

Integrating and managing the local dimension of heritage: the challenge of linking the Venice Charter with territorial planning tools in France

Integrar e gerir a dimensão local do património: o desafio de conectar a Carta de Veneza às ferramentas de planeamento territorial em França

ROMEO CARABELLI^{1*} 
GEORGES-HENRY
LAFFONT² 

1. UMR 7243 CITERES (CNRS & Université de Tours - France),
MSH Val de Loire BP 60449, 37204
TOURS cedex 03, France
2. UR Architectures &
Transformations, ENSA de Saint-
Etienne – Université Jean Monnet
de Saint-Etienne, 1 rue Buisson,
42000 Saint-Etienne, France

*romeo.carabelli@univ-tours.fr

Abstract

Even if the Venice Charter is an essential reference, a limited reformulation may prove useful. We present here a reflection on a possible evolution focused on the co-production of knowledge and expertise between technicians, academics and heritage communities. This proposal invites thinking about heritage as an interface between conservation and planning tools. The wills of the Venice Charter could interact towards a better recognition of the social dimension of heritage through a revaluation of the heritage community. In the Grand-Chambord area (France), we tested a process that seems capable to facilitate the integration of the social dimensions of heritage into planning tools. This method, that could be adapted to other cases, is based on a reframing of the initial vision of the Venice Charter by linking it to the population wills of each area. This specific adaptation would allow territorial transformation respecting the heritage values of our landscapes.

Resumo

Mesmo que a Carta de Veneza seja uma referência essencial, uma reformulação limitada pode revelar-se útil. Apresentamos aqui uma reflexão sobre uma possível evolução centrada na coprodução de conhecimento e especialização entre técnicos, académicos e comunidades patrimoniais. Esta proposta convida a pensar no património como uma interface entre ferramentas de conservação e planeamento. As intenções da Carta de Veneza poderiam interagir no sentido de um melhor reconhecimento da dimensão social do património através de uma reavaliação da comunidade patrimonial. Na área de Grand-Chambord (França), testámos um processo que parece capaz de facilitar a integração das dimensões sociais do património nas ferramentas de planeamento. Este método, que poderia ser adaptado a outros casos, baseia-se numa reformulação da visão inicial da Carta de Veneza, ligando-a às vontades da população de cada área. Esta adaptação específica permitiria uma transformação territorial que respeita os valores patrimoniais das nossas paisagens.

KEYWORDS

France
Inventory
Register
Planning tools
Heritage community
Landscapes

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

França
Inventário
Registo
Ferramentas de planeamento
Comunidade patrimonial
Paisagens

Preamble

The Venice Charter is a crucial document for cultural heritage, even if its direct focus is on monuments, and it is still an important player in the development of the concept of heritage and its management. It was born when the USSR existed, May '68 was not yet a possibility, modern colonialism was still alive and Asian countries had not yet emerged. We should keep in mind that the Venice Charter was written in four original versions (English, French, Italian and Russian) and immediately some questions about the existing differences of interpretation appear [1-3]. Moreover, all the translations in the world came from these different texts, realising some consistent differences in translation issues [4-5].

The changes of the last six decades have meant that heritage has become a multifaceted issue, closely linked to local lifestyles and economies. The term “heritage” has become “heritages”, changing from a singular monumental vision to a multiplicity of elements that make up the tangible cultural heritage. It is essential to recognise and manage this diversity; in this paper we revisit the subject after many authors, using their experience and adding our own. We propose an approach aimed at establishing a more proactive contact between the current property regime and spatial planning instruments.

The introduction – broadening the heritage base – deals with the link between the planning instruments of heritage protection and the concepts contained in the Venice Charter, the former linked to the complexity of the contemporary world and the latter linked to an outdated moment in our history. Of course, we are not the first to understand the change in the patrimonial vision during these 60 years.

In the section “A theme and a field project to test it”, we indicate the ground on which we have been working, pointing out the importance of local heritage. It can act as a bridge between the monumental dimension of the Venice Charter and the current dimension of heritage, which is more open and attentive to smaller issues and societies.

The knowledge and recognition of the built heritage is a fundamental act in the management of the territorial heritage, also because it is a topical moment to think about the actions of the heritage and their link with the people and their organisations.

We then present an experiment that we have had the opportunity to carry out, which leads us to consider the Venice Charter as a solid reference for heritage management, but an enrichment would allow it to continue to be an important and recognised point of reference in heritage valorisation.

Broadening the heritage base

This text addresses the need for change that has emerged in the 60 years since the Venice Charter was established, particularly in relation to the relationship with the inhabitants and the different perspectives on heritage.

This diversity is perhaps accentuated by the emergence of a weak postmodern thought [6]. Regarding heritage issues, a less monumental and normative way of thinking is gradually emerging, more interested in community will and knowledge [7-8].

Charged with a spiritual message from the past, humanity's monumental heritage remains as a living testimony to its ancient traditions. As modern society becomes more aware of human values, it regards these traditions as a common heritage. In relation to future generations, society recognises its shared responsibility to preserve and transmit this heritage in all its rich authenticity.

The Venice Charter definitively establishes the link between humanity and tangible traces of the past. It highlights the inherent link between technology, knowledge and heritage conservation, and emphasises the need for continuous conservation efforts.

At the end of the first quarter of the twenty first century, we have witnessed a change in the approach to heritage. The monumental heritage outlined in the Venice Charter was enriched by many other less monumental elements. In addition, the concept of valorisation was adopted for heritage conservation.

In France, classified heritage, which is recognised as such, is now joined by heritage that can be described as minor – but which we prefer to call “local heritage”. This heritage is a fundamental part of the daily life of local people and is more closely linked to them than the heritage classified by the French State. It is noteworthy that the Charter does not yet clearly integrate the living spaces and daily experiences of individuals [9-11]. In our view, this implies considering the territory as a living heritage as well as a lived heritage, as was later done with the UNESCO “HUL” recommendation [12].

These new conditions, unknown to the authors of the Charter, lead us to consider the integration of the heritage issue into territorial management tools, to effectively enhance patrimonial objects. The changes in the concept of heritage and its valorisation raise the question of how to develop tools that can make the system work in the real world.

This action reveals strong links with the development of ideas related to communities of inhabitants that can establish commons, as discussed by Lucie K. Morisset, as well as with the concept of commons presented by Elinor Ostrom [13-15].

After 60 years as an indispensable reference, amended several times to ensure its integrity and adaptability to local and global changes, a reorientation of the Venice Charter could be useful. Here we present a reflection that could, in the long term, lead to a new evolution of the Charter. It focuses on the co-production of knowledge and expertise between technicians, academics and the heritage community. This approach can fully integrate local and listed heritage [16].

This reflection invites us to consider the heritage issue as an interface between the preservation of the built heritage – the central focus of the Venice Charter – and the planning tools that organise landscape transformations - the process of translating the Venice Charter into lived territories.

This link between the Venice Charter, heritage and planning tools could help to achieve greater recognition of the social dimension of heritage by strengthening the role of the heritage community.

As part of our research in partnership with the *Inventaire* (the official French national register of recognised cultural heritage), we propose a flexible tool that can incorporate the social and territorial aspects of heritage [13]. This contribution is based on the collaborative work carried out in the Grand Chambord area, where elected representatives, technicians and residents have experimented with this type of arena.

This method cannot be reproduced in its current form and should be adapted on a case-by-case basis, re-framing the original vision of the Venice Charter and linking it to national planning instruments. This specific adaptation would make it possible to transform landscapes while respecting their heritage values.

A theme and a field project to test it

We have identified a nodal point in this process of transformation, a point that affects the notion of heritage as well as all the spatial planning tools and the way in which national heritage is recognised and managed. A system in constant flux.

To address this issue in a real action on the ground, we had the opportunity to be supported by the Centre Val de Loire region within the framework of a project entitled *Patrimoine culturel de proximité, Bien Commun pour la construction territoriale* (PBC – Local Cultural heritage, a common good for territorial development).

The research consortium includes researchers from the Universities of Tours and Orleans (UMR CITERES and CRJ Pothier) and institutional partners (Communauté de Communes du Grand Chambord – CCGC in text, CAUE 41, Mission Val de Loire). Two *départements* in the centre of France were chosen for the project: Loir-et-Cher and Indre-et-Loire.

Recognising and listing local heritage

This research action proposed the hypothesis that the change in the patrimonial sphere could be transferred to the sphere of territorial transformation, with a change in the act of recognising and characterising the existing buildings, the whole set of existing buildings that are potentially active in territorial development. Even if not directly inspired, this process is not far from the identification of the Burra Charter [17-18], including the technical needs of planning issues.

It was therefore decided to characterise the local architectural inheritance through a different and innovative process.

This objective responds not only to the evolution of the heritage field and the actions undertaken at its various institutional levels, but also to the strong cultural link that each of us has with our heritage. It is so strong that we have direct access to heritage judgement. We identify and evaluate heritage through experience; our culture and life experiences lead us to approach the complexity of heritage in an almost instinctive way.

These evaluations, assessments, judgments and translations of forms of appropriation are valuable both for measuring changes in heritage and for helping to make heritage sustainable.

From then on, the PBC research-action aimed to report on and explain how these actions were constructed and carried out, to identify the levers that would enable the heritage characterization process to be appropriated by a multitude of players, including those described as “non-experts”. We proposed to deconstruct part of the heritage identification mechanism for a better understanding and to reconfigure it to make it easy to use, a necessary transformation to keep the idea of heritage away from “only-monuments”.

Indeed, we formulate the hypothesis that through the characterization of items, it is possible to enrich the heritage of several entities otherwise excluded. We imagine this transformation as the transition from a formal National Inventory to a kind of census, involving the entire population of a given territory.

The concept of heritage, as it is conceived and characterised today, has evolved over the last two centuries, thanks in particular to the contribution of numerous thinkers such as Viollet-le-Duc [19], John Ruskin [20], William Morris [21], Gustavo Giovannoni [22], and, more recently, Alberto Magnaghi [10].

This history of heritage and its construction and stabilisation as a concept teaches us that heritage, in all its dimensions and complexity, is constantly changing, as is clearly shown by the developments between the major international documents that define it: the Athens and Venice Charters, the First and Second International Congresses of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments 1931 and 1964 [16], the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage [23] and, closer to home, the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage [24] and the 2011 Recommendations on Historic Urban Landscapes [12].

These elements form an international framework. However, we should also take into account national frameworks – for example, we are directly affected by the French tradition, from the law of 31 December 1913 on historical monuments on historical monuments to the LCAP law of 2016, which is also influenced by international documents such as the conventions of the Council of Europe, such as the Faro Convention of 2005 – although France has not yet ratified it.

At the same time, much thought is being given to the appropriation of heritage by those who can benefit from it, encounter it daily and use it in some way [14, 25]. These trends pave the way for a broader concept of heritage, closer to the inhabitants and considering their daily

experiences. To encourage and structure this new perception of heritage, to “invent” heritage [26], the characterisation of “normal” objects, those of local everyday life, becomes more useful, heuristic and interesting. A broader and more collaborative recognition of heritage [27] will enable the construction of a future shared narrative about it.

As we have just emphasised, heritage is constantly evolving over time and with society. It is embedded in space and therefore varies according to the territory. The relationship between heritage and territory is therefore strong [28], and in the PBC project we give it an important place. For this reason, our analytical, methodological and reflexive interest is focused on the proximity heritage, a subset of the material heritage bequeathed to us by previous generations, which has a tangible and perceptible materiality and is meaningful both for an individual and for a community [25].

In our view, the interest in evoking, invoking and mobilising local heritage lies in the fact that this component of cultural heritage, in addition to being a concrete illustration of the above, interacts with the daily lives of the inhabitants. Without denying the importance of monumental or already widely recognised heritage (such as listed or classified monuments), we are interested in what is sometimes called “small”, “local” or “neighbourhood” heritage, which is often not recognised as heritage.

With this notion of local heritage, we are aiming at the component of material heritage that interacts with the experience of the communities and societies for which this heritage is a reference. This is how we interpret the Town Planning Code (*Code de l'urbanisme*), which states that “French territory is the common heritage of the nation. The public authorities are its custodians and guarantors within the limits of their powers” (Art. L. 101-1: *Le territoire français est le patrimoine commun de la nation. Les collectivités publiques en sont les gestionnaires et les garantes dans le cadre de leurs compétences*). In this way, the local heritage shared by a community is inextricably linked to a territory and its local life, to its protection and its active promotion.

Following this line of thought, the territory is based on the positive and balanced development of communities, a process in which heritage plays an increasingly important role. Having been considered as an object to be preserved and then as an essential element in the constitution of the nation [26, 29], heritage has become a resource for the construction and development of territories. Participating consciously and, why not, actively in this territorial construction through heritage seems to be an opportunity for individuals, communities and institutional actors to articulate social needs with the crises and transitions of the twenty first century.

To meet these challenges, the PBC consortium proposed to test a conceptual and operational tool to help raise awareness of heritage, linking institutional heritage and neighbourhood heritage, symbolic values and using values to contribute to the co-construction of territories, involving some experts but also as many elected representatives, technicians, associations and residents as possible.

Aware of various risks and abuses, however, we remain vigilant about the practices of heritage characterisation and recognition, to allow the benefits of a new identity-based heritage development, while limiting the risk of fetishising it. Indeed, as we have studied and highlighted, this drift can express ideological positions and be very – or even too – strongly linked to exclusive communities or overly targeted interests. The rhizome nature [30] of heritage is certainly a potential, but also a risk, in this search for polyarchic constructions of both heritage and territory.

It is in the light of these objectives and points of vigilance that we feel it is worthwhile to report here on the work carried out specifically with the Great Chambord Area (CCGC) and the *Inventaire* of the Centre VdL region.

Knowledge and recognition of the built heritage: a fundamental act in the management of territorial heritage. The *Inventaire* has not only studied the monumental heritage, much of which is protected by the laws on historical monuments. Since its creation, it has paid particular attention to vernacular architecture, the small-scale and local heritage made up of

farms, houses, mills, wash-houses, wayside crosses, etc. This heritage is exceptionally protected as a Historic Monument and is rarely protected as a *Site Patrimonial Remarquable* (or the former *Secteurs Sauvegardés* or ZPPAUP/AVAP) when it is located in lightly and moderately urbanised areas. However, this heritage is taken into account, preserved and protected by a *Plan local d'urbanisme* (PLU), a planning document that sets out a development project for a commune or group of communes (PLUi - a ministerial decree came into force on 1 January 2016 modernising the PLU with the aim of moving from regulatory to project-based urban planning).

"To survey, to study, to make known" is the motto of the *Inventaire*, a motto that remains common to the various regional services. These studies take various forms: basic studies, topographical or thematic studies, preliminary studies, etc. They are included in the various national inventory databases available online (named: *Mérimée*, *Palissy*, *Mémoire*). They can also be the subject of scientific reports, scientific publications (the journal: *Les cahiers du Patrimoine*), publications aimed at a wider public (the magazine: *Images du Patrimoine*) and tourist publications (the guides: *Parcours du Patrimoine*).

What the historical analysis of the specific work of the *Inventaire* – and more generally of the evolution of the construction of the heritage fact – shows is the gradual emergence of an interest in a heritage diagnosis that is not a register of individual objects, monuments, landscapes, but a set of structural rules that keep alive the identity of the territory itself and guarantee its reproduction [10].

Conducting a heritage census differs from “simply” compiling a collection of information in that it is a fundamental unit for understanding both the territorial dynamics underway and the issues raised by the heritage. Moreover, this diagnosis can be taken into account in the definition of territorial planning tools, as it becomes a means of giving a collective meaning to the many individual entities.

For the *Inventaire*, the diagnosis of the heritage should bring it closer to the problems of regional planning. Although the link between the *Inventaire* and regional planning has a long history [13], it is still difficult to make it work effectively. The Centre Val de Loire is a case in point, both because it illustrates this desire to link heritage and the region, and because it forms part of the basis of the PBC project.

As part of its relationship with the local representative in charge of heritage management (UDAP), the *Inventaire* took part in the characterisation of the heritage of the commune of La Riche as part of the drafting of a new PLU. In this field, the local demand for support and interpretation of the heritage provided an opportunity to reflect on a new methodology aimed at providing evaluation elements capable of supporting decision-making. It was necessary to identify characterisation criteria that would support this assessment: this led to the so-called “ERIC” method [13], conceived by the head of the regional office of *Inventaire* – at that time M. Claude Quillivic – and previously tested in the field. It is based on the criteria of exceptionality, rarity, integrity and contextuality.

Exceptionality, to indicate exceptionalities as opposed to normal buildings. Originally intended for monuments, it was quickly restricted because it was not entirely relevant and could be replaced in any case. Rarity, to indicate the scarcity of this type of building, through the activities carried out inside or the architectural type. The presence of more or less similar elements influences their treatment. Integrity, a simplified estimate of the materiality of the element, this indicator is also important to manage its possible transformations. Contextuality, this is an attempt to indicate whether the building in question – remember that the analysis is carried out on a building scale – has some links with the buildings surrounding it, to enrich its vision and the future way of acting.

A “real life” test

Our aim was, and still is, to carry out work that integrates the diversity of heritage and, at the same time, supports decision-making in spatial planning. This method, which is experimental

and not to be used systematically, has its own rules, but it proposes to support the management of local heritage that is not formally protected.

The first test on field for this method was done in 2015/2016, by its inventor, M. Claude Quillivic – director of the *Inventaire* of *Region Centre Val de Loire* – in the municipality of La Riche (37) within the framework of the implementation of the local PLU. The coverage was about the whole municipality's historical envelope – the part called “compact” and present on nineteenth century maps. Subsequently, and thanks to the PBC project, it was possible to propose a more consequential work carried out between 2017 and 2020 on the communes that compose the *Communauté de Communes du Grand Chambord* (<https://www.grandchambord.fr/> 17 municipalities at that time, now 16 – 20 609 inhabitants at the 2021 census, 433 sq.k.). Having previously organised together with the *Inventaire* the data collection sheet for ERIC, an engineer was hired between June 2017 and May 2018 to carry out the building information capture of the 17 communes (for practical reasons of time, we limited ourselves to the areas of dense built-up areas, without taking into account the isolated buildings on the territory). The data integrated the technical G.I.S. of the CCGC by the company Pilote⁴¹ (today Pilote-OET – <https://pilote-oet.fr/>) in charge of the data management of the Loiret Department (41), in this way, information were made available to the communal technicians. The work involved a constant exchange with the 17 mayors – during the usual Monday's institutional meeting - and with the CCGC technicians. Sessions to present the work were organised in all municipalities during 2019 and the exchanges had to be stopped because of the COVID19 pandemic time.

The method proposes the use of relatively simple and configurable criteria to participate in a sort of rating system that helps to create groupings of properties that can theoretically enjoy the same territorial status.

One of the criteria chosen was that of Exceptionality, which lost its status during the field exercise, confirming the distance of the concept of heritage from the Exceptionality that characterises monumental heritage.

Exceptionality primarily concerns historical monuments that are already officially recognised as heritage and for which a selection has already been made. These works can therefore be considered exceptional in the sense that they are the exception to the rule, and this criterion makes it possible to distinguish them from the outset and give them special treatment. Exceptionality is linked above all to the history and distinction of the work and can be the subject of legal protection.

For this reason, that of being “already” a recognised heritage asset, this character is avoided in the field test because, in the end, there is no longer any need to indicate the exceptional character of a monumental heritage asset. The other three variables (rarity, integrity and contextuality) do not contradict the notion of nearby heritage, thus confirming their role. As we told, the first – rarity – indicates the quantity of similar properties present in each territory, the second – integrity – the material condition of the property, and the third - contextuality – the integration – or not – of a property in a series of properties that benefit from being considered together.

The interest and originality of the “ERIC” method lay in the integration of an evaluation logic based on comparison, which is rarely proposed in other methodologies. To improve it, we have defined an evaluation system that associates a scale of values (from 1 to 3) to each criterion, reflecting the Rarity, Integrity and Contextuality of the work in question. Only Exceptionality (which can only have a value of 0 or 1) has become an overall useless variable and is destined to disappear.

Critical review of field experience

At the *Rendez-vous du Val de Loire* in 2015 (a heritage event organized by the *Mission Val de Loire Patrimoine Mondial*), the CCGC management team had already shown an interest in the

participatory approach applied to heritage in particular. At the time, it was producing a PLUi on heritage and, during the event, it was particularly interested in the presentations of the two inventories and diagnoses already carried out using this type of tool (the communes of Luynes and La-Riche). This interest is linked to the CCGC's desire to become part of the *Grands Sites de France* network with a view to long-term regional development. The heritage assessment was carried out within the CCGC and the results are convincing. Both the local population and the institutional players have been supported in their efforts to include the local heritage in the inventory of heritage sites for regional development.

The project was implemented from January 2017 to December 2020, and the specific “ERIC” field work lasted 12 months from June 2017. During this time, the maintenance of the Exceptionality criterion was quickly questioned. Indeed, we observed that it “interfered” or interacted too much with the sensitive or emotional dimension of local heritage. The use of a rare, and therefore recognised, building to discuss the value attributed to local heritage only provoked conflict and tension, and failed to reveal the significance of local heritage.

Furthermore, to describe a local heritage item as “exceptional” would be, on the one hand, to accept a kind of immutability of the heritage dimension of a building, which would be at odds with a relational and evolving heritage fact, and, on the other hand, to refer to an element that is “already classified” because it is exceptional and does not require recognition work as such. The field test of rarity has proved to be ambivalent, being positive in some cases and negative in others [27]. Indeed, rarity seems to be contextual, flirting with the criterion of contextuality. It varies not only according to the individual, although a kind of consensus has been observed on many occasions, but also, if not above all, according to the territorial scale that is openly used or suggested to assess the value of local heritage. Finally, rarity also varies according to the architectural element in question, its nature and whether or not it has a strong local character.

Integrity, for its part, has come to be seen as a judgement about the condition of a building based on a relationship between a current state and an initial state, whether real or imagined. Integrity is therefore a relationship with the otherness of a heritage, both in terms of its materiality and its image. Thus, while on the surface the characterisation of a property by this criterion may appear simple (it proposes to compare two states and to indicate the unchanged material proportion between these two situations), on the ground it is complex, because the evaluation of the degree of transformation of the property is quite complex, since it involves physical and symbolic elements. Finally, the fourth variable, contextuality, allows us to qualify the relationship between the good and other goods in the immediate vicinity. It is the idea of coherence, the production of a motif, a sequence that is as important in the characterisation of the heritage as the building itself.

This criterion has proved to be a point of discussion between residents and experts, some of whom have different scales of value and use different elements. While for the experts in the inventory or the elected representatives, contextuality refers to a line of facades, a layout, etc., for the residents it refers to an atmosphere or any other characterisation in the sensitive or aesthetic register [13].

In the end, after the field experience carried out in 2017 and 2018 within the CCGC, the method proved to be particularly encouraging for starting a dialogue between elected representatives and the local population. Based on simple criteria that are easy to understand, it allowed the inhabitants to “give a name” to the non-formalised knowledge that local actors possess but are often unable to define and share.

The experience of the elected representatives and the inhabitants is highlighted and given meaning, something that is often underestimated and unfortunately often marginalised when it comes to major monuments.

This is the case of the *Château de Chambord*, which is seen both as an attractive and dynamic feature of the area and as a “special issue” for the municipalities of the CCGC. The monumental – and recognised – heritage ends up overshadowing the small-scale heritage, which then

suffers from a lack of interest, which is particularly noticeable during the European Heritage Days. Finally, the participatory diagnosis carried out within the CCGC has highlighted elements of heritage in the local fabric that had previously been undervalued.

Towards a new edition for the Venice Charter?

Like several other authors, we show that the Venice Charter, as it stands, is a document of its time which, at first sight, should be rewritten. However, in view of the numerous documents produced over the last six decades, which have successively and partially addressed situations not initially included in the original text, it would certainly be a gaffe to produce a new version.

Indeed, on the one hand, the plasticity of the Charter is a guarantee that the heritage issue can evolve in line with transitions of all kinds. On the other hand, the Charter's internal solidity, despite the constant need to respond to specific cases and new ways of thinking about heritage in relation to territory, makes it an evergreen and ever-powerful tool that can be articulated with other documents and tools adapted to each spatial situation. In the medium term, therefore, the aim is to update the effectiveness of the Venice Charter. This is only sketched out here, highlighting the need to consider local heritage within the framework of the Venice Charter.

In many countries, and particularly in France, heritage has developed as a popular concept, but also as a constitutive element of territorial production [31]. The field of heritage has continued to expand over the last forty years [32].

Another observation is that the relationship with heritage is often imbued with a strong emotional and individual charge [29, 33]. It could even be argued that emotion is proof of the existence of heritage [34]. It's a complex reality that we have explored in the PBC project, and one that we believe can help renew the debate on how to consider the links that are forged between residents and heritage, so that symbolic and use values can coexist. In time, this debate could lead to proposals for amendments to the Venice Charter.

However, there is still a long way to go, for how can we give a common meaning to this local heritage, since it is based on the diversity of emotions to be shared? How can we integrate relational values into the process of identification, characterisation and recognition, so that it is shared and recognised by all?

Like territory, heritage is essentially defined by mechanisms of appropriation [35] and by a "mode of action by which individuals collectively compose and experience a common good through the relationships they maintain with the outside world, in ways of knowing and valuing the space that is their own and that they share" [36].

Thus, a first step would be to share expertise in an "equivalence of intelligences" [37] between residents, institutional actors and researchers, so that heritage becomes an asset whose value to others is recognised by all, and the need to share these values and build a common frame of reference that allows this encounter between uses (bottom up) and symbolism (top down).

REFERENCES

1. Houbart, C., 'Du monument à la ville: actualité de la Charte de Venise', paper presentation, Cycle de séminaires ABF Grand Est (2024).
2. Houbart, C., 'Faut-il en finir avec la Charte de Venise?', *CeROArt* **13** (2024), <https://doi.org/10.4000/12ldf>.
3. Houbart, C., 'L'évolution de la pensée', in *Retour à l'esprit de la Charte de Venise*, Icomos France, Paris (2019) 7.
4. Jokilehto, J., 'Observations on concepts in the Venice Charter', *Conversaciones...* **11** (2021) 353-363, <https://www.revistas.inah.gob.mx/index.php/conversaciones/article/view/19056> (accessed 2023-21-09).
5. Yildiz, H., *Translation as a restoration of literary monuments: Turkish translations of the Venice Charter*, Master dissertation, Department of Architectural History, The Bartlett School of Architecture, London (2019).
6. Vattimo, G.; Rovatti, P. A., *Il pensiero debole*, Feltrinelli, Milan (2010).

7. Laffont, G.-H.; Carabelli, R., 'Une en (re)construction? Réflexions et explorations à propos d'interstices où se forment les communs urbains en Val de Loire', in *Espaces à Saisir: la ville à l'épreuve de l'interdisciplinarité, dynamiques citoyennes en Europe*, eds. D. Boisseuil, U. Krampl, M.-P. Lefeuve & J. Serrano, Peter Lang AG, Bern (2024) 431-453.
8. Vanuxem, S., 'Du droit de déambuler: le paysage comme lieu de passages', *Les Cahiers de l'école de Blois* **19** (2021) 10-20.
9. Magnaghi, A., *La biorégion urbaine: petit traité sur le territoire bien commun*, Eterotopia, Paris (2014).
10. Magnaghi, A., *Il progetto locale: verso la coscienza di luogo*, 2nd ed., Bollati Boringhieri, Turin (2012).
11. Magnaghi, A., *La rappresentazione identitaria del territorio: Atlanti, codici, figure, paradigmi per il progetto locale*, Luoghi Alinea, Florence (2005).
12. UNESCO, 'Recommendation on the historic urban landscape', in *UNESCO World Heritage Convention* (2011), [World Heritage Centre - Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape](#) (accessed 2023-21-09).
13. Carabelli, R.; Gigot, M.; Robert, A., *Identifier et caractériser le patrimoine de proximité: vers une approche participative*, Mission Val de Loire, Tours (2022).
14. Morisset, L. K., 'Préserver ou partager? Du patrimoine aux communautés patrimoniales', in: *Pratiques mémorielles et politique: pour une anthropologie politique du patrimoine*, ed. B. Chérubini, L'Harmattan, Paris (2018) 39-52.
15. Ostrom, E., *Gouvernance des biens communs: pour une nouvelle approche des ressources naturelles*, De Boeck, Bruxelles (2010).
16. ICOMOS, 'Chartes et textes doctrinaux', in ICOMOS, <https://www.icomos.org/fr/charte-et-textes-doctrinaux> (accessed 2025-04-22).
17. ICOMOS Australia, 'Burra Charter & practice notes', in *Australia ICOMOS* (2013), <https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes> (accessed 2023-21-09).
18. Lesh, J., 'Forty years of the Burra Charter and Australia's heritage vision', in *Foreground*, <https://www.foreground.com.au/culture/forty-years-of-the-burra-charter-and-australias-heritage-vision/> (accessed 2023-21-09).
19. Foucart, B., 'Viollet-le-Duc et la restauration', in *Les lieux de mémoire*, ed. P. Nora, 1, Gallimard, Paris (1997) 1615-1643.
20. Ruskin, J., *The seven lamps of architecture*, Waverley Book Co., London (1920).
21. Diligent A. (ed.), *William Morris, 1834-1896: l'art dans tout*, Snoeck la Piscine, Gand & Roubaix (2022).
22. Giovannoni, G., *Vecchie città ed edilizia nuova*, UTET, Turin (1931).
23. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 'Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage', in *UNESCO World Heritage Centre*, Paris (1972), <https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext> (accessed 2025-22-04).
24. UNESCO, 'Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage', in *UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris (2003), <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> (accessed 2025-22-04).
25. Carabelli, R.; Laffont, G.-H., 'Vers une construction polyarchique des territoires en Val de Loire: patrimoines et paysages culturels en action?', in *Vous avez dit espace commun?*, ed. S. Segapeli, Peter Lang, Bruxelles (2022) 230-243.
26. Choay, F., *Le patrimoine en questions*, Le Seuil, Paris (2009).
27. Heinich, N., *La fabrique du patrimoine: de la cathédrale à la petite cuillère*, Maison de Sciences de l'Homme, Paris (2009).
28. Di Meo, G., 'Patrimoine et territoire, une parenté conceptuelle', *Espaces et Sociétés* **78** (1994) 15-34.
29. Poulot, D., *Une histoire du patrimoine en occident*, PUF, Paris (2006).
30. Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F., 'Introduction: rhizome', in *Mille plateaux*, eds. G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, Éditions de Minuit, Paris (1980) 1-15.
31. Dambre-Sauvage, L.; Joannette, M., *Patrimoine et développement local: de l'attractivité des territoires à la qualité des milieux de vie*, Presses de l'Université du Québec, Québec (2024).
32. Massary X.; Coste, G., *Principes, méthode et conduite de l'inventaire général du patrimoine culturel*, Éditions du Patrimoine, Paris (2007).
33. Rioux, J. P., 'L'émoi patrimonial', *Le Temps de la réflexion* **6** (1985) 39-48.
34. Heinich, N., 'Les émotions patrimoniales: de l'affect à l'axiologie', *Social anthropology* **20** (2012) 19-33.
35. Ripoll F.; Veschambre, V., 'Introduction', *Noroi* **195** (2005) 7-15.
36. Lajarge, R., *Territorialités en développement, contribution aux sciences territoriales*, HDR Université Joseph Fournier, Grenoble (2012).
37. Rancière, J., *Le maître ignorant: cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle*, Fayard, Paris (2004).

RECEIVED: 2024.9.18

REVISED: 2025.6.13

ACCEPTED: 2025.9.24

ONLINE: 2026.5.29



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>.