

**Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik
(German Institute of Urban Affairs)**

Occasional Paper

Claus Peter Echter

**Preservation in Germany and the Study on Cultural
Assets in Europe**

The „Occasional Papers“ are a collection of articles in languages other than German that have been written for various events such as conventions and conferences. They also contain summaries taken from selected publications of the institute. All papers of this collection are also available online: <http://www.difu.de/english/occasional/>

This paper and the questionnaire were published in: ***Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)***, Criteria for the Spatial Differentiation of the EU Territory: Cultural Assets, Bonn 2001 (Forschungen 100.2), pp. 1-11, 107-115.
We thank the BBR for the reprint permit.

The author:

Claus-Peter Echter
German Institute of Urban Affairs, Berlin

Distributed by:

Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik
German Institute of Urban Affairs

Straße des 17. Juni 112
D-10623 Berlin

Tel.: +49 (0)30/390 01-0
Fax: +49 (0)30/390 01-100
E-Mail: difu@difu.de
<http://www.difu.de>



Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Cultural assets – the approach to the study	4
3.	Important results of the study on cultural assets	5
4.	The European-Heritage.Net project	6
5.	Concerning the situation in respect of the preservation of historical monuments in Germany	8
6.	Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm's theses concerning the future of historical monument preservation in Germany	10
7.	Concerning the problem of representing German historical monument preservation in the report on cultural assets	13
8.	Conclusions	14
	Bibliography	16
	Appendix: Questionnaire on Cultural Assets for the National Focal Points of the Study Programme	17

1. Introduction

The proportion of monuments forming part of the building stock varies throughout Europe from between two (England) and ten percent (Switzerland). Germany is ranked in the middle here, with an estimated proportion of between three and five percent. In Berlin, the Federal capital, four percent of all buildings are classified as historical monuments. In spite of this somewhat modest proportion, the cultural heritage, and thus the historical wealth of the different countries, is regarded as an increasingly important aspect of spatial planning in Europe.

2. Cultural assets – the approach to the study

The approach to the study on cultural assets in the framework of the Study Programme on European Spatial Planning, namely preservation of the cultural heritage, socioeconomic growth and sustainable development¹ – is finding considerable resonance amongst specialists in the field and in politics, even if it does not strike at the core of monument preservation work: registration, protection and care of monuments and ensembles. The aim of the study was to determine several indicators which could provide information on the importance of cultural heritage² and to acquire criteria for measuring the importance of and also danger to historical cities, building and ground monuments and ensembles. It proved extremely difficult to obtain meaningful data for these tasks. In spite of this, the working group was able to draw up a report extremely quickly in which the indicators which emphasise, define, describe and illustrate in map form the importance of, danger to and management of building heritage. The report deals with the following three respectively four indicators: “presence of cultural sites”/“concentration of cultural sites”, “use pressure on cultural sites”, “touristicity of the cultural sites” as well as “sustainability of use of cultural heritage” as a combined indicator.

Cultural heritage in spatial planning is the theme of the introductory chapter of the report on cultural assets. It calls for an innovative strategy for the maintenance of our cultural heritage.³ This strategy implies that the protection of historical buildings represents an important prerequisite for peace and stability and provides social and economic opportunities at the same time. The preservation of culture contributes to the identity of the citizens, creates jobs, supports the economy and promotes the responsible handling of societal resources. An important element of the strategy is the “wise” use of the historical heritage which is compatible with sustainable development.

Tourism is regarded as the main use for the historical heritage⁴, which ignores above all the use for living space. The vast majority of all monuments in Germany – and not just here – are privately used residential buildings. The authors justify focusing on use for tourism by the fact that the sustainable use of the cultural heritage, particularly historical

1 See *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Criteria for the Spatial Differentiation of the EU Territory: Cultural assets, Bonn 2001 (Forschungen 100.2), pp. 15 f.

2 *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Study Programme on European Spatial Planning – Final Report, Bonn 2001 (Forschungen 103.2), pp. 9 f.

3 See *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Criteria for the Spatial Differentiation of the EU Territory: Cultural assets, pp. 17 ff.

4 Ibid.

cities frequented by large numbers of tourists, demands enormous planning efforts and effective management.⁵ Overemphasising the aspect of tourism in the study nevertheless remains questionable. Likewise the retention of the traditional understanding of a monument to assist in quantification and in examining the consequences of the upkeep of the historical heritage in terms of spatial planning is also problematic.⁶ Conversely, the authors' statement that the preservation of historical monuments has gained in importance in the field of planning remains completely undisputed.

3. Important results of the study on cultural assets

In view of the poor statistical starting point, the authors regard their study as a first step towards a "wiser" use of the cultural heritage through spatial planning across Europe. They knew that reliable indicators for the quality, importance and future development of cultural assets still have to be found, as the gaps are currently still too large in respect of the availability and comparability of data. By elaborating their indicators for the built heritage, which they have illustrated in five maps, the authors have succeeded in making considerable progress.

The indicators "presence of cultural sites / concentration of cultural sites", (map B-1 and B-2) are a measure of the cultural wealth of a region and provide an insight into the spatial organisation of the built heritage. Peripheral regions such as southeast Sweden, Scotland, Ireland, the main Italian Islands and the Peloponnesus come off well in terms of the total number of monuments, and areas in central Europe such as Flanders and Saxony as well as large cities such as Rome, London, Dublin and Lisbon come off well in terms of the relative number of monuments. The pressure of use, as shown in map B-3, is very high in cities such as Seville, Venice, Florence, Vienna and in the traditional tourist regions, the Alpine-Adriatic region (north-east Italy, Austria, southern Germany) and the Mediterranean coast from western Italy to southern Spain including the western Mediterranean islands. The indicator for tourist capacity (map B-4) stands in very strong correlation to the indicator *use pressure of cultural sites*. For planners, the differences between maps B-3 and B-4 are of considerable significance. They enable them to determine potential crisis areas in which use of the building heritage is sustainable. The authors regard this information, which is derived from the description of "the European cultural area" based on the four indicators, as particularly valuable. map B-5 shows that the problems of sustainable use of the cultural heritage are not particularly pressing in the vast majority of European regions. Regions where pressure of use is great abound in central Italy, the Spanish, French and Greek coasts as well as western Ireland. Areas where the cultural heritage potential does not yet appear exhausted are concentrated in northern France, Belgium and Germany, such as Cologne, for example.

The three case studies on the unsustainable use of the cultural heritage for the Alhambra in Granada, Venice and the Belgian province of western Flanders have shown that investigations into the loadbearing capacity of the built heritage are urgently required. This topic plays a decisive role for the management and preservation of the cultural heritage at

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

a local level. For problem areas, i.e. historical towns and sites frequented by large numbers of tourists, valuable indications can be derived from such studies. In addition it became clear that studies on the relationships between towns and their built heritage, as well as their surroundings and their cultural landscape, were required.⁷

The Alhambra is an example of very efficiently organised entry to a building monument. The study on Venice clearly shows the conflicts which arise if the socioeconomic load-bearing capacity of an “art city” is damaged. The case of western Flanders and its cultural capital, Bruges, shows how difficult it is to alter tourism development models, especially when there are coordination problems within a region and the various protagonists in the central city.⁸ More precise details would have been desirable in the case study cities of Venice and Bruges on the state of historical monument preservation, the compilation of inventories and instruments or strategies for the preservation of monuments.

4. The European-Heritage.Net project

The European harmonisation of standards in the field of monument preservation is particularly important. Although consensus with regard to assessment standards is a long way off, it nevertheless remains desirable. Since both the conventions in Granada on 3.10.1985 on the protection of historical monuments and in Malta on 16.2.1992 on the protection of the archaeological heritage, the exchange of information concerning the practice of protection of historical monuments in European states is considered urgently necessary.

In 1996 a report was published on European monument preservation policies with corresponding reports from 27 countries.⁹ The publication provided an overview of the political concepts of cultural heritage in these states, and picked out the system of protecting historical monuments, the state of compilation of inventories, support programmes and restoration procedures as the central themes. From 1998 the Cultural Heritage Department of the Council of Europe developed an extremely informative information system in the framework of the European Heritage Information Network/HEREIN project, which can be accessed via the Council of Europe internet address. Its aim is to make the latest information available in the internet.

The European-Heritage.Net project¹⁰ is intended to make access to important aspects of European cultural heritage easier, and in particular to provide experts in the preservation of historical monuments with constantly up-to-date information systems. The information system HEREIN is being developed in stages over a period of 2 years – from November 1998 to November 2000 – by a consortium comprising the central authorities for the protection of historical monuments in six European countries, the computer company Bull S.A. and local IT companies, with the support of the Council of Europe. As well as the

7 *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Study Programme on European Spatial Planning – Final Report, pp. 64 ff.

8 See *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Criteria for the Spatial Differentiation of the EU Territory: Cultural assets, pp. 81 f.

9 *Council of Europe (ed.)*, Report on cultural heritage policies in Europe, Strasbourg 1996.

10 European-Heritage.Net, www.european-heritage.net

project partners, the European Union is also contributing to the financing of the project through its Application Programme. ICOMOS is also one of the project partners.

By 1999 the information system for the six partner countries (France, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Spain and Great Britain) had been elaborated. To date it has not been possible to install the extended database for the additional 21 countries – including Germany – which was planned for the year 2000. An expansion of the programme at a overall European level is scheduled from 2001.

The HEREIN information system covers an extremely broad range of subjects which are also of particular importance for the ESPON project. These include, amongst other things:

- contribution of historical monument protection to sustainable development,
- short and medium term historical monument preservation strategies,
- institutions and initiatives,
- staffing levels,
- the support system,
- the specific legislation on historical monument protection,
- the manner of compilation of inventories,
- preservation of historical monuments and spatial planning,
- historical monument management,
- use and upgrading of historical monuments,
- public relations work,
- tourism and preservation of historical monuments,
- publications,
- number and kind of monuments as well as
- ownership status.

Table 1: Number of historical monuments and ensembles in selected European states 2000

States	Historical monuments	Archaeological monuments and sites	Ensembles ¹ and historical sites ²	Total
Spain	11 618	635	963	13 216
France	39 994		8 046	48 040
Great Britain	446 842	17 351	9 731	482 692
Hungary	10 357		219	10 576

Data: European-Heritage.Net, computations: Echter.

1 Conservation areas: France 89, Great Britain 9 324, Hungary 25.

2 Historical sites: Spain 751, France 7 712, Great Britain 407.

The HEREIN information system enables meaningful data concerning the number and kind of historical monuments and ensembles in Spain, France, Great Britain and Hungary (cf. table 1) to be derived. With a total of approximately 450,000, the United Kingdom has the largest number of historical monuments. Statistical information on historical monuments is also available here for England (364,425), Wales (23,125), Scotland (50,611) and Northern Ireland (8,681). Moreover, the files contain information on the different categories of historical buildings in all the regions of Spain, from Andalucia to Murcia. It ultimately becomes clear that countries such as Great Britain and France have

different assessment standards for property incorporated into ensembles. Whilst France has protected 89 extremely valuable “secteurs sauvegardés” such as Versailles and Avignon, in England however, the total number of “conservation areas” amounts to 8,724. Nevertheless, in Scotland, in a similar manner to France, only 204 exceptional “conservation areas” are identified.

There is a vast amount of information in the HEREIN project files. There are only a few cases for which no data are available. For example, there is no information on the total number of historical monuments in Ireland and Norway.

The HEREIN information system provides important starting points for a continuation of the ESPON project.

5. Concerning the situation in respect of the preservation of historical monuments in Germany

Whilst complaints are heard in other European countries that there is no lobby to represent the stone witnesses of the past, the commitment to the maintenance of historical buildings has enjoyed increasing popularity in Germany since the European Architectural Heritage Year in 1975. The preservation of historical monuments is regarded as one of the few remaining fields “where a consensus between public spiritedness and political will continues to exist”.

Until now, expenditure on the preservation of monuments has also not been dramatically curtailed – in spite of growing social poverty. Politicians regard funds for the preservation of monuments as investments in the future, which carve identities, create jobs and encourage the responsible handling of societal resources.

The preservation of historical monuments has even become an export hit. Not only is “German know-how” in the maintenance and safeguarding of historical buildings in demand in neighbouring countries, but in Asia too. “The Federal Republic occupies a leading position worldwide in the field of preservation of historical monuments.”¹¹ This applies not only for the restoration of monuments but also in terms of the availability of a large variety of informative publications on the subject of monument preservation and practical instruments¹².

Although Germany is unable to compete with neighbouring European states such as Italy and France in respect of outstanding historical monuments, its extended concept of the term means that it is undoubtedly the country with the most historical monuments. Estimates range from between 900,000 and 1.2 million historical monuments, of which approximately 400,000 can be apportioned to the new Laender. No less numerous are the

11 *Birgit Matuschek-Labitzke*, German aid for the great Buddha. The Federal Republic of Germany occupies a leading position in the field of preservation of historical buildings, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25.9.1996. For an overview of preservation of historical monuments in Germany cf. *Gottfried Kiesow*, *Denkmalpflege in Deutschland. Eine Einführung*, Stuttgart 2000, as well as *Michael Petzet and Gert Mader*, *Praktische Denkmalpflege*, 2nd edition, Stuttgart 1995.

12 Cf. an assessment of the quality of currently available, selected, “recent” documentation and instruments in: *Claus-Peter Echter*, *Grundlagen und Arbeitshilfen städtischer Denkmalpflege in Deutschland*, Berlin 1999 (Difu-Beiträge zur Stadtforschung, vol. 28).

number of recorded ensembles and historical sites. Bavaria reveals 900 ensembles, of which 80 are in Munich alone. At the beginning of the year 2000 there were 173 historical areas identified in North Rhine-Westphalia.

The protection of historical sites through the implementation of statutes involves a considerable amount of specialised preparatory work and administrative activity. However, it enables clearly outlined protection for a large number of building installations and historical structures to be established at a single stroke. It is therefore to be hoped that the flexible and very practicable instrument of historical site protection will be used more intensively, and that further historical sites will be identified in North Rhine-Westphalia, Mecklenburg-West Pomerania, Thuringia and Saxony.

With regard to cooperation and linking between town planning and monument preservation, the urban development, planning related preservation of historical buildings or ensembles retains considerable importance in practice. Monument preservation in urban development is understood to mean activities concerned with the preservation of historical monuments which extend beyond individual objects to the maintenance of historical ensembles and urban structures and local and cultural forms of landscape.

Urban development or larger scale preservation of historical monuments developed through recognition of the fact that the sum of maintained individual historical monuments does not guarantee the preservation of the townscape. Its aim is the conservation of historical towns, their ancient structures and spatial qualities.

It is not the aesthetic quality of individual buildings which is the important aspect of ensembles, rather the visual effect and readability of the overall context. This effect is accounted for in the architectural proportions, in the composition of the ground plan and elevation, in the rhythmical sequence of the facades and in the spaces created by streets and squares.

Towards the end of the 1990s, monument preservation in urban development became one of the main issues in historical monument preservation, particularly in the new Länder of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The instruments of monument preservation in urban development range from the development plans (zoning plan, building plan), in which account must be taken of historical monument preservation requirements, to the statutes on conservation and style and the identification of historical sites. As well as these legal instruments, aids such as the building age plan for urban redevelopment, target planning and the framework plan for monument preservation and the historical monument preservation plan provide essential foundations for the development of sound planning and operational concepts.

Admittedly, complaints are heard about the lack of staff in official historical monument departments (of the Federal states and local authorities), yet here too we are able to stand comparison with other European countries.

Preventive strategies are gaining in importance for monument preservation. Citizens can only be encouraged to become more receptive towards maintaining the cultural heritage through active monument preservation policies, not through sanctions. Important elements in such prophylactic monument preservation are:

- examination of building documents from
- the past,
- protection of building and ground
- monuments,
- identification of ensembles,
- early introduction of aspects of historical monument preservation in the elaboration of urban development and town planning concepts and in the discussion of large building projects,
- continuous coordination within authorities responsible for monuments and building authorities,
- direct and indirect grants for monuments,
- information and advice for owners of historical monuments and
- comprehensive public information programmes.

6. **Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm's theses concerning the future of historical monument preservation in Germany**

Since the seventies, the preservation of historical monuments has gained in influence in Germany. Midway through the year 2000 the preservation of historical monuments is the subject of articles in many newspapers. In March 2000 Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, the Berlin town planning expert, was commissioned by the Federal parliamentary group "Bündnis 90/Die Grünen" to draw up a report on the denationalisation of historical monument preservation.¹³ He argued for an extensive revision of the previous form of monument preservation. State preservation should be abolished in favour of private support, which should be taken care of by the enlightened citizens' society itself. Decisions should only be made by the population, particularly at a local level.¹⁴ This will prevent the continued "enforcement" of such monuments "which people do not even want", a thesis which brought him the accusation of "populistic architectural Darwinism" from the Munich architecture historian Winfried Nerding.

For the Green party in particular, such a report lacks reference to the preservation of resources through monument protection, as this represents a substantial contribution to environmental protection. The most fundamental function of historical monument preservation is to "sustain": this principle has always generated ideas which intersect different departments. With its experience in the application of solutions which are fit for the future it can make a concrete contribution to Agenda 21.¹⁵ The sustainability concept of

13 *Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm*, Kann die Denkmalpflege entstaatlicht werden? A polemic – report for the federal parliamentary group Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, March 2000, without indication of place of publication. See also *same*, Alles bewahren heißt nichts erhalten. Die Denkmalpflege ist am Ende und braucht eine neue Aufgabe: Die Suche nach den Projektionen gesellschaftlichen Glücks, in: *Die Zeit*, 25.5.2000, and *same*, Dolchstoßlegende für Denkmalpfleger. Die Forderung nach einer Entstaatlichung des Denkmalschutzes hat einen Kulturkampf ausgelöst, in: *Berliner Zeitung*, 8./9.7.2000.

14 *Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm*, Kann die Denkmalpflege entstaatlicht werden? p. 20 f.

15 Agenda 21 was passed at the United Nations Environment and Development Conference in June 1992 in Rio de Janeiro. In the concluding document urgent action was determined to protect the planet and support for sustainable development agreed. The Agenda is meant as a programme of action for the transition to the 21st century.

Agenda 21 corresponds with the principle of maintaining the essence of a place which characterises monument preservation.

Antje Vollmer, the Green party spokeswoman on cultural and educational policy and Vice President of the Federal Parliament, on whose initiative the report is founded, has summarised her ideas in the form of theses.¹⁶ While she recognises a general need for reform and possibility for changes concerning monument protection, Hoffmann-Axthelm goes into more detail. He proposes:

1. that state protection of historical monuments should be limited to publicly owned objects and
2. the retreat from the idea of monuments as objects which are witnesses to history to monuments which make an impression through their beauty and distinctiveness.

The relationship between the citizen and the authorities is not an altogether harmonious one. Those responsible for the preservation of monuments are often forced to intervene and make owners justify and agree their plans. Hoffmann-Axthelm uses this difficult situation for historical monument preservation as an opportunity to make a general statement. He characterises a person involved in the preservation of historical monuments as an “appointed self-seeker”, who spreads his political opinion under the cloak of administrative responsibility.¹⁷ Contrary to this opinion, those involved in the preservation of historical monuments can also be described as politically informed and competent, corresponding with the image of the responsible citizen. Hoffmann-Axthelm calls those involved in the preservation of monuments whom he criticises as “hunters and gatherers”¹⁸ and doubts their ability to judge.

The exclusion of private historical monuments from public maintenance would cause a destructive breach. The suggestion of attaching great importance to beauty in determining the value of historical monuments is even more radical.

The potential for destruction through changes in taste can be illustrated time and again in the history of monument preservation. Uncomfortable objects would have no chance of becoming monuments, although in their capacity to shape identity they are, like all other historical monuments, essential material witnesses of enlightened memory and responsible planning. In restricting monuments to the time prior to 1840 and to “attractive monuments” Hoffmann-Axthelm finds himself in conflict with all laws on the protection of monuments which have come into force in Germany since the Second World War and, in respect of his trenchant aesthetic argument, also with the Venice Charter of 1964. Here it is stated that “the concept of an historic monument ... applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time. The aim ... is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence”.¹⁹ The chairman of the association of national monument conservationists in the Federal Republic of Germany, Jörg Haspel, writes in relation to this: “Not only aesthetic objects have a value as monuments but also objects which

16 Antje Vollmer, Zwölf Thesen zum Thema Denkmalschutz. Reformbedarf und Veränderungsmöglichkeiten, in: Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen, no.89 II/2000, p. 11.

17 Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, Kann die Denkmalpflege entstaatlicht werden?, p. 7.

18 Ibid., p. 15.

19 ICOMOS, The Venice Charter. International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, Venice 25.-31.5.1964.

document history ... of particular value as monuments are objects which bear witness to the development of Europe in the post-feudal world.²⁰

It was only 30 years ago that the time and value limits in respect of monument preservation shifted from 1870 to 1945, thus recognising that historical evidence and new building was worth protecting in principle.²¹ In the meantime, building monuments from the 1950s and 1960s and those of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), considered a closed epoch, are protected.

Hoffmann-Axthelm and Vollmer suggest a reduction and minimisation of the historical monument stock. On what types of monument should an exclusion list concentrate:

- industrial monuments,
- characteristic building monuments of the Nazi period,
- buildings of the GDR period,
- urban development monuments or
- functionalistic classical modern buildings?

With regard to GDR buildings in particular, Hoffmann-Axthelm allows himself to be led by very specific experiences in the central district of Berlin. With all the above monument categories it remains undisputed – at least amongst monument experts, less so in the public domain – that they must be considered in terms of historical monument preservation.

Hoffmann-Axthelm's and Vollmer's analyses are original and in many respects also correct. What follows, however, is a suggestion for a solution which is fundamentally incorrect.²² The problem of the large number of monuments still awaits a reasonable solution: "This cannot lie in restricting the numbers, which is orientated around the financial means of the state, however, but only in differentiating the approach, which could constitute for example a different treatment of objects in an overall system on the one hand, and those which represent individual cultural monuments on the other."²³

Antje Vollmer's and Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm's call for an improvement in dialogue between bodies responsible for historical monuments and the owners is very thought-provoking. Both reveal a sore point in monument preservation here. The service and consultation work of bodies responsible for historical monuments must be considerably improved, otherwise preservation will lose credibility. The argument concerning a lack of financial and staffing support does not hold water. More agencies and advice centres are necessary. Monument management is required with large projects such as the re-use of old industrial sites. As the legal representative of cultural monuments, the monument conservationist also has to pursue economic goals and develop strategies for saving monuments. In so doing, he will have to enter coalitions with financial experts and property managers.

20 Jörg Haspel, Die Summe des Ganzen. Denkmalschutz ist eine staatliche Aufgabe, in: FAZ, 17.5.2000.

21 Cf. Hanno Rautenberg, Ballast abwerfen. Warum Antje Vollmer, die kulturpolitische Sprecherin der Grünen, den Denkmalschutz auflösen möchte, in: Die Zeit, 19.4.2000.

22 Cf. Benedikt Hotze, Schönheit als Denkmalkern, in: Bauwelt, vol. 91 (2000), no. 18, p. 15.

23 Gerd Weiß, Aus aktuellem Anlaß, in: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege in Hessen (ed.), Denkmalpflege und Kulturgeschichte, no. 1 (2000), p. 1.

Denationalisation is not necessary, but rather the reinforcement of the protection of historical monuments. Considerable public effort is essential in this respect. This debate presents the opportunity to promote this idea. A second opportunity exists in explaining the principles of modern historical monument protection in the confrontation with Hoffmann-Axthelm's theses.²⁴

7. Concerning the problem of representing German historical monument preservation in the report on cultural assets

- The report on cultural assets gives a false picture of historical monument preservation in Germany. According to the maps "Presence of cultural sites" and "Concentration of cultural sites" (B-1 and B-2) Germany can be characterised as the country with the lowest concentration of historical monuments in Europe, with many urban and rural districts with a very small number of monuments. Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of areas also have a high concentration of historical monuments. Germany's poor showing, which does not correspond with the reality of the situation, can be traced back to the approach selected by the Italian authors, namely to classify historical cities, cultural sites and monuments on the basis of information contained in TCI (Italian Tourist Club) travel guides. As well as the absence of a valid definition of cultural heritage across Europe, the reason for this approach is also the dearth of information on historical monuments (monument and site lists), which has been justly criticised, and a lack of homogeneity at a national or European level. Coordination with ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) as well as with the cultural heritage department of the Council of Europe, for example, would also not have solved the problem of the insufficient availability of information, although co-operation would nevertheless have been helpful. Even after the maps had been drawn up, national experts could have provided useful feedback in order to qualify the statement in relation to Germany, for example. The Italian travel guide which serves as the basis for recording historical monuments conveys a picture of the urban landscape which is characterised above all by traditional monuments such as churches, museums, castles and parks.²⁵ In Germany one frequently comes across another kind of monument, the so-called simple monuments: residential buildings from the time of German unification in 1871 and the turn of the century, garden cities, housing estates from the 1920s and 1950s, industrial monuments, half-timbered houses and rural architecture.
- The historical monuments list and monument topography were given as basic indicators of concentration of cultural sites/monuments and stratification in the questionnaire, and further documentation and instruments such as large scale inventory, Bavarian historical sites list, special inventories of industrial monuments, the monument preservation plan, target planning for monument preservation and building age plan were listed in the framework of the case studies. These publications and instruments

24 Cf. *Sabine Weissler*, Alle Macht der Schönheit? Alle reden über den Denkmalschutz. Er taugt nicht mehr viel, sagt Antje Vollmer. Dabei sollte er nicht abgeschafft, sondern verstärkt werden. In: *Der Tagesspiegel*, 29.6.2000.

25 *Mechthild Agreiter*, Das Münchenbild in italienischen Reiseführern, in: *Geographische Rundschau*, no. 3 (2000), pp. 35-39.

were not taken into account anywhere in the report, although monument topography and the monument preservation plan, for example, reflect general historical structures at the urban development scale, the latter in addition being a suitable instrument for encouraging sustainable use of the cultural heritage.

- In contrast to the chapter concerning the cultural landscape, complaints also exist in respect of the wholly inadequate bibliography, which focuses almost exclusively on subjects such as tourism, urban development and historical legacy, and concentrates on countries such as Italy, Holland and Great Britain, while titles concerning the preservation of historical monuments at a national and European level are absent. The authors themselves pointed out (see chapter B-1.3, pages 68 f.) that they received an exhaustive list of studies, examples of cases and details of literature. These useful details were not reflected in the report, although this would have been of great interest to national experts.

Finally, it should also be mentioned that the inventory for the whole of Europe, which was submitted to the ministers of the EU member states in 1996 in Venice both as a map and in the form of a table, could also have been presented.²⁶

8. Conclusions

- In a very short space of time the working group carried out indispensable pioneering work on the complex of monument preservation and spatial planning, setting standards for further research in a European context.
- The preservation of the cultural heritage and sustainable development approach, with its many complex variables, has proved itself viable.
- The elaboration of three respectively four from an original total of 17 indicators "presence of cultural sites"/ "concentration of cultural sites", "use pressure on cultural sites", "touristicity of cultural site" and the combined indicator "sustainability of use of cultural heritage" also shows itself to be worthwhile.
- The elaboration of maps on a European scale is extremely commendable.
- One of the most remarkable results of the study is the emphasis on the necessity for reliable, coordinated and easily accessible data as a prerequisite for every further attempt to plan the sustainable development of the European heritage.
- Although there is a great deal of knowledge and information on world heritage monuments, this is lacking in respect of standard monuments both at national level and definitely at European level. There is a need for research at this level into the number and quality of monuments and historical sites. Such studies should be initiated by the European Union. For this reason the ESPON project should be continued.
- Improved cooperation in this field between the Council of Europe, UNESCO, the Commission of the European Union and ICOMOS is necessary at a European level.

²⁶ *Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR), Study Programme on European Spatial Planning – Final Report*, p. 105.

- Due to the lack of basic monument preservation data, cross links in particular with monument preservation authorities, but also with the German National Committee for Monument Preservation, the monument preservation subcommittee of the conference of the ministers of culture, the German foundation for the preservation of historical monuments and local monument preservation is necessary at a German level in the continuation of the project.

Bibliography

- Agreiter, Mechthild*, Das Münchenbild in italienischen Reiseführern, in: Geographische Rundschau, no. 3 (2000), pp. 35-39.
- Council of Europe (ed.)*, Report on cultural heritage policies in Europe, Strasbourg 1996.
- Echter, Claus-Peter*, Grundlagen und Arbeitshilfen städtischer Denkmalpflege in Deutschland, Berlin 1999 (Difu-Beiträge zur Stadtforschung, vol. 28).
- European-Heritage.Net*, www.european-heritage.net.
- Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Criteria for the Spatial Differentiation of the EU Territory: Cultural assets, Bonn 2001 (Forschungen 100.2).
- Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR)*, Study Programme on European Spatial Planning - Final Report, Bonn 2001 (Forschungen 103.2).
- Haspel, Jörg*, Die Summe des Ganzen. Denkmalschutz ist eine staatliche Aufgabe, in: FAZ, 17.5.2000.
- Hoffmann-Axthelm, Dieter*, Kann die Denkmalpflege entstaatlicht werden? A polemic – Report for the parliamentary group Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, 2000, without indication of place of publication.
- Hoffmann-Axthelm, Dieter*, Alles bewahren heißt nichts erhalten, in: Die Zeit, 25.5.2000.
- Hoffmann-Axthelm, Dieter*, Dolchstoßlegende für Denkmalpfleger, in: Berliner Zeitung, 8./9.7.2000.
- Hotze, Benedikt*, Schönheit als Denkmalkern, in: Bauwelt, vol. 91 (2000), no. 18, p. 15.
- ICOMOS*, The Venice Charter. International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, Venice 25.-31.5.1964.
- Kiesow, Gottfried*, Denkmalpflege in Deutschland. Eine Einführung, Stuttgart 2000.
- Matuschek-Labitzke, Birgit*, Deutsche Hilfe für den großen Buddha. Auf dem Gebiet der Denkmalpflege nimmt die Bundesrepublik weltweit eine Spitzenstellung ein, in: Süddeutsche Zeitung, 25.9.1996.
- Petzet, Michael, and Gert Mader*, Praktische Denkmalpflege, 2nd edition, Stuttgart 1995.
- Rautenberg, Hanno*, Ballast abwerfen, in: Die Zeit, 19.4.2000.
- Vollmer, Antje*, Zwölf Thesen zum Thema Denkmalschutz. Reformbedarf und Veränderungsmöglichkeiten, in: Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen, no. 89 II/2000, p. 11.
- Weiß, Gerd*, Aus aktuellem Anlaß, in: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege in Hessen (ed.), Denkmalpflege und Kulturgeschichte, no. 1 (2000), p. 1.
- Weissler, Sabine*, Alle Macht der Schönheit, in: Der Tagesspiegel, 29.6.2000.

Appendix

Questionnaire on Cultural Assets for the National Focal Points of the Study Programme

Part II: Cultural Cities, Historic and Religious Buildings, Archaeological Sites

Answered by:

Claus-Peter Echter and Klaus Mittag

Assisted by Katja Bagge

Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik, Abt. Köln

Including advice and comments of:

Dr. Gerhard Ongyerth

Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, München

For the German National Focal Point

September 1999

Legend

Possible data sources:

I = Institution

S = Source

CS No. = Number of case study* (⇒ part 2.3/4)

Information about data:

DF = Data format

TU = Territorial unit

MD = Measurement level of data

SD = Scale of data

Categories:

H = High

A = Average

L = Low

***Note:** if necessary for scientific reasons, the case studies were supplemented with basic literature

2.1 Please fill in the table. For an explanation of indicators see enclosure 1 and the background-paper that has been presented at the Nijmegen-meeting. In the last five columns, please circle the letter according to the system explained in the manual for this questionnaire: H (High) – A (Average) – L (Low). For all data, please refer to the actual numbers as well as the percentage of decline or growth for the last decade.

Number of indicator (cf. enclosure 1)	Concerned indicator	Measuring instrument / subindicator "What does the indicator measure?"	Possible data sources "Where do we get the data from?"	Information about data format and territorial unit / scale of data "What are the data like? How can we work with the data?"	Availability of data	Creditability/ comprehensibility	Comparability	Significance	Threshold/ benchmarks
1	Concentration of cultural sites / monuments	Number of cultural assets (sites and monuments) per square km in the provincial area	I: state conservation offices S: list of monuments / monument registers (number of sites only in some <i>Länder</i> , e.g. Bavaria), monument topography (=Projekt Denkmaltopographie Bundesrepublik Deutschland) CS No.: 1, 2, 7, 8, 18, 19, 21	DF: hardcopy, partly electronic TU: NUTS 1–3 MD: nominal, interval level SD: 1:5,000, 1:25,000, 1:50,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
2	Stratification	Identification of architectural elements, decors and cultural references belonging to different periods situated in the province	I: state conservation offices S: list of monuments / monument registers CS No.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 21	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 1–3 MD: nominal, interval level SD: 1:5,000, 1:25,000, 1:50,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
3	Tourist pressure on heritage city / site / monument	Visitors / residents ratio; time trend	I: statistical offices, tourist offices S: no standard statistics, local countings and surveys, often only for some sites / monuments CS No.: 12, 13	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
4	"Touristicity" of the heritage city / site / monument	Tourist beds / resident ratio; time trend	I: statistical offices, tourist offices S: standard statistics and special local surveys CS No.: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
5	Extension of tourist region	Ratio between the administrative area where the site is located (municipality, village) and the region in which a given percentage of the visitors to such site (e.g. 75 %) stays for the night	I: statistical offices, tourist offices S: no standard statistics, possibly local surveys	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
6	Conflict level in the use of the land (general)	Identification of a level of conflict in the tourist use of the cultural site / monument in terms of superposition of the tourist functions to other systems of fruition of the area.	I: possibly town-planning offices, offices for urban development planning S: local studies	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval, ordinal level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
7	Conflict level in the use of public transport	Tourist use of public transport for urban or extra-urban mobility; weight of tourist production in the budget of transit company	I: town-planning offices, transit companies S: possibly local countings and surveys	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
8	Tourist prices	Comparison of the level and time trend of prices of tourist products respect to non-tourist goods	I: tourist offices, statistical offices S: no standard statistics, local studies and surveys, only for some products	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L

continued

continued

Number of indicator	Concerned indicator	Measuring instrument / subindicator	Possible data sources	Information about data format and territorial unit / scale of data	Availability of data	Credibility/ comprehensibility	Comparability	Significance	Threshold/ benchmarks
9	Presence of infrastructures nearby the heritage city / cultural site / monument	Identification of infrastructures nearby the cultural site / monument	I: town-planning offices, survey offices, building office S: plans for land use and built-up areas, municipal base maps	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval, nominal level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
10	Presence of productive structures nearby the heritage city / cultural site / monument	Identification of productive structures nearby the heritage city/ cultural site/monument	I: town-planning offices, offices for environmental affairs S: plans for land use and built-up areas, emission measurements, regional and local studies (e.g. International Building Exhibition <i>Emscher Park</i>) CS No.: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	DF: hardcopy, electronic TU: NUTS 2, 3 MD: interval, ordinal level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
11	Crime rate	Absolute yearly number of crimes against visitors, or % respect to total number of yearly crimes in the area; time trend	I: town-planning offices, subordinal monument protection authority S: no standard statistics; only local studies CS No.: 16	DF: hardcopy; electronic TU: NUTS 3 MD: interval level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
12	Carrying capacity (socio-economic)	Number of yearly violations of the socio-economic carrying capacity, to be quantified with a programming approach (Costa); time trend	I: possibly offices for urban development planning S: no standard planning, no statistical basis; programming approach (Costa) unknown	DF: ./. TU: ./. MD: ./. SD: ./.	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
13	Management / ownership regime	The cultural site / monument or the area has to be classified on the base of the complexity of ownership and management structures (number of institutions/levels of government which own or are entitled to manage the site)	I: state conservation office S: monument registers, e.g. North Rhine-Westphalia, not in all <i>Länder</i>	DF: hardcopy, partly electronic TU: NUTS 1 MD: nominal, interval level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
14	Decision-making regime	The cultural site / monument or the area has to be classified on the base of the complexity of the decision-making process that regards the site (number of institutions/ levels of government/ informal actors/ stakeholders involved in the decision-making process or determining to some extent its outcome)	I: associations, research instituts (e.g. <i>Deutscher Städtetag</i> , <i>Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik</i>) S: special surveys CS No.: 6	DF: hardcopy; electronic TU: NUTS 1, 3 MD: nominal, interval level SD: 1:5,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
15	Controls on the development and existence of regional planning regarding heritage cities / sites / monuments	Identification of laws/ regulations/procedures for the compatibility of tourist use of the cultural site	I: monument and owner-specific organisations (e.g. castle and lake administrations like <i>Bayrische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen</i> , churches, municipalities S: administration documents and reports	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 1,3 MD: nominal level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L

continued

continued

Number of indicator	Concerned indicator	Measuring instrument / subindicator	Possible data sources	Information about data format and territorial unit / scale of data	Availability of data	Creditability / comprehensibility	Comparability	Significance	Threshold / benchmarks
16	Co-ordination in management of cultural assets	Management policies of the cultural heritage must be referred to the system of assets in an integral way. If some element of this system remains out, there might occur overlaps, inefficiencies and conflicts	I: monument and owner specific organisations (e.g. castle and lake administrations, archaeological parks, churches, municipalities) S: administration documents and reports CS No.: 6, 17	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 3 MD: nominal level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
17	Community involvement	Identification of procedures /for the involvement of stakeholders (groups, associations, unions, etc.) in the decision-making regarding the site operations and interpretation	I: <i>Deutscher Städtetag</i> , <i>Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz</i> (German foundation for preservation) S: special surveys; annually awarded initiatives by the <i>Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz</i> and state foundations CS No.: 6	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 0, 1-3 MD: nominal, interval level SD: 1:5,000, 1:25,000, 1:50,000	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L

2.2 In this table, there is some space provided for you to add indicators, that are not included in our list, but that seem worth to be regarded in your opinion. If you add any indicators, please use the same system as explained above for the last five columns.

Number of indicator	Your indicator	Measuring instrument	Objective / purpose	Possible data sources	Information about data format and territorial unit / scale of data	Availability of data	Creditability / comprehensibility	Comparability	Threshold / benchmarks	Significance
		"What does the indicator measure?"	"Why do we need this indicator?"	"Where do we get the data from?"	"What are the data like? How can we work with the data?"					
1.	Concentration of cultural sites/ monuments	Number of cultural assets/ number of buildings ratio in municipality area	Significant for the importance of the monument preservation in the municipality	see indicator		H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L
2.	Public financial subsidies	Amount of public financial subsidies/ number of monuments ratio	Important for long-term sustainability	I: state conservation offices, subordinate conservation authorities S: statistical reports	DF: hardcopy TU: NUTS 1 MD: interval level	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L	H A L

2.3 Do you know case studies on built cultural heritage, that contain the following data (please mark the indicators with an “x”, if they are aspects that are considered in the case study), especially on their determination or registration (compilation of an inventory)?

Case study	Age	Leisure and Tourism	Formal shaping	Condition of preservation	Commonness	Regional identity	Persistence	Intensity of use (e.g. size of agricultural plots)	Landscape aesthetics	Experience / interpretation	Regional marketing of (agricultural products)
1. Monument topography (<i>Denkmaltopographie</i>)	X		X								
2. Comprehensive inventory (<i>Großinventar</i>)	X		X								
3. Monument preservation plan (<i>Denkmalpflegeplan</i>)	X		X	X					X		
4. Monument preservation target planning	X		X	X					X		
5. Building age plan	X		X	X					X		
6. Survey on measures, activities and financial aids regarding monument preservation of municipalities	X		X		X			X			
7. Buildings of industry and technology	X		X		X			X			
8. Guide to the monuments of industry and technology	X		X		X			X			
9. Study of commercially used and protected monuments in Hamburg					X			X			
10. Building of engineering and technology	X			X			X				
11. City hall on the bridge, Bamberg		X									
12. Tourism plan, Bamberg		X									
13. Heritage and tourism		X									
14. Monument preservation and tourism		X									
15. Culture tourism in Europe, growth without limit		X									
16. The Heidelberg atlas of crime		X									
17. City marketing											X
18. Monument register of Bavaria	X		X								
19. List of Bavarian sites	X		X						X		
20. Cultural landscape ca-daster											
21. Archaeological layer atlas Cologne			X stratification								
22. Environmental information system of state (<i>Länder</i>) and regional planning in Bavaria stratification					X						

2.4 How can we get further information on the case studies you mentioned in question?

Name of case study	Location	Year	Sources	Contacts
1. Monument topography	NUTS 3	since 1981, until 1999 115 volumes have been published continuously	Claus-Peter Echter, Grundlagen und Arbeitshilfen städtischer Denkmalpflege in Deutschland, Berlin 1999 (Difu Beiträge zur Stadtforschung, Bd. 28) (= Fundamental principles and aids to urban monument preservation in Germany)	Claus-Peter Echter Difu Abteilung Köln Lindenallee 11 50968 Köln Phone: 0221-3771-145 e-mail: echter@difu.de
2. Comprehensive inventory	NUTS 3	continuously	Association of state preservationists (= Vereinigung der Landesdenkmalpfleger)	Dr. Ursula Quednau Westfälisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Salzstraße 38 Erbdrostenhof 48143 Münster Phone: 0251-59109
3. Monument preservation plan	NUTS 3	since 1981, until 1999 24 plans have been published continuously	Claus-Peter Echter, Grundlagen und Arbeitshilfen städtischer Denkmalpflege in Deutschland, Berlin 1999 (Difu Beiträge zur Stadtforschung, Bd. 28)	Claus-Peter Echter Difu Abteilung Köln Lindenallee 11 50968 Köln Phone: 0221-3771-145 e-mail: echter@difu.de
4. Monument and preservation target planning	NUTS 3: Schleswig-Holstein	since 1972, until 1999 around 50 plans have been published continuously	see above	Dr. Gerd Kaster Landesamt f. Denkmalpflege Schleswig-Holstein Schloß 24103 Kiel Phone: 0431-90670
5. Building age plan	NUTS 3: Bavaria	1972 – 1993, 12 plans	see above	Dr. Manfred Mosel Bayrisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Hofgraben 4 80539 München Phone: 089-2114-0
6. Measures and activities regarding monument preservation of municipalities	NUTS 0: nation-wide	1985	Claus-Peter Echter, Denkmalpflegerische Maßnahmen, Aktivitäten und finanzielle Leistungen der Gemeinden, Berlin 1987.	Claus-Peter Echter Difu Abteilung Köln Lindenallee 11, 50968 Köln Phone: 0221-3771-145 e-mail: echter@difu.de
7. Building industry and technology	NUTS 0: nation-wide	1994	Axel Föhl, Bauten der Industrie und Technik, Bonn 1994.	Axel Föhl Rheinisches Amt f. Denkmalpflege Abtei Brauweiler Ehrenfriedstraße 19 50259 Pulheim Phone: 02234-98540
8. Guide to the monuments of industry and technology	NUTS 0: nation-wide	1992	Volker Rödel, Reclams Führer zu den Denkmälern der Industrie und Technik in Deutschland 1, Alte Länder, Stuttgart 1992.	Dr. Volker Rödel Dezernat Planung Referat für Denkmalpflege Braubachstraße 15 60311 Frankfurt am Main Phone: 069-212-3619
9. Study of commercially used and protected monuments in Hamburg	NUTS 3: City of Hamburg	1996	Studie zu gewerblich genutzten und gesetzlich geschützten Denkmälern in Hamburg, Hamburg 1996.	Dr. Volker Konerding Denkmalschutzamt Imstedt 20 22083 Hamburg Phone: 040-29188-2737
10. Buildings of engineering and technology of the 19 th and early 20 th century. Use and monument preservation	NUTS 3	1985	Claus-Peter Echter (ed.), Ingenieur- und Industriebauten des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts. Nutzung und Denkmalpflege, Berlin 1985.	Claus-Peter Echter Difu Abteilung Köln Lindenallee 11 50968 Köln Phone: 0221-3771-145 e-mail: echter@difu.de
11. City hall on the bridge. Bamberg	NUTS 3: Bamberg	1998	Preservation of city image – tourism – sponsoring. Speech held at a conference of German urban monument preservationists in Cologne, September 1998.	Richard Schröppel Head of the subordinate monument protection authority Untere Sandstraße 32 96049 Bamberg Phone: 0951-871680
12. Tourism plan Bamberg	NUTS 3: Bamberg	1999 (in progress)		Andreas Christel Amt für Tourismus und Kongreßservice Geyerswörthstraße 3 96047 Bamberg e-mail: touristinfo@Bamberg.de

continued

continued

Name of case study	Location	Year	Sources	Contacts
13. Heritage and tourism	NUTS 3: Trier	1998	Speech held at a conference of German preservationists in Berlin, February 1999.	Reppel und Partner Wilhelmstraße 56 76275 Ettlingen Phone: (0 72 43) - 7 80 91 Dr. Angelika Meyer Denkmalpflegeamt Rathaus / Postfach 34 70 D 54244 Trier Phone: (06 51) - 7 18 16 80
14. Monument preservation and tourism	NUTS 0: nation-wide	1987	Peter Roth: Die Bedeutung des historischen Denkmals für ausländische Touristen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in: Denkmalpflege und Tourismus. International symposium from Nov. 26 th to 29 th 1986.	Europäisches Tourismus Institut GmbH an der Universität Trier Bruchhausenstraße 1 54290 Trier Phone: (06 51) - 97 86 60 e-mail: info@eti.de
15. Culture tourism in Europe, growth without limits	Europe	1993	Christoph Becker, Albrecht Steinecke: Kulturtourismus in Europa. Wachstum ohne Grenzen. Trier 1993. (ETI-Studien, Bd. 2)	Europäisches Tourismus Institut GmbH an der Universität Trier Bruchhausenstraße 1 54290 Trier Phone: (06 51) - 97 86 60 e-mail: info@eti.de
16. The Heidelberg atlas of crime	NUTS 3: Heidelberg	1998	Stadt Heidelberg, Der Heidelberger Kriminalitätsatlas – ein Kooperationsmodell zwischen Polizei und Kommunalverwaltung. Heidelberg 1999, (Schriften zur Stadtentwicklung)	Stadtverwaltung Heidelberg Marktplatz 10 69117 Heidelberg Phone: (0 62 21) - 5 80
17. City marketing	NUTS 3	1998	Busso Grabow, Beate Hollbach-Grömig, Stadtmarketing – eine kritische Zwischenbilanz. (Difu Beiträge zur Stadtforschung, Bd. 25)	Dr. Busso Grabow Beate Hollbach-Grömig Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik Straße des 17. Juni 111 Phone: (0 30) - 3 90 01 - 0 e-mail: grabow@difu.de hollbach-grömig@difu.de
18. Monument register of Bavaria (<i>Denkmalliste, Denkmaldatei</i>) first step: monument data file second step: monument map of Bavaria	NUTS 1: Bavaria	1. work in progress 2. work at the beginning	paper Ongyerth, September 8 th 1999	Dr. Gerhard Ongyerth Bayrisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Hofgraben 4 80539 München Phone: (0 89) - 21 14 - 0
19. List of Bavarian sites (Ensembles), ground plan 1:5.000	NUTS 1: Bavaria	permanent	paper Ongyerth, September 8 th 1999	see above
20. Cultural landscape cadaster	NUTS 0: nation-wide	permanent	Klaus Fehn, Winfried Schenk, Das historisch-geographische Kulturlandschaftskataster – eine Aufgabe der geographischen Landeskunde. In: Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde 2 / 1993, S. 479–488. Peter Burggraaff, Klaus-Dieter Kleefeld, Historische Kulturlandschaft und Kulturlandschaftspflege, Bonn – Bad Godesberg 1998, S. 55–107 (Bundesamt für Naturschutz, angewandte Landschaftsökologie, H. 20)	Prof. Dr. Klaus Fehn Dr. Andreas Dix Seminar für Historische Geographie Konviktstraße 11 Phone: (02 28) - 36 90 e-mail: a.dix@uni-bonn.de
21. Archaeological layer atlas Cologne (<i>Archäologischer Schichtenatlas Köln</i>)	NUTS 3: City center of Cologne	work in progress	paper by Ongyerth, September 8 th 1999	Prof. Dr. Klaus Greve Dr. Christina Häuber Geographische Institute Abt. GIS und Fernerkundung Meckenheimer Allee 166 53115 Bonn Phone: (02 28) - 73 55 96 (Prof. Dr. Greve) Phone: (0 26 42) - 90 01 16 (Dr. C. Häuber) Internet: http://www.giub.uni-bonn.de/greve/projekte/fortuna/koeln_t.htm
22. Environmental information system of state and regional planning in Bavaria (Rauminformationssystem der Landes- und Regionalplanung in Bayern – Raumordnungskataster RIS-Bayern / ROK)	NUTS 1: Bavaria	permanent	paper Ongyerth, September 8 th 1999	Dr. Reinhold Koch Bayrisches Staatsministerium für Landesentwicklung und Umweltfragen Referat 5/4 Phone: 089–92143438 e-mail: poststelle@stmlu.bayern.de

Comments

The questionnaire for the development of a Europe-wide, map-based information system for the cultural heritage within in the framework of a European spatial development concept is important and useful. However the presented questionnaire reveals some problems:

1. Approach and contents

From our point of view the questionnaire seems to be a bit “highbrow” and for monuments preservationists only partly answerable. The approach “Monument preservation and sustainable development” is recently well received among experts, but it does not represent the heart of monument presentation: registration, protection and preservation of monuments and ensembles. The aspect “tourism and monument preservation” weighs too heavily in the questionnaire whereas questions of use and re-use of monuments are of too little significance.

We could only give little information concerning the “archaeological monuments” because of the short amount of time we had to work on the questionnaire.

2. Methodological aspects

The following weaknesses are relevant:

- a) Attempts of statistical quantification and mapping are stressed too heavily.
- b) Missing homogeneity of indicators and aspects of valuation; mixing of not compatible aspects or of those that cannot be answered at the same time (e.g. time trends – territorial context; threshold values – benchmarks)
- c) Some indicators are of too high complexity (e.g. socio-economic carrying capacity) and at the same time unprecisely operationalised (e.g. number of actors).
- d) Unrealistic expectations concerning the availability of data.