 5.4** If conflict cannot be avoided, the weight given to heritage values in making the decision should be proportionate to the significance of the place and the impact of the proposed change on that significance.

6 Documenting and learning from decisions is essential

- 6.1** Accessible records of the justification for decisions and the actions that follow them are crucial to maintaining a cumulative account of what has happened to a significant place, and understanding how and why its significance may have been altered.
- 6.2** Managers of significant places should monitor and regularly evaluate the effects of change and responses to it, and use the results to inform future decisions. Public bodies similarly should monitor and respond to the effects on the historic environment of their policies and programmes.
- 6.3** If all or part of a significant place will be lost, whether as a result of decision or inevitable natural process, its potential to yield information about the past should be realised. This requires investigation and analysis, followed by archiving and dissemination of the results, all at a level that reflects its significance.
- 6.4** Where such loss is the direct result of human intervention, the costs of this work should be borne by those who benefit from the change, or whose role it is to initiate such change in the public interest.

UNDERSTANDING HERITAGE VALUES

Preamble

- 30** People may value a place for many reasons beyond utility or personal association: for its distinctive architecture or landscape, the story it can tell about its past, its connection with notable people or events, its landform, flora and fauna, because they find it beautiful or inspiring, or for its role as a focus of a community. These are examples of cultural and natural heritage values in the historic environment that people want to enjoy and sustain for the benefit of present and future generations, at every level from the ‘familiar and cherished local scene’³ to the nationally or internationally significant place.
- 31** Many heritage values are recognised by the statutory designation and regulation of significant places, where a particular value, such as ‘architectural or historic interest’ or ‘scientific interest’, is judged to be ‘special’, that is above a defined threshold of importance. Designation necessarily requires the assessment of the importance of specific heritage values of a place; but decisions about its day-to-day management should take account of *all* the values that contribute to its significance. Moreover, the significance of a place should influence decisions about its future, whether or not it is has statutory designation.
- 32** Although most places of heritage value are used, or are capable of being used, for some practical purpose, the relationship between their utility and their heritage values can range from mutual support (in the normal situation of use justifying appropriate maintenance) to conflict. Places with heritage values can generate wider social and economic (‘instrumental’) benefits, for example as a learning or recreational resource, or as a generator of tourism or inward economic investment, although their potential to do so is affected by external factors, such as ease of access. Utility and market values, and instrumental benefits, are different from heritage values in nature and effect.
- 33** This section is intended to prompt comprehensive thought about the range of inter-related heritage values that may be attached to a place. The high level values range from evidential, which is dependent on the inherited fabric of the place, through historical and aesthetic, to communal values which derive from people’s identification with the place.
- 34** Some values can be appreciated simply as a spontaneous, although culturally influenced, response; but people’s experience of all heritage values tends to be enhanced by specific knowledge about the place.

³ PPG 15, *Planning and the historic environment* (1994), para 1.1.

Evidential value

- 35 Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- 36 Physical remains of past human activity are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them. These remains are part of a record of the past that begins with traces of early humans and continues to be created and destroyed. Their evidential value is proportionate to their potential to contribute to people's understanding of the past.
- 37 In the absence of written records, the material record, particularly archaeological deposits, provides the only source of evidence about the distant past. Age is therefore a strong indicator of relative evidential value, but is not paramount, since the material record is the primary source of evidence about poorly-documented aspects of any period. Geology, landforms, species and habitats similarly have value as sources of information about the evolution of the planet and life upon it.
- 38 Evidential value derives from the physical remains or genetic lines that have been inherited from the past. The ability to understand and interpret the evidence tends to be diminished in proportion to the extent of its removal or replacement.

Historical value

- 39 Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be *illustrative* or *associative*.
- 40 The idea of *illustrating* aspects of history or prehistory – the perception of a place as a link between past and present people – is different from purely evidential value. Illustration depends on visibility in a way that evidential value (for example, of buried remains) does not. Places with illustrative value will normally also have evidential value, but it may be of a different order of importance. An historic building that is one of many similar examples may provide little unique evidence about the past, although each illustrates the intentions of its creators equally well. However, their distribution, like that of planned landscapes, may be of considerable evidential value, as well as demonstrating, for instance, the distinctiveness of regions and aspects of their social organisation.

- 41 Illustrative value has the power to aid interpretation of the past through making connections with, and providing insights into, past communities and their activities through shared experience of a place. The illustrative value of places tends to be greater if they incorporate the first, or only surviving, example of an innovation of consequence, whether related to design, technology or social organisation. The concept is similarly applicable to the natural heritage values of a place, for example geological strata visible in an exposure, the survival of veteran trees, or the observable interdependence of species in a particular habitat. Illustrative value is often described in relation to the subject illustrated, for example, a structural system or a machine might be said to have 'technological value'.
- 42 *Association* with a notable family, person, event, or movement gives historical value a particular resonance. Being at the place where something momentous happened can increase and intensify understanding through linking historical accounts of events with the place where they happened – provided, of course, that the place still retains some semblance of its appearance at the time. The way in which an individual built or furnished their house, or made a garden, often provides insight into their personality, or demonstrates their political or cultural affiliations. It can suggest aspects of their character and motivation that extend, or even contradict, what they or others wrote, or are recorded as having said, at the time, and so also provide evidential value.
- 43 Many buildings and landscapes are associated with the development of other aspects of cultural heritage, such as literature, art, music or film. Recognition of such associative values tends in turn to inform people's responses to these places. Associative value also attaches to places closely connected with the work of people who have made important discoveries or advances in thought about the natural world.
- 44 The historical value of places depends upon both sound identification and direct experience of fabric or landscape that has survived from the past, but is not as easily diminished by change or partial replacement as evidential value. The authenticity of a place indeed often lies in visible evidence of change as a result of people responding to changing circumstances. Historical values are harmed only to the extent that adaptation has obliterated or concealed them, although completeness does tend to strengthen illustrative value.

- 45 The use and appropriate management of a place for its original purpose, for example as a place of recreation or worship, or, like a watermill, as a machine, illustrates the relationship between design and function, and so may make a major contribution to its historical values. If so, cessation of that activity will diminish those values and, in the case of some specialised landscapes and buildings, may essentially destroy them. Conversely, abandonment, as of, for example, a medieval village site, may illustrate important historical events.⁴

Aesthetic value

- 46 Aesthetic value derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- 47 Aesthetic values can be the result of the conscious *design* of a place, including artistic endeavour. Equally, they can be the seemingly *fortuitous* outcome of the way in which a place has evolved and been used over time. Many places combine these two aspects – for example, where the qualities of an already attractive landscape have been reinforced by artifice – while others may inspire awe or fear. Aesthetic values tend to be specific to a time and cultural context, but appreciation of them is not culturally exclusive.
- 48 *Design value* relates primarily to the aesthetic qualities generated by the conscious design of a building, structure or landscape as a whole. It embraces composition (form, proportions, massing, silhouette, views and vistas, circulation) and usually materials or planting, decoration or detailing, and craftsmanship. It may extend to an intellectual programme governing the design (for example, a building as an expression of the Holy Trinity), and the choice or influence of sources from which it was derived. It may be attributed to a known patron, architect, designer, gardener or craftsman (and so have associational value), or be a mature product of a vernacular tradition of building or land management. Strong indicators of importance are quality of design and execution, and innovation, particularly if influential.
- 49 Sustaining design value tends to depend on appropriate stewardship to maintain the integrity of a designed concept, be it landscape, architecture, or structure.
- 50 It can be useful to draw a distinction between design created through detailed instructions (such as architectural drawings) and the direct creation of a work of art by a designer who is also in significant part the craftsman. The value of the artwork is proportionate to the extent that it remains the actual product of the artist's hand. While the difference between design and 'artistic' value can be clear-cut, for example statues on pedestals (artistic value) in a formal garden (design value), it is often far less so, as with repetitive ornament on a medieval building,

⁴ For guidance on the restoration on ruins see para 133, on alterations to sustain use, para 154.

- 51 Some aesthetic values are not substantially the product of formal design, but develop more or less *fortuitously* over time, as the result of a succession of responses within a particular cultural framework. They include, for example, the seemingly organic form of an urban or rural landscape; the relationship of vernacular buildings and structures and their materials to their setting; or a harmonious, expressive or dramatic quality in the juxtaposition of vernacular or industrial buildings and spaces. Design in accordance with Picturesque theory is best considered a design value.
- 52 Aesthetic value resulting from the action of nature on human works, particularly the enhancement of the appearance of a place by the passage of time ('the patina of age'), may overlie the values of a conscious design. It may simply add to the range and depth of values, the significance, of the whole; but on occasion may be in conflict with some of them, for example, when physical damage is caused by vegetation charmingly rooting in masonry.
- 53 While aesthetic values may be related to the age of a place, they may also (apart from artistic value) be amenable to restoration and enhancement. This reality is reflected both in the definition of conservation areas (areas whose 'character or appearance it is desirable to preserve or enhance') and in current practice in the conservation of historic landscapes.

Communal value

- 54 Communal value derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. Communal values are closely bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values, but tend to have additional and specific aspects.
- 55 *Commemorative* and *symbolic* values reflect the meanings of a place for those who draw part of their identity from it, or have emotional links to it. The most obvious examples are war and other memorials raised by community effort, which consciously evoke past lives and events, but some buildings and places, such as the Palace of Westminster, can symbolise wider values. Such values tend to change over time, and are not always affirmative. Some places may be important for reminding us of uncomfortable events, attitudes or periods in England's history. They are important aspects of collective memory and identity, places of remembrance whose meanings should not be forgotten. In some cases, that meaning can only be understood through information and interpretation, whereas, in others, the character of the place itself tells most of the story.

- 56** *Social value* is associated with places that people perceive as a source of identity, distinctiveness, social interaction and coherence. Some may be comparatively modest, acquiring communal significance through the passage of time as a result of a collective memory of stories linked to them. They tend to gain value through the resonance of past events in the present, providing reference points for a community's identity or sense of itself. They may have fulfilled a community function that has generated a deeper attachment, or shaped some aspect of community behaviour or attitudes. Social value can also be expressed on a large scale, with great time-depth, through regional and national identity.
- 57** The social values of places are not always clearly recognised by those who share them, and may only be articulated when the future of a place is threatened. They may relate to an activity that is associated with the place, rather than with its physical fabric. The social value of a place may indeed have no direct relationship to any formal historical or aesthetic values that may have been ascribed to it.
- 58** Compared with other heritage values, social values tend to be less dependent on the survival of historic fabric. They may survive the replacement of the original physical structure, so long as its key social and cultural characteristics are maintained; and can be the popular driving force for the re-creation of lost (and often deliberately destroyed or desecrated) places with high symbolic value, although this is rare in England.
- 59** Spiritual value attached to places can emanate from the beliefs and teachings of an organised religion, or reflect past or present-day perceptions of the spirit of place. It includes the sense of inspiration and wonder that can arise from personal contact with places long revered, or newly revealed.
- 60** Spiritual value is often associated with places sanctified by longstanding veneration or worship, or wild places with few obvious signs of modern life. Their value is generally dependent on the perceived survival of the historic fabric or character of the place, and can be extremely sensitive to modest changes to that character, particularly to the activities that happen there.

Preamble

- 61 Understanding a place and assessing its significance demands the application of a systematic and consistent process, which is appropriate and proportionate in scope and depth to the decision to be made, or the purpose of the assessment. This section sets out such a process, which can be applied not only to places already acknowledged as significant, but also to those where the potential for change generates the need for assessment. Not all stages will be applicable to all places.

Understand the fabric and evolution of the place

- 62 To identify the cultural and natural heritage values of a place, its history, fabric and character must first be understood. This should include its origins, how and why it has changed over time (and will continue to change if undisturbed), the form and condition of its constituent elements and materials, the technology of its construction, any habitats it provides, and comparison with similar places. Its history of ownership may be relevant, not only to its heritage values, but also to its current state.
- 63 The study of material remains alone will rarely provide sufficient understanding of a place. The information gained will need to be set in the context of knowledge of the social and cultural circumstances that produced the place. Documentation underpinning any existing statutory designations is also important. Historical and archaeological archives always help with understanding how and why the place has changed over time, as may personal recollections, which can be fundamental to identifying some historical and communal values. Published research frameworks may highlight particular aspects of evidential value or potential, but absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, especially of concealed or buried remains.
- 64 Historic Environment Records play a vital role in developing a comprehensive and dynamic information resource, both for understanding particular places and as a wider research tool. Key elements of documentation generated through understanding places, and making changes to significant places, should be copied to Historic Environment Records, as well as remaining accessible to everyone directly concerned with the place.

- 65 Extensive mapping, description, understanding and assessment – ‘characterisation’ – can facilitate rapid analysis of large areas, both urban and rural. Its aim is to help people recognise how the past has shaped the present landscape, by identifying the distinctive historic elements of an area, and explaining past contexts of particular places within it.⁵

Identify who values the place, and why they do so

- 66 To provide a sound basis for management, the people and communities who are likely to attach heritage values to a place should be identified, and the range of those values understood and articulated, not just those that may be a focus of contention. This involves engaging with owners, communities and specialists with a sufficient range of knowledge of the place, subject to the need for proportionality.
- 67 Different people and communities may attach different weight to the same heritage values of a place at the same time. Experience shows that judgements about heritage values, especially those relating to the recent past, tend to grow in strength and complexity over time, as people’s perceptions of a place evolve. It is therefore necessary to consider whether a place might be so valued in the future that it should be protected now.
- 68 Understanding the history of a place does not necessarily make it significant; but the process of investigation often generates and helps to define perceptions of heritage value. This may happen through physical or documentary discoveries, or dialogue; but equally may be prompted by the articulation of links between the qualities of a particular place and the evolution of the culture that produced it, or the events that happened there.

⁵ See *Boundless Horizons: Historic Landscape Characterisation* and *Using Historic Landscape Characterisation* (English Heritage, 2004) and at a more detailed level, *Guidance on conservation area appraisals* (English Heritage, 2006).

Relate identified heritage values to the fabric of the place

- 69** An assessment of significance will normally need to identify how particular parts of a place and different periods in its evolution contribute to, or detract from, each identified strand of cultural and natural heritage value. This is current practice in statutory designation, in relation to those particular values that are the basis of selection. The most useful categories for differentiating between the components of a place ('what') are temporal ('when', often linked to 'by whom') and spatial ('where', 'which part', often linked to 'why'). Understanding a place should produce a chronological sequence of varying precision, allowing its surviving elements to be ascribed to 'phases' in its evolution. Some phases are likely to be of greater significance than others, while some values, such as historical or communal, will apply to the place as a whole. For example:

'The evidential value and potential of Smith's Hall lies primarily in the timber-framed elements of the medieval hall house and 16th century cross-wing, and to a moderate extent in the 18th century alterations and partial casing. The latter is, however, of high architectural value, marred by superficial 19th century accretions, but complemented by a study extension of c1970 by A Architect. The contemporary garden is an outstanding design, integrating framework, sculpture and planting. The building well illustrates a regionally typical pattern of development from a medieval core, and its historical value is enhanced by its association with the writer A Wordsmith who commissioned the study and garden. Since his death Smith's Hall has developed as a creative writing centre and the focus of an annual literary festival'.⁶

- 70** In other cases, differentiation will be spatial, for example:

'The street block of the factory was designed by A N Other to demonstrate the architectural potential of the company's terracotta; it is a bold and well-proportioned design which was followed by others in the district. Its architectural value is reinforced by the technological [*ie illustrative historical*] value of the fireproof construction of the floors using hollow pots. The rear block, although it followed soon afterwards, is by contrast architecturally entirely typical of its date and place. While of lesser architectural value, it and the other buildings on the site, each of which fulfilled a specific role in the manufacturing process, are collectively of high evidential and historical value.'

- 71** In many cases, differentiation will be a combination of the spatial and the temporal. It will normally best be illustrated by maps or plans showing the age and relative significance of the components or character areas of a place. Where the assessment is prompted by potential change, it is important that elements that would be directly affected are addressed at an appropriate level of detail, but always in relation to the place as a whole.

⁶ As a result of which it may also acquire social value over time.

Consider the relative importance of those identified values

- 72** It is normally desirable to sustain all the identified heritage values of a place, both cultural and natural; but on occasion, what is necessary to sustain some values will conflict with what is necessary to sustain others (paragraphs 91-92). If so, understanding the relative contribution of each identified heritage value to the overall value of the place – its significance – will be essential to objective decision-making. A balanced view is best arrived at through enabling all interested parties to appreciate their differing perspectives and priorities.
- 73** As the 'Smith's Hall' example above demonstrates, some elements of a place may actually mar or conceal its significance. Identifying these is current good practice in statutory designation, both national and local, the latter through conservation area character appraisals. Eliminating or mitigating negative characteristics may help to reveal or reinforce heritage values of a place and thus its significance.

Consider the contribution of associated objects and collections

- 74** Historically-associated objects can make a major contribution to the significance of a place, and association with the place can add heritage value to those objects. The range includes, but is not limited to, artefacts recovered through archaeological fieldwork, artworks and furnishings, collections, tools and machinery, and related archives, both historical and archaeological. The value of the whole is usually more than the sum of the parts, so that permanent separation devalues both place and objects. The contribution of such objects and archives, including evolving collections, should be articulated, even if they are currently held elsewhere, and regardless of whether their contribution falls within the scope of statutory protection.
- 75** Where places have been created around accumulated collections (for example, museums or libraries), the interior of a room or part of a garden has been designed as an entity (including a specific collection of furniture or sculpture, as well as fixed elements), or where an industrial building was designed around or to accommodate particular machinery, the relationship between the objects or elements and the place is fundamental to the significance of the place.

Consider the contribution made by setting and context

- 76** 'Setting' is an established concept that relates to the surroundings in which a place is experienced, its local context, embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape. Definition of the setting of a significant place will normally be guided by the extent to which material change within it could affect (enhance or diminish) the place's significance.
- 77** 'Context' embraces any relationship between a place and other places. It can be, for example, cultural, intellectual, spatial or functional, so any one place can have a multi-layered context. The range of contextual relationships of a place will normally emerge from an understanding of its origins and evolution. Understanding context is particularly relevant to assessing whether a place has greater value for being part of a larger entity, or sharing characteristics with other places.

Compare the place with other places sharing similar values

- 78** Understanding the importance of a place by comparing it with other places that demonstrate similar values normally involves considering:
- how strongly are the identified heritage values demonstrated or represented by the place, compared with those other places?
 - how do its values relate to statutory designation criteria, and any existing statutory designations of the place?
- 79** Designation at an international, national or local level is an indicator of the importance of particular value(s) of a place; but the absence of statutory designation does not necessarily imply lack of significance. Detailed research and analysis may reveal new evidence about any place, and designation criteria are reviewed from time to time. The heritage values of a place established through detailed study should therefore normally be compared with current selection criteria for designation or the application of protective policies.

- 80** Value-based judgements about elements of the historic environment have implications both for places and for everyone with an interest in them. Such judgements provide the basis for decisions about whether, or to what extent, a place should be conserved, rather than remade or replaced. Designation forms the basis of the statutory system of heritage protection. It may have important financial and other consequences for owners, while the refusal to designate may mean the loss of a place to which some people attached considerable significance. Consistency of judgement is therefore crucial to the public acceptability and fairness of the process. Detailed criteria for statutory designation, periodically updated,⁷ and a methodical articulation of how a particular place does or does not meet such criteria, make a major contribution to achieving that consistency.
- 81** The fact that a place does not meet current criteria for formal designation does not negate the values it may have to particular communities. Such values should be taken into account in making decisions about its future through the spatial planning system,⁸ or incentive schemes like Environmental Stewardship.

Articulate the significance of the place

- 82** A 'statement of significance' of a place should be a summary of the cultural and natural heritage values currently attached to it and how they inter-relate, which distils the particular character of the place. It should explain the relative importance of the heritage values of the place (where appropriate, by reference to criteria for statutory designation), how they relate to its physical fabric, the extent of any uncertainty about its values (particularly in relation to potential for hidden or buried elements), and identify any tensions between potentially conflicting values. So far as possible, it should be agreed by all who have an interest in the place. The result should guide all decisions about material change to a significant place.
- 83** Assessments in support of a decision that a place passes the threshold for statutory designation for a particular value normally stand the test of time. However, the values of a place tend to extend beyond those which justify designation, and to grow in strength and complexity as time passes (Principle 3.3). A statement of significance is an informed and inclusive judgement made on a particular set of data, applying prevailing perceptions of value, primarily to inform the management of a significant place. The statement will therefore need review in the light of new information, and periodically to reflect evolving perceptions of value (Principle 3.4).

⁷ Communities and Local Government Circular 01/2007, *Revision to principles of selection for listing buildings* complemented by detailed *Selection Guides* for particular building types produced by English Heritage, are a major step towards achieving this objective for listed buildings.

⁸ In line with the *European Landscape Convention*, Articles 5, 6.

MANAGING CHANGE
TO SIGNIFICANT
PLACES

Preamble

- 84** Conservation involves people managing change to a significant place in its setting, in ways that sustain, reveal or reinforce its cultural and natural heritage values (Principle 4.2). Conservation is not limited to physical intervention, for it includes such activities as the interpretation and sustainable use of places. It may simply involve maintaining the *status quo*, intervening only as necessary to counter the effects of growth and decay, but equally may be achieved through major interventions; it can be active as well as reactive. Change to a significant place is inevitable, if only as a result of the passage of time, but can be neutral or beneficial in its effect on heritage values. It is only harmful if (and to the extent that) significance is eroded.
- 85** The public interest in significant places is recognised through specific legislative and policy constraints on their owners, but there are few fiscal concessions to encourage conservation, and direct financial assistance is very limited. It is the potential of significant places to be used and enjoyed that generates value in the market or to a community, and so tends to motivate and enable their owners to exercise positive, informed stewardship. Very few significant places can be maintained at either public or private expense unless they are capable of some beneficial use; nor would it be desirable, even if it were practical, for most places that people value to become solely memorials of the past.
- 86** Keeping a significant place in use is likely to require continual adaptation and change; but, provided such interventions respect the values of the place, they will tend to benefit public (heritage) as well as private interests in it. Many places now valued as part of the historic environment exist because of past patronage and private investment, and the work of successive generations often contributes to their significance. Owners and managers of significant places should not be discouraged from adding further layers of potential future interest and value, provided that recognised heritage values are not eroded or compromised in the process.
- 87** The shared public and private interest in sustaining significant places in use demands mutual co-operation and respect between owners or managers and regulators. The best use for a significant place – its 'optimum viable use'⁹ – is one that is both capable of sustaining the place and avoids or minimises harm to its values in its setting. It is not necessarily the most profitable use if that would entail greater harm than other viable uses.

⁹ PPG 15, paragraph 3.9, in the context of listed buildings, but the principle is applicable to most significant places.

- 88 Decisions about change to significant places may be influenced by a range of interests. They may involve balancing the heritage value(s) of what exists now against the predicted benefits and disbenefits of the proposed intervention; that is to say, the public interest in the historic environment (which, if statutorily protected, is subject to a policy presumption in favour of preservation), with other, usually inter-related, public and private interests. There is rarely a single right answer, so adequate information and adopting a consistent, rigorous process are crucial to reaching publicly-justifiable decisions.

Establish whether there is sufficient information

- 89 Understanding the impacts or consequences of proposed change should go beyond implications that are immediately apparent; for example, how much physical intervention would really be required to implement a proposal or a change of use? Specific investigation is often required, not only of ongoing processes of growth, change and decay, and other factors which may make the significance of the place vulnerable to harm or loss, but also of technical information about all the implications of a potential change, and often of the methods by which it would be achieved.
- 90 Having understood the scope of continuing or proposed change, sufficient information about the values of the elements of the place that would be affected is essential. The general process of assessing values and significance is addressed above (paragraphs 61-65). But detailed, targeted investigation and evaluation may be required, particularly of habitats, and of potential buried archaeological deposits or concealed structure, in order adequately to establish the contribution they make to the significance of the place. If required as part of a statutory process, such research must, however, be directly and proportionately related to the nature of proposal and its potential effects.

Consider the effects on authenticity and integrity

- 91** Evidential value, historical values and some aesthetic values, especially artistic ones, are dependent upon a place retaining (to varying degrees) the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past; but authenticity lies in whatever most truthfully reflects and embodies the values attached to the place (Principle 4.3). It can therefore relate to, for example, design or function, as well as fabric. Design values, particularly those associated with landscapes or buildings, may be harmed by losses resulting from disaster or physical decay, or through ill-considered alteration or accretion. Design value may be recoverable through repair or restoration, but perhaps at the expense of some evidential value. Keeping a large machine, like a water mill or boat lift, in use, may require replacement and modification of structural or moving parts which could be retained if it ceased to operate, producing a tension between authenticity of fabric and function.
- 92** The decision as to which value should prevail if all cannot be fully sustained always requires a comprehensive understanding of the range and relative importance of the heritage values involved (guided by the assessment of significance: paragraphs 82-83), and what is necessary (and possible) to sustain each of them. Retaining the authenticity of a place is not always achieved by retaining as much of the existing fabric as is technically possible.
- 93** A desire to retain authenticity tends to suggest that any deliberate change to a significant place should be distinguishable, that is, its extent should be discernible through inspection. The degree of distinction that is appropriate must take account of the aesthetic values of the place. In repair and restoration, a subtle difference between new and existing, comparable to that often adopted in the presentation of damaged paintings, is more likely to retain the coherence of the whole than jarring contrast.
- 94** Integrity (literally, 'wholeness, honesty') can apply, for example, to a structural system, a design concept, the way materials or plants are used, the character of a place, artistic creation, or functionality. Decisions about recovering any aspect of integrity that has been compromised must, like authenticity, depend upon a comprehensive understanding of the values of the place, particularly the values of what might be lost in the process.
- 95** Every place is unique in its combination of heritage values, so, while it is technically possible to relocate some structures, their significance tends to be diminished by separation from their historic location. There are exceptions, for example public sculpture not significantly associated with its current site, or moving a structure back from an eroding cliff edge, thus recovering its intended relationship with the landform. Relocated structures may also acquire new values in a new location.

Take account of sustainability

- 96** Significant places should be used and managed in ways that will, wherever possible, ensure that their significance can be appreciated by generations to come, an established aspect of stewardship. Sustaining the value of the historic environment as a whole depends also on creating in the present the heritage of the future, through changes that enhance and enrich the values of places. Both objectives involve the difficult task of anticipating the heritage values of future generations, as well as understanding those of our own.
- 97** Sustaining heritage values is likely to contribute to environmental sustainability, not least because much of the historic environment was designed for a comparatively low-energy economy. Many historic settlements and neighbourhoods, tending towards high density and mixed use, provide a model of sustainable development. Traditional landscape management patterns have been sustained over centuries. Many traditional buildings and building materials are durable, and perform well in terms of the energy needed to make and use them. Their removal and replacement would require a major reinvestment of energy and resources.
- 98** The re-use of sound materials derived from the place being repaired or altered is traditional practice and contributes to the sustainable use of energy and material resources. Mixing old and new materials in exposed situations, however, may be inadvisable. Maintaining demand for new traditional and local materials will also stimulate their continued or renewed production, and help to ensure a sustainable supply and the craft skills to utilise it.
- 99** The re-use of sound traditional materials recovered from alteration and demolition elsewhere can also contribute to sustainability, provided they are not derived from degrading other significant places primarily because of the value of their materials.

Consider the potential reversibility of changes

- 100** In reality, our ability to judge the long-term impact of changes on the significance of a place is limited. Interventions may not perform as expected. As perceptions of significance evolve, future generations may not consider their effect on heritage values positive. It is therefore desirable that changes, for example those to improve energy efficiency in historic buildings, are capable of being reversed, in order not unduly to prejudice options for the future.

- I01** However, places should not be rendered incapable of a sustainable use simply because of a reluctance to make modest, but irreversible, changes. It is also unreasonable to take the idea of reversibility to the point that intervention in significant places diminishes their aesthetic values by appearing contrived, awkward or ugly, in order to ensure that it can be undone. Unless of very short duration, crude and intrusive changes are certainly not justifiable simply because they are theoretically temporary or reversible, for they risk becoming permanent.

Compare options and make the decision

- I02** Ideally, proposed changes will cause no harm to any of the values of the place, and the right decision will be obvious. In practice, however, there tend to be options for achieving the objective of proposed change, each of which will have different impacts on values. The predicted long-term or permanent consequences of proposals (in terms of degree, and whether positive, negative or neutral) on each of the identified heritage values of a place, and thus on the significance of the whole, should provide the reasoned basis for a decision, where necessary taking other interests into account.
- I03** Where there are options for the conservation management of change, or reconciling conservation and other interests, 'heritage impact assessment' can be used to compare the predicted effects of alternative courses of action (including taking no action) on the values of a place, in order to identify the optimum solution. The approach can be refined by weighting different values to reflect their relative importance for the place and its significance. Heritage impact assessment can be particularly useful if applied at the conceptual stage of a proposal, and refined at each successive step towards making a decision.

Apply mitigation

- I04** If some negative impact or loss of fabric is unavoidable, mitigation should be considered to minimise harm. This will normally include making records and archiving parts of significant elements, including archaeological deposits, that will be removed or altered prior to and during the work, in accordance with Principles 6.3 and 6.4. A high quality of design of proposed interventions is not mitigation; it is essential in any significant place (Principle 4.6), regardless of any unavoidable harm. Mitigation should not be confused with compensation – non-essential benefits to other aspects of the place, or to other heritage interests.

Monitor and evaluate outcomes

- I05** Monitoring implementation helps to ensure that outcomes reflect expectations. If, despite prior investigation, the unexpected is revealed during implementation, proposals should, so far as is reasonably possible, be amended to minimise harm.
- I06** The management of significant places should include regular monitoring and evaluation of the effects of change, in accordance with Principles 6.1 and 6.2. This provides the basis for action to address ongoing change (including action by authorities to mitigate the effects of deliberate neglect). Outcomes of decisions can be compared with expectations, often revealing unanticipated consequences, and informing future policy and decisions.
- I07** Conservation management plans, regularly reviewed, can provide a sound framework for the management of significant places, particularly those in responsible long-term ownership.

ENGLISH HERITAGE
CONSERVATION
POLICIES AND
GUIDANCE

Preamble

- 108** This section summarises the policies that will guide English Heritage in offering advice or making decisions about particular types of change affecting significant places. More than one type of change may of course be included in any particular proposal. English Heritage is primarily concerned with the effect of proposals on the heritage values of places, and its policies are framed accordingly.
- 109** While some of the policies have a close relationship to particular principles (for example 'New work and alteration' to Principle 4.6), it is important that all the policies are interpreted in the framework of the *Principles* as a whole.
- 110** Tension between conservation and other public policies usually arises from a perceived need to harm the heritage values of a place in order to achieve another important public policy objective, or to sustain the place itself (paragraph 150). The converse is 'enabling development' contrary to public policy, which is proposed in order to sustain a significant place (paragraph 158). In both cases, it is important to keep a sense of proportion, and not automatically to assume that cultural or natural heritage values must prevail over all other public interests. Such tensions are usually best reconciled by integrating conservation with the other public interests through dialogue, based on mutual understanding and respect.

Routine management and maintenance

- 111** **The conservation of significant places is founded on appropriate routine management and maintenance.**
- 112** The values of landscapes and buildings tend to be quickly obscured or lost if long-standing management and maintenance regimes are discontinued. Such regimes are often closely linked to historic design, function and stewardship, and dependent on traditional processes and materials. Since most habitats in England are the result of long-established land management practices, sustaining their ecosystems can depend upon continuing those practices. Reinstating a lapsed regime can help to recover both cultural and natural heritage values.
- 113** Regular monitoring should inform continual improvement of planned maintenance and identify the need for periodic repair or renewal at an early stage. If a permanent solution to identified problems is not immediately possible, temporary works should be undertaken to prevent the problems from escalating. Temporary solutions should be effective, timely and reversible.

Periodic renewal

- I 14** Periodic renewal of elements of a significant place, intended or inherent in the design, is normally desirable unless any harm caused to heritage values would not be recovered over time.
- I 15** Periodic renewal, such as re-covering roofs, differs from maintenance in that it occurs on a longer cycle, is usually more drastic in nature and often has a greater visual impact. It involves the temporary loss of certain heritage values, such as the aesthetic value of the patina of age on an old roof covering, or the value of a dying tree as a habitat for invertebrates; but these values are likely to return within the next cycle, provided the replacement is physically and visually compatible (normally 'like for like', to the extent that this is sustainable). By contrast, the consequence of not undertaking periodic renewal is normally more extensive loss of both fabric and heritage values.
- I 16** The justification required for periodic renewal will normally be that the fabric concerned is becoming incapable of fulfilling its intended functions through more limited intervention; and additionally, in the case of landscapes, that succession planting cannot achieve the objective in a less drastic way. Harm to values that will normally be recovered during the next cycle can, in most cases, be discounted, but potential permanent harm cannot be ignored in making the decision.

Repair

- I 17** Repair necessary to sustain the heritage values of a significant place is normally desirable if:
- a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposals on the significance of the place; and
 - b. the long term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future; and
 - c. the proposals are designed to avoid or minimise harm, if actions necessary to sustain particular heritage values tend to conflict.
- I 18** It is important to look beyond the immediate need for action, to understand the reasons for the need for repair and plan for the long-term consequences of inevitable change and decay. While sufficient work should be undertaken to achieve a lasting repair, the extent of the repair should normally be limited to what is reasonably necessary to make failing elements sound and capable of continuing to fulfil their intended functions.

- I19** The use of materials or techniques with a lifespan that is predictable from past performance, and which are close matches for those being repaired or replaced, tends to carry a low risk of future harm or premature failure. By contrast, the longer term effects of using materials or techniques that are innovative and relatively untested are much less certain. Not all historic building materials or techniques were durable – iron cramps in masonry, or un-galvanised steel windows, for example, are both subject to corrosion. Some structural failures are the inevitable, if slowly developing, consequences of the original method of construction. Once failure occurs, stabilising the structure depends on addressing the underlying causes of the problem, not perpetuating inherent faults.
- I20** The use of original materials and techniques for repair can sometimes destroy more of the original fabric, and any decoration it carries, than the introduction of reinforcing or superficially protective modern materials. These may offer the optimum conservation solution if they allow more significant original fabric to be retained. In historic landscapes, planting may need to utilise alternative species, to resist disease or the effects of climate change. Before making decisions, it is essential to understand all the heritage values of the elements concerned, and to consider the longer term, as well as the immediate, conservation objectives.
- I21** Sometimes, the action necessary to sustain or reinforce one heritage value can be incompatible with the actions necessary to sustain others. Understanding the range, inter-relationships and relative importance of the heritage values associated with a place should establish priorities for reconciling or balancing such tensions. While every reasonable effort should be made to avoid or minimise potential conflict, contrived solutions requiring intensive maintenance are likely to be difficult to sustain.

Intervention to increase knowledge of the past

- I22** Intervention in significant places primarily to increase knowledge of the past, involving material loss of evidential values, should normally be acceptable if:
- a. preservation *in situ* is not reasonably practicable; or
 - b. it is demonstrated that the potential increase in knowledge
 - cannot be achieved using non-destructive techniques; and
 - is unlikely to be achieved at another place whose destruction is inevitable; and
 - is predicted decisively to outweigh the loss of the primary resource.

If acceptable, an intervention demands:

- c. a skilled team, with the resources to implement a project design based on explicit research objectives;
 - d. funded arrangements for the subsequent conservation and public deposit of the site archive, and for appropriate analysis and dissemination of the results within a set timetable;
 - e. a strategy to ensure that other elements and values of the place are not prejudiced by the work, whether at the time or subsequently, including conservation of any elements left exposed.
- I23** The historic environment provides a unique record of past human activity, but differs from written archives in that 'reading' some parts of it can only be achieved through the destruction of the primary record. This policy applies particularly to the excavation of buried archaeological deposits, but can be relevant to the physical investigation of structures. It concerns intervention that goes beyond the evaluation and targeted investigation that may be necessary to inform and justify conservation management decisions.
- I24** The continuing development of investigative techniques suggests that, in future, it will be possible to extract more data from excavation and intervention than is currently possible, just as now it is usual to extract much more information than was possible a few decades ago. This demands a cautious approach to the use of a finite resource, and seeking to avoid loss of integrity, but it cannot reasonably exclude all research at a significant place. It must be recognised that much of the evidential value of the primary archive – the place itself – lies in its potential to increase knowledge of the past, to help protect the place and other similar places by a better understanding of their significance, to stimulate research, to encourage the further development of techniques to extract data, and to train successive generations of archaeologists.

- I25** Intervention must be justified primarily by considering the potential gain in knowledge in relation to the impact on the archaeological resource, and specifically on the place or type of site in question. Established, relevant research framework priorities should be taken into account. Intervention should always be the minimum necessary to achieve the research objectives, fully utilising the potential of non-destructive techniques; but also extensive enough to ensure that the full research potential of what is necessarily to be destroyed in the process can be realised.

Restoration

- I26** Restoration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:
- a. the heritage values of the elements that would be restored decisively outweigh the values of those that would be lost;
 - b. the work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the place, and is executed in accordance with that evidence;
 - c. the form in which the place currently exists is not the result of an historically-significant event;
 - d. the work proposed respects previous forms of the place;
 - e. the maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable.
- I27** Restoration is intervention made with the deliberate intention of revealing or recovering a known element of heritage value that has been eroded, obscured or previously removed, rather than simply maintaining the *status quo*. It may also achieve other conservation benefits, for example restoring a roof on a roofless building may make it both physically and economically sustainable in the long term. Restoration of some elements of a place may be a desirable precursor to the introduction of new work (paragraph I38), which will necessarily take over where the evidence for restoration ends.
- I28** The concept of authenticity (paragraph 91) demands that proposals for restoration always require particularly careful justification. Reinstating damaged elements of work directly created by the hand of an artist normally runs counter to the idea of authenticity and integrity. However, the reinstatement of damaged architectural or landscape features in accordance with an historic design evidenced by the fabric of a place may not do so, if the design itself was the artistic creation, intended to be constructed by others, and the necessary materials and skills are available.
- I29** Mitigation through recording (paragraph I04) is particularly important in restoration work. The results should be integrated with and used to update the initial analysis of the evidence for restoration (which will often be expanded and modified in detail during the early stages of work), and the result deposited in the appropriate Historic Environment Record.

‘The heritage values of the elements that would be restored decisively outweigh the values of those that would be lost.’

- I30** Any restoration inevitably removes or obscures part of the record of past change to a significant place, and so reduces its evidential value, as well as potentially affecting its historical and aesthetic values. Restoration may, however, bring gains by revealing other heritage values, such as the integrity and quality of an earlier and more important phase in the evolution of a place, which makes a particular contribution to its significance. Careful assessment of the values of the elements affected is essential. Where the significance of a place is the result of centuries of change, restoration to some earlier stage in its evolution is most unlikely to meet this criterion.

‘The nature of the work proposed is justified by compelling evidence of the evolution of the place, and is executed in accordance with that evidence’.

- I31** Evidence of the evolution of the place, and particularly of the phase to which restoration is proposed, should be drawn from all available sources – from study of the fabric of the place itself (the primary record of its evolution), any documentation of the original design and construction process, and subsequent archival sources, including records of previous interventions. The results of this research and the reasoned conclusions drawn from it should be clearly set out.
- I32** Speculative or generalised re-creation should not be presented as an authentic part of a place: the criteria for new work should apply to its design. But judgement is needed in determining the level of information specific to the place required to justify restoration. For example, reinstatement of an historic garden requires compelling evidence of its planned layout and hard materials, usually based upon or verified by archaeological investigation, and the structure of its planting; but it would be neither essential nor possible to replicate the precise location of every plant once within the garden.

‘The form in which the place currently exists is not the result of an historically-significant event’.

- I33** If a building or structure was ruined or its character fundamentally changed as a consequence of an important historical event, its subsequent state will contribute to its significance: castles slighted in the Civil War, or monastic houses unroofed at the Dissolution, provide examples. In the wake of such episodes, some places were ruined, some cleared away completely, and others repaired and adapted for new purposes. Attempts to restore those exceptional places that have survived as ruins would deny their strong visual and emotional evidence of important historic events. Ruins – real or contrived – can also play a major role in designed landscapes, define the character of places, or be celebrated in art. Even so, their restoration or adaptive re-use may be justified if the alternative is loss.

- I34** The response to dramatic contemporary events which may ultimately come to be seen as historically significant – to memorialise, rebuild or redevelop – tends to be driven by public debate. If the place involved was not previously considered significant, such debate may be regarded solely as part of the event. Physical sustainability and changing values will, however, tend to influence the medium- to long-term future of memorialised ruins of comparatively modern buildings, or the scars of conflict.
- I35** By contrast, neglect and decay, abandonment, including the removal of roofs, crude adaptation for transient uses, accidental fires and similar circumstances are not normally historically-significant events, and subsequent restoration of the damaged parts of the place, even after a long interval, will not fail this test. Retaining gutted shells as monuments is not likely, in most cases, to be an effective means of conserving surviving fabric, especially internal fabric never intended to withstand weathering; nor is this approach likely to be economically sustainable. In such cases, it is appropriate to restore to the extent that the evidence allows, and thereafter to apply the policy for new work (paragraph I38).
- I36** **‘The work proposed respects previous forms of the place’**
The more radical the restoration, the more likely it is to introduce an element of incongruity. The reversal of relatively minor but harmful changes, to restore a place to a form in which it recently existed as a complete entity, is unlikely to contradict this criterion. By contrast, the restoration of isolated parts of a place to an earlier form, except as legible elements of an otherwise new design, would produce an apparently historic entity that had never previously existed, which would lack integrity.
- I37** **‘The maintenance implications of the proposed restoration are considered to be sustainable’**
It is essential to consider the long term implications of a proposed restoration for viability and sustainability. If, for instance, a place or part of it was modified primarily in order to reduce maintenance costs, restoration without considering the increased resources needed for maintenance is likely to be counter-productive. The reinstatement of elaborate parterres in historic gardens is an obvious example, but others can have more serious consequences. For example, reversing a ‘crown flat’ – a flat roof inserted between ridges to eliminate a valley gutter in an historic roof – will lead to rapid decay if the restored valley gutter is not readily accessible and adequately maintained.

New work and alteration

- I38** New work or alteration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:
- there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place;
 - the proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed;
 - the proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future;
 - the long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future.

- I39** The recognition of the public interest in heritage values is not in conflict with innovation, which can help to create the heritage of the future. Innovation is essential to sustaining cultural values in the historic environment for present and future generations, but should not be achieved at the expense of places of established value.

‘The proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed’

- I40** The greater the range and strength of heritage values attached to a place, the less opportunity there may be for change, but few places are so sensitive that they, or their settings, present no opportunities for change. Places whose significance stems essentially from the coherent expression of their particular cultural heritage values can be harmed by interventions of a radically different nature.

- I41** Quality of design, materials, detailing and execution is obviously essential in places of established value. Conversely, places of lesser significance offer the greatest opportunity for the creation of the heritage values of tomorrow, because they have the greatest need of quality in what is added to them. Their potential will only be achieved if all new work aspires to the quality routinely expected in more sensitive places.

‘The proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future’

- I42** The need for quality in new work applies at every level, from small interventions in an historic room, to major new buildings or developments. Small changes need as much consideration as large ones, for cumulatively their effect can be comparable.

- I43 There are no simple rules for achieving quality of design in new work, although a clear and coherent relationship of all the parts to the whole, as well as to the setting into which the new work is introduced, is essential. This neither implies nor precludes working in traditional or new ways, but will normally involve respecting the values established through an assessment of the significance of the place.
- I44 Quality is enduring, even though taste and fashion may change. The eye appreciates the aesthetic qualities of a place such as its scale, composition, silhouette, and proportions, and tells us whether the intervention fits comfortably in its context. Achieving quality always depends on the skill of the designer. The choice of appropriate materials, and the craftsmanship applied to their use, is particularly crucial to both durability and to maintaining the specific character of places.
- ‘The long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future’**
- I45 New work frequently involves some intervention in the existing fabric of a place, which can be necessary to keep it in or bring it back into use. A ‘presumption in favour of preservation’ (doing no harm), even preservation of evidential value, does not equate to a presumption against any intervention into, or removal of, existing fabric; but such interventions require justification in terms of impacts on heritage values.
- I46 There are limits, however; beyond which loss of inherited fabric compromises the authenticity and integrity of a place. At the extreme, a proposal to retain no more than the façade of an historic building attached to a modern structure must be considered in the light of an assessment of the existing values of the building, both as a whole and in its elements. The relationship between the façade and the existing and proposed structures behind will be crucial to the decision, but retaining the façade alone will not normally be acceptable.
- I47 Changes designed to lessen the risk or consequences of disaster to a significant place require a balance to be struck between the possibility of major harm to heritage values without them, and the certainty of the lesser, but often material, harm caused by the works themselves. The need for physical precautions should be considered as part of disaster response and recovery planning for the place as a whole, based on risk assessment and management requirements, and any statutory duties. All options should be evaluated, including improved management as an alternative to, or in conjunction with, lower levels of physical intervention.

- 148** As with repair, the use in interventions of materials and techniques proven by experience to be compatible with existing fabric, including recycled material from an appropriate source (paragraphs 98-99), tends to bring a low risk of failure. Work which touches existing fabric lightly, or stands apart from it, brings progressively greater opportunity for innovation. Energy efficiency (in production as well as use), sustainable sourcing of materials, and environmental good practice should guide all new work, but not to the extent of causing harm to the heritage values of the place.

Integrating conservation with other public interests

- 149** Changes which would harm the heritage values of a significant place should be unacceptable unless:
- a. the changes are demonstrably necessary either to make the place sustainable, or to meet an overriding public policy objective or need;
 - b. there is no reasonably practicable alternative means of doing so without harm;
 - c. that harm has been reduced to the minimum consistent with achieving the objective;
 - d. it has been demonstrated that the predicted public benefit decisively outweighs the harm to the values of the place, considering
 - its comparative significance,
 - the impact on that significance, and
 - the benefits to the place itself and/or the wider community or society as a whole.
- 150** The integration of heritage and other environmental interests with economic and social objectives at every level of strategic planning – national, regional, local – helps to minimise conflict. A willingness to consider and compare the impacts on the significance of a place of a range of options to achieve the public objective concerned is essential, as is selecting an option that either eliminates, or (as far as is possible) mitigates harm. This will often involve those representing heritage interests in employing the skills necessary critically to appraise the case and options for development, as well as its promoters employing the skills needed to evaluate heritage implications. The heritage case should be put fully and robustly.
- ‘Comparative significance’**
- 151** The greater the significance of a place to society, the greater the weight that should be attached to sustaining its heritage values. This concept of ‘proportionality’ (Principle 5.4) relies on judgement rather than formulae, but is fundamental to equitable reconciliation of the public interest in heritage with other public and private interests.

- I52** Since statutory designation, at local as well as national level, is a clear indicator of the significance of a place, the fact of designation can itself play a vital role in guiding options for strategic change. The absence of designation, however, does not necessarily mean that a place is of low significance (paragraphs 79, 81). The weight to be attached to heritage values relative to other public interests should not be considered until those heritage values have been properly evaluated, assessed against current criteria and, if they meet them, safeguarded by designation.
- ‘Impact on significance’**
- I53** The assessment of the degree of harm to the significance of a place should consider the place as a whole and in its parts, its setting, and the likely consequences of doing nothing. In the case of a derelict historic building, for example, should a viable, but modestly damaging, proposal be refused in the hope that a better or less damaging scheme will come forward before the place reaches the point of no return? In such circumstances, the known or predicted rate of deterioration is a crucial factor, and hope must be founded on rational analysis. The potential availability of subsidy as an alternative to harmful change, or to limit its impact, should be considered. The fact that a place is neglected should not, of itself, be grounds for agreeing a scheme that would otherwise be unacceptable.
- ‘Benefits to the place’**
- I54** Quite minor changes, for example to meet the duties to make ‘reasonable adjustments’ under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, or accommodate changing liturgy in a church, may keep a place fit for use. This in turn can make a place sustainable by maintaining its market value, or allowing its continued use by a community. Any changes that would cause harm to the heritage values of the place should obviously be limited to what is necessary to sustain it in use, and their impacts mitigated so far as possible. However, a high quality of design of proposed interventions is not mitigation, but essential in any significant place (Principle 4.6), and offers of compensation should not make harmful proposals more acceptable (paragraph 104).
- ‘Benefits to the wider community or society as a whole’**
- I55** These assessments are broader and more complex than those concerned only with the gains and losses for the heritage values of a place. The underlying considerations should always be proportionality and reasonableness: whether, in relation to the place or society, the predicted benefits of change outweigh the residual, unavoidable harm that would be done to the significance of the place. The balance lies between retaining significance – the sum of the heritage values ascribed at the point of change to something which, if lost, cannot be replaced – and the predicted, and potentially short-term, benefits of development. The benefits, including those of strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, need to be subject to scrutiny in proportion to their impact on heritage values.

156 Reconciling conservation and other public objectives can be most difficult when the heritage values of a significant place, often an archaeological site or an historic building, must be compared with the potential of a replacement to enhance the place because of its allegedly greater cultural value. Subjective claims about the architectural merits of replacements cannot justify the demolition of statutorily-protected buildings.¹⁰ There are less clear-cut situations, however, in which it is proposed to replace a building or develop a place of modest, but positive, heritage value with one that is claimed to be of much greater architectural quality, or where such a proposal would affect the setting of a significant place. Its supporters claim net enhancement, while its opponents claim absolute harm to the heritage values of the place. Each is making a value-based judgement, but choosing to attach different weights to particular values. If such positions are maintained, the choice is ultimately a political one, or for decision at public inquiry.

Enabling development

157 Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless:

- a. it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting
- b. it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place;
- c. it will secure the long term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose;
- d. it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid;
- e. sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source;
- f. it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests;
- g. the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies.

158 Enabling development is development that would deliver substantial benefit to a place, but which would be contrary to other objectives of national, regional or local planning policy. It is an established planning principle that such development may be appropriate if the public benefit of rescuing, enhancing, or even endowing a significant place decisively outweighs the harm to other material interests. Enabling development must always be in proportion to the public benefit it offers.

¹⁰ This is currently stated as government policy in PPG 15, *Planning and the historic environment* (1994) at paragraph 3.19 (iii).

- 159** If it is decided that a scheme of enabling development meets all the criteria set out above, planning permission should be granted only if:
- a. the impact of the development is precisely defined at the outset, normally through the granting of full, rather than outline, planning permission;
 - b. the achievement of the heritage objective is securely and enforceably linked to the enabling development, bearing in mind the guidance in ODPM Circular 05/05, *Planning obligations*;
 - c. the place concerned is repaired to an agreed standard, or the funds to do so made available, as early as possible in the course of the enabling development, ideally at the outset and certainly before completion or occupation; and
 - d. the planning authority closely monitors implementation, if necessary acting promptly to ensure that obligations are fulfilled.

CONCLUSION

Applying the *Principles*

- 160** These *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* build on earlier statements and experience, to formalise an approach which takes account of a wide range of heritage values. They are intended to help everyone involved to take account of the diverse ways in which people value the historic environment as part of their cultural and natural heritage. They acknowledge that the cultural and natural heritage values of places, including those reflected in landscape designations, should be managed in parallel, fostering close working relationships between cultural and natural heritage interests.
- 161** Balanced and justifiable decisions about change in the historic environment depend upon understanding who values a place and why they do so, leading to a clear statement of its significance and, with it, the ability to understand the impact of the proposed change on that significance.
- 162** Every reasonable effort should be made to eliminate or minimise adverse impacts on significant places. Ultimately, however, it may be necessary to balance the public benefit of the proposed change against the harm to the place. If so, the weight given to heritage values should be proportionate to the significance of the place and the impact of the change upon it.
- 163** The historic environment is constantly changing, but each significant part of it represents a finite resource. If it is not sustained, not only are its heritage values eroded or lost, but so is its potential to give distinctiveness, meaning and quality to the places in which people live, and provide people with a sense of continuity and a source of identity. The historic environment is a social and economic asset and a cultural resource for learning and enjoyment.
- 164** Although developed primarily to guide the activities of English Heritage staff, we therefore commend these *Principles, Policies and Guidance* for adoption and application by all involved with the historic environment and in making decisions about its future.

DEFINITIONS

This section includes words used in a specific or technical sense. The *Oxford English Dictionary* definition otherwise applies.

Alteration

Work intended to change the function or appearance of a place

Authenticity

Those characteristics that most truthfully reflect and embody the cultural heritage values of a place¹¹

Conservation

The process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations

Conservation area

'An area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance', designated under what is now s69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Context

Any relationship between a place and other places, relevant to the values of that place

Designation

The recognition of particular heritage value(s) of a significant place by giving it formal status under law or policy intended to sustain those values

Fabric

The material substance of which places are formed, including geology, archaeological deposits, structures and buildings, and flora

Harm

Change for the worse, here primarily referring to the effect of inappropriate interventions on the heritage values of a place

Heritage

All inherited resources which people value for reasons beyond mere utility

Heritage, cultural

Inherited assets which people identify and value as a reflection and expression of their evolving knowledge, beliefs and traditions, and of their understanding of the beliefs and traditions of others

Heritage, natural

Inherited habitats, species, ecosystems, geology and landforms, including those in and under water, to which people attach value

Historic environment

All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible or buried, and deliberately planted or managed flora

Historic Environment Record

A public, map-based data set, primarily intended to inform the management of the historic environment

Integrity

Wholeness, honesty

Intervention

Any action which has a physical effect on the fabric of a place

Maintenance

Routine work regularly necessary to keep the fabric of a place in good order

Material

Relevant to and having a substantial effect on, demanding consideration

Natural change

Change which takes place in the historic environment without human intervention, which may require specific management responses (particularly maintenance or periodic renewal) in order to sustain the significance of a place

¹¹ This definition is based on *The Nara Document on Authenticity* (ICOMOS 1994)

Object

Anything not (now) fixed to or incorporated within the structure of a place, but historically associated with it

Place

Any part of the historic environment, of any scale, that has a distinctive identity perceived by people

Preserve

To keep safe from harm¹²

Proportionality

The quality of being appropriately related to something else in size, degree, or other measurable characteristics

Public

Of, concerning, done, acting, etc. for people as a whole

Renewal

Comprehensive dismantling and replacement of an element of a place, in the case of structures normally incorporating sound units

Repair

Work beyond the scope of maintenance, to remedy defects caused by decay, damage or use, including minor adaptation to achieve a sustainable outcome, but not involving restoration or alteration

Restoration

To return a place to a known earlier state, on the basis of compelling evidence, without conjecture

Reversible

Capable of being reversed so that the previous state is restored

Transparent

Open to public scrutiny

Setting

The surroundings in which a place is experienced, its local context, embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape

Significance [of a place]

The sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place, often set out in a statement of significance

Significant place

A place which has heritage value(s)

Sustain

Maintain, nurture and affirm validity

Sustainable

Capable of meeting present needs without compromising ability to meet future needs

Value

An aspect of worth or importance, here attached by people to qualities of places

Value, aesthetic

Value deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place

Value, communal

Value deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory

Value, evidential

Value deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity

Value, historical

Value deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present

Value-based judgement

An assessment that reflects the values of the person or group making the assessment

¹² The legal interpretation established in *South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment and Rowbotham* [1991] 2 L.P.R. 97

Text prepared for English Heritage by Paul Drury and Anna McPherson
of The Paul Drury Partnership.

English Heritage, 1 Waterhouse Square, 138-142 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST.

Published by English Heritage. © English Heritage April 2008.

Product code: 51393(HWC04/08)VIT15000

Designed by Holmes Wood

Printed by Vitesse

The inside of this document is printed on 75% recycled paper.



If you would like this document in a different format,
please contact our Customer Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Textphone: 01793 414878

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk

If you would like this document in a different format, please contact
our Customer Services department:
Telephone: 0870 333 1181
Fax: 01793 414926
Textphone: 01793 414878
E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk