



## Introduction

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2026-04-05 02:55 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Rönn, M., Grahn Danielson, B. (2020). Introduction. Cultural heritage compensation: Approaches to transformation of sites with cultural values and architectural qualities: 3-31

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

## INTRODUCTION

Magnus Rönn & Benjamin Grahn Danielson

---

This proceeding is the last part of a research project investigating how compensation is expressed in designing detailed development plans in areas with heritage values and architectural qualities. The overall objective of the research project has been to produce new knowledge about heritage compensation as a concept, method and tool in planning processes. The practical benefit lies in development of empirical findings about how professionals handle cultural heritage and architectural qualities in the transformation of places. Our work about compensation when impacting cultural heritage, cultural environment and architectural qualities started already in 2012. In December that year Magnus Rönn, Benjamin Grahn Danielson and Stig Swedberg were granted funding from the Swedish National Heritage Board's R&D grant for the research project *Policies and Compensation Measures in cultural heritage sector (2013-2015)* which resulted in three publications, one national conference in Sweden on the topic of compensation when impacting cultural- and natural environment, and participation in several conferences both in Sweden and abroad. This was a first exploration of the idea and concept of compensation when it comes to compensating impact on cultural heritage. In 2018 Magnus Rönn, now at *Kulturlandskapet* and *Chalmers University of Technology* was granted funding for a continuation by the Swedish National Heritage Board's R&D, *Compensation, Cultural Environment and Cultural Ecosystem Services (2017-2019)*.<sup>1</sup> This proceeding is the final part of this work, a collection of papers from a workshop in 2019.

At the centre of the research project 2018-2019 are three sub-studies: First, Magnus Rönn, carried out a study on heritage and compensation in detailed development plans. Eight detailed development plans in cultural heritage areas of national interest in Gothenburg, Sweden, have been examined. Secondly, a study was conducted on cultural heritage and cultural environment in the concept of ecosystem services. The study is based on document analyses and interviews, and was carried out by Susanne Fredholm, Freja Frölander and Krister Olsson, *Department of Conservation, Gothenburg University*. Focus is on how heritage values are described, understood and

expressed in the discourse of ecosystem services. Thirdly, an international workshop was arranged, with invited scholars. Ten professionals and researchers from Finland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, United Kingdom and Greece were invited to the workshop. The intention was to broaden and deepen the findings on compensation for impact on heritage and architectural qualities.

This proceeding presents the third part of the project – the international workshop – called *Architecture, cultural environment and compensation in planning processes*.<sup>2</sup> The workshop took place at Chalmers University of Technology in Gothenburg, 16-17 September 2019, and was organized as a joint venture between *Kulturlandskapet* (a cooperative heritage consultancy) and *Building Design, Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology*. The theme in the invitation was summarized in the following way: On compensation as a concept, method and professional practice by architects, architectural conservators and archaeologists in planning processes.

One of the approaches in the research project has been to understand the fundamental meaning of heritage compensation through the exchange of experiences – professional as well as scientific - with scholars and professionals such as architects, architectural conservators and archaeologists. Research and education at universities is completely dominated by studies on ecological compensation presented in scientific journals. Therefore, the search for knowledge on heritage compensation had to be conducted in a different way. For this reason, we decided to directly target selected groups for the workshop with a special invitation – call for abstracts – in May 2018 to selected associations and departments in Europe.<sup>2</sup> Based on their submitted abstracts, ten scholars were invited to present their contributions at the workshop in Gothenburg: Tom Davies, Iida Kalakoski, Athanasios Kouzelis, Mathilde Kirkegaard, Anders Larsson, Urban Nilsson, David Ross, Magnus Rönn, Jennie Sjöholm and Helena Teräväinen.

The Gothenburg-workshop was planned with regard to presentation, question and discussion. Each author had 30 minutes for their session. For each paper/author, two others of the invited scholars had been appointed in advance as discussants. Their task was to read and comment the paper in order to give qualified feedback to the author. This strategy for generating a valuable discussion on papers in sessions is commonly used in symposia in the Nordic Countries organised by the *Nordic Association of Architectural*

*Research.* The workshop ended in general reflection on compensation as key-concept, method and practice. After the workshop, invited scholars were given additional comments and were then asked to deliver improved papers within a month, to the organizers of the workshop, Magnus Rönn and Benjamin Grahn Danielson.

## USES OF LANGUAGE AND APPROACHES

In this introduction we are using different concepts about cultural heritage. The overview follows the definition of cultural heritage that the National Heritage Board of Sweden uses. But the translation to English causes difficulties in a Swedish context, and semantic differences tend to complicate the explanation in an international context. For example, the National Heritage Board, use *kulturvärde* (cultural value) as umbrella concept when describing significant cultural heritage values in a certain area. Architectural quality is also an overall concept in architecture for properties, experiences and values in design proposals and the built environment. Qualities in architecture and urban design are sometimes included in *kulturvärden* by the Swedish National Heritage Board. Directly translated to English, this means cultural values. But in English, cultural values also mean a personal view upon certain ways of life that comes from your cultural background (*kulturella värderingar*). We have therefore decided to use heritage values as the concept in this text. For this reason, when describing compensation in this introduction, this concerns compensation for negative impact on heritage values in the landscape and built environment. Heritage values are both tangible- and intangible. In this proceeding, negative impact means lack, damage and loss.

Compensation comes from the Latin word *compensare*. The concept is used in the sense of compensating, indemnifying, balancing, settling, restoring and reaching a balance etc. There are several synonyms in both English and in Swedish (for example in the dictionary published by The Swedish Academy). Their meanings have in common that there must be some sort of deficiency, lack, loss or damage that must be replaced. Compensation for impact on heritage values due to development can from this point of view correspond to measures that aim to redress insufficiencies in spatial planning, to recreate lost heritage values and/or repair damages on listed buildings with architectural qualities. Compensation measures can in a Swedish context make sense through the underlying intention, through certain values and/or qualities that are negatively impacted when an area is transformed and put to a different use than the previously intended. How compensation

should be carried out and practiced, and the means used, are contested issues in communities and the society as a whole. There are also different views on values and qualities depending on which professions are involved. The controversial issue is whether heritage values and qualities are unique and fixed to a specific plot, or whether they are mobile and can be redesigned at another site. Architects, architectural conservators, archaeologists and other heritage professionals work differently and have different approaches to this issue in transformation of areas.

Using the term *compensation* could be an awkward use of English in an Anglo-Saxon context. In his contribution to this proceeding, Tom Davies raises this concern as an interesting difference between a Swedish context and an English one. Mitigation seems to be a more common concept than compensation when transformation of heritage is addressed. Davies refers to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, which describes compensate as to supply an equivalent and to offset an error, defect, or undesired effect. Synonyms for compensation in this sense may also include “payment” and “remuneration”.<sup>3</sup> Davies points out that *mitigate* in the Merriam-Webster dictionary has a different interpretation. It means to become less harsh or hostile and to make less severe or painful, offering alternatives such as *alleviate* (guilt), *mollify* (calm-down) and *extenuate* (excuse).<sup>4</sup> The Merriam-Webster dictionary presents two contrasting meanings of the word compensate, the first of a monetary or financial compensation and the second of measures to restore injury, harm and loss.

The Swedish context presents a stronger distinction between compensation as a measure and actions on one hand, and on the other hand as monetary or financial issue. These different understandings of compensation can be seen in the transformation of areas with valuable nature- and/or heritage values. However, the difference lies in if it is a single, individual interest or a public interest that is referred to and meant to be compensated. If it is a question of compensating the interest of one party, for example a property owner whose ownership of land is infringed upon by the municipality or the state, then it is a monetary issue. A typical example is when a property owner through a detailed plan is prohibited from demolishing a building, or is expected to preserve it, with regard to its heritage value. In such a case the municipality may be obliged to compensate the property owner in money. When it comes to listing historical buildings with the support of the Historical Environment Act, a preservation measure that highly complicates its use, the State may in

a corresponding way be obliged to compensate the owner in money. If the case concerns the damage or loss of natural- and/or heritage values that are considered to be of public interest and utility to the community and for the citizens, the developer or the party causing the damage is held responsible for its compensation. In such a case it is not a question of monetary compensation, but rather a question of replacing loss. This may include measures such as repairing, rebuilding, restoring etc. due to development in the area with the identified values. Both meanings of compensation occur in the planning and formation of detailed plans. The concept of compensation thus has two different meanings in the Swedish language, depending on who is the decision maker and what type of value is impacted.

There are no regulations that address compensation measures in the Swedish *Planning- and Building Act* when it comes to development and exploitation that impact heritage values. The law, however, prescribes that buildings should be designed and situated in a way that is suitable with regard to the landscape and cityscape, natural environment and heritage on site, and result in a positive overall impact (PBL 2:3). The built areas' specific historical, heritage, environmental and artistic values should be protected (PBL 2:6). Compensation can be addressed as a precondition for developing areas of public interest, such as heritage. The *Environmental Code* provides regulations about compensation when impacting valuable natural environments, cultural heritage areas that are of general interest to the whole society and a utility for citizens in the community. According to the Environmental Act, it is possible to detail "*demands and requirements to compensate impact on general interest that a planned enterprise leads to*" (MB, chapter 16 §9 p.3). The requirement for compensation is consequently not limited to developments that impact specifically protected natural and cultural heritage areas/sites. Further, there are also local policies and guidelines that inform potential compensatory measures.

In the City of Gothenburg, two important documents contain requirements for compensation measures that should be applied in the planning process. The first policy is from 2008: *Compensation measures for nature and recreation*, which was adopted by the City's Building, Property Management Committee, Environment Committee, and the Traffic Committee. Compensation in the policy is "*a voluntary agreement between the municipality and the developer to compensate natural and recreational values that are being damaged or lost when detailed plans are implemented*" (2008:7). The Urban

Planning Department at Gothenburg City Council refers to this policy in those detailed plans that mention compensation measures.

The second document is the *Comprehensive Plan for Gothenburg*, accepted by the City Council in 2009. Nature and cultural heritage are strategic areas for the city in the first part of the comprehensive plan, where compensation also is to be applied. “*Removed natural, cultural heritage, and recreational values are to be compensated*” (CP, part 1:96). An active approach to preserve, protect and compensate cultural heritage is emphasised as urgent. “*Actively apply use-regulations, protection-regulations, demolition prohibition, and compensation measures for built environments with heritage values, in the formulation of in-depth advancements of the comprehensive plan and detailed development plan*” (CP, part 1:97). The future planning should aim to “*develop and use methods of compensation measures for nature, culture heritage, and recreational values in the planning*” (CP, part 1:96). The comprehensive plan for Gothenburg is hence a document that supports compensation in planning and development, guiding the process of detailed development plans in cultural heritage areas.

#### COMPENSATION AS AN ESSENTIALLY CONTESTED CONCEPT IN PLANNING

Compensation is a controversial concept with divergent meanings. How can compensation be defined in the transformation of areas with heritage values and architectural qualities? What kind of measures and actions in planning are expressions for heritage compensation? As a starting point for the discussion on compensation in this context, we use the idea of “essentially contested concepts” by Walter Bryce Gallie, a British social theorist – professor, politician and philosopher. His paper on “essentially contested concepts” was first published in 1956 in *The Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* and later in 1964 in the book *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*. Gallie provides a tool for analysing the term compensation and how this key-concept is understood in exploitation of sites with heritage values and architectural qualities. The theoretical framework sheds light on conflicts regarding compensatory planning processes and transformations of areas through exploitation.

Typical for “essentially contested concepts” are disputes about the correct meaning and interpretation of different terms and language use. However, there is no way to determine what is the right, or wrong, use of words. Profes-

sionals have differing opinions. Gallie uses the word *championship* as an example. In the world of sports, championship is normally something that is appreciated and valuable. At the same time, the concept changes meaning according to the circumstances. Championship is not only about being the best. A champion should also fight well and win the public's heart.

Gallie's idea of essentially contested concepts fits into the discussion on compensation. The transformation of sites is often followed by debates on how to understand heritage values and architectural qualities. Statements from professionals about "good", "bad" or "accepted" actions when dealing with loss of important environments, sites and objects are also controversial. The heritage sector is composed of architects, architectural conservators and archaeologists who all have different opinions on heritage compensation; what it is and how the concept should be used in the transformation of sites. Compensation may appear as a law-based requirement when permits are needed for projects, as a voluntary agreement according to local guidelines, an alteration of architectural design depending of critique from key actors, or unspoken actions by professionals imbedded in planning processes as ethical issues in order to obtain access to building plots. Ethics do not respect geographical boundaries and the limitations by law. The challenge for professionals from an ethical point of view is to find what characterises a suitable way to handle compensation issues in planning processes. Gallie provides a starting point for identifying some important functions connected to compensation as key concept in the transformation of sites:

### **Open concept**

1) Compensation is an *open concept* with changing expressions. With the knowledge of what heritage compensation is, professionals can recognize, explain and point out illustrative examples. Knowledge is obtained through education, practice and research. Scholars who understand the concept have to be capable of demonstrating and accounting for compensation intended to restore damage to values and loss of qualities. Compensation as an open concept includes new kinds of measures and actions to protect heritage values and safeguard architectural qualities in the transformation of sites. There is an on-going revision of compensation thinking, reinterpreting of expressions and specifications around how to bridge different opinions in planning processes. No final definition of what characterizes heritage compensation can be found. The concept receives its meaning through a critical dialogue among stakeholders. Communication is therefore a prerequisite for the

understanding of compensation as an open concept in the transformation of areas including heritage values and architectural qualities.

### **Future-oriented uncertainty**

2) Compensation is connected to *future-oriented uncertainty*. Professionals taking part in the preparation of detailed development plans are supposed to be able to foresee how heritage values and architectural qualities are affected by forthcoming projects. They must make a future-oriented evaluation of not yet implemented developments presented in drawings and illustrations. Nevertheless, scholars must regard the transformation as an already built environment, read a plan proposal and its regulation, interpret the design or new buildings at the plot, and come to a conclusion. The challenge lies in seeing the future in the plan and how identified heritage values and architectural qualities have been safeguarded. In this context, compensation responds to a “wicked problem”, filled with uncertainty about the outcome (Churchman, 1967). Anders Larsson notes in his contribution that the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimize, restore and compensate) is a strategy that might be used for ecological compensation in projects where there is an obvious link between damage and measure. But the strategy is not suitable for exploitation in areas with heritage values and therefore must be criticized. According to Larsson, the mitigation hierarchy favours tangible properties and clearly defined damage to nature at the expense of aspects of intangible heritage, such as stories and memories.

Typical for “wicked problems” is that challenges cannot be solved by traditional analyses that attempt to find the best measures to restore cultural heritage. There are no clear relationships between identified heritage values and architectural qualities at the site, plan proposals, requirements in laws and local guidelines, damage and loss pointed out by professionals and suggested compensation measures. The mitigation hierarchy seems to be an inappropriate policy to use as a foundation for heritage compensation. A more creative approach needs to be developed.

Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber (1973) describe wicked problems as ill-defined issues that have unique causes and solutions. There are several possible compensation actions in plan proposals that may be considered appropriate responses to the damage of heritage values and loss of architectural qualities. This is a wicked problem. Since there are different solutions to compensating negative effects, the plan proposal will be marked by *uncertainty*. How do

we care for, protect and safeguard heritage values and architectural qualities in a positive way? This question represents a fundamentally unfixed point in the planning process that will remain until the final decision. In Sweden, there are cultural heritage areas of national interest. The County Administrative Board in any Swedish county may turn down a detailed development plan approved by the municipality if they suspect it will cause considerable damage to an area of national interest. Neighbours may also appeal against the detailed development plan, delaying its implementation, or even necessitating change or cancellation.

### **Promoting debates**

3) Demands for compensation measures for loss and damage to heritage values and architectural qualities *promote debate*. There are fundamental disagreements among professionals regarding the possibility to restore values in nature and cultural heritage. On the one hand, ecological compensation is supported by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, which has published a manual, dealing with compensation in Environmental Assessment. Heritage compensation, on the other hand, is perceived as a controversial proposal with regard to the demolition of historically important buildings, displacement of designated housing with architectural qualities, and exploitation in cultural heritage areas of national interest. However, displacement is a compensatory measure that has been used in practice for over a hundred years in Sweden, in order to salvage heritage values. Old buildings have been moved from areas undergoing transformation to new allotments in special districts. Three very well-known examples in Sweden are *Skansen* in Stockholm from 1891, *Kulturen* in Lund established in 1892 and the foundation of *Old Linköping* in 1953. There are several small-scale examples from all over the country, while Skansen has risen to become an international concept for outdoor museums of this type.

Heritage compensation is particularly controversial among the authorities responsible for cultural heritage issues and preservation within the state, such as the Swedish National Heritage Board and the County Administrative Boards. One example of how compensation through moving important buildings promotes debate is the relocation of the mining city Kiruna, which within these proceedings is addressed by Jennie Sjöholm. In 2004, the mining company LKAB informed the Municipality of Kiruna that the underground extraction of iron would be continuing towards the central areas of the city. This would necessitate the evacuation of central parts of the small city, and

the city centre would literally have to be moved! In the Competition Brief 2012 for a new city centre for Kiruna, the following is stated:

*The existing cultural heritage should be treated as a resource. Possibilities exist of transferring certain buildings from the old city to new townships, but this is not to say that they will have the same value as in their original positions. New values will be added. Buildings can acquire new functions and other contexts. The new city centre must tell its own, unique story. (Architectural competition brief 2012:46)*

And further:

*The old city centre has a number of buildings which must or can be moved. The participants can suggest locations anywhere on the competition site, but must specifically show those which are suitable in the new city centre[...] The treatment of historic buildings and environments which will be affected by the ground deformation has been a topic of discussion ever since the process of urban transformation began in 2005. The moot point has been which buildings are to be moved, preserved or recreated and which can be documented and demolished. Important qualities – material, economic, architectural, social and, not least, heritage-related – are lost when buildings are pulled down and the existing milieu disappears. This discussion has been characterised by a variety of viewpoints. Some argue that, in principle, all buildings must be moved, and existing heritage values recreated as far as possible, while others do not really ascribe any value at all to older buildings and view them exclusively in terms of expense and problems. (Architectural competition brief 2012:52-53)*

#### **Charged with values**

4) Compensation, heritage values and architectural qualities are concepts in the transformation of areas *charged with values*. The existence of resources in terms of values is acknowledged in relevant laws. Compensation, actions and measures in plan proposals presuppose that there is justified criticism of the exploitation. The point that is missing is an appropriate response to loss of heritage values at sites, damage to architectural qualities, often connected to the intention of safeguarding appraised properties in protected heritage areas. Consequently, compensation as concept, method and practice is embedded with values – dislike or approval. This is the case regardless of whether the measures are considered sufficient to preserve resources or are criticized for

not recreating affected qualities. Values are also included in acceptance of losses through demolitions of buildings, as well as design proposals aimed at adding new qualities to the site and its surroundings.

Compensation is linked to evaluation in planning processes. Heritage values and architectural qualities are seen as something basically positive in national guidelines and local policies. A detailed development plan containing heritage compensation is therefore sometimes accredited with positive value. The plan has a certain number of desirable characteristics. It is a positive feature from an ethical point of view to safeguard properties and give back experiences of cultural heritage that would otherwise have been lost through the exploitation. From this perspective, compensation measures in the transformation of sites can be seen both as an attractive way of securing access to plots by developers and town planning offices, and simultaneously a way to re-create qualities and potentially add new values to the area. Compensation is a result of negotiations and judgments within the plan proposal, which allow the implementation of projects at the building plots under certain conditions.

### **Value-charged questions**

5) The need for heritage compensation is examined in plan proposals with the help of *value-charged questions*. The exploitation of areas with natural environment and heritage values are assessed in two fundamental ways in plan proposals. Partly this is done with regard to general objectives of the Historic Environmental Act, the Planning and Building Act and the Environmental Code, and partly taking into account local policies, guidelines in comprehensive plans and political objectives. Key actors consider questions in relation to plan proposals that are based on professional opinions and ideals; these include interpretation of the site in plan proposals and its potential, how new buildings fits in the area and affect identified values and qualities. Professionals acquire knowledge by posing questions to plan proposals. Response to these questions may decide whether the heritage investigation needs to be supplemented, if the architectural design must be changed, if compensation measures must be carried out to safeguard existing heritage values and architectural qualities at the site.

Through a manual from 2014, the Swedish National Heritage Board has presented a list of which questions that need to be asked when examining a planning proposal in cultural heritage areas of national interest. These ques-

tions are based on the regulations in the Environmental Code concerning the prohibition of exploitation and development that impose significant damage to the protected areas. The County Administrative Board in each county is responsible for examining the plan proposals and assesses the risk of significant damage. The County Administrative Board can annul plans that are assessed as risking significant damage to an area of national interest. To decide if a planning proposal involves such a risk, the National Heritage Board proposes that the analysis should deliver answers to the following six questions:

a) *What is lost, and what is gained?*

Does this include single objects, structures or visual and functional connections, which are important for the understanding and readability of the cultural heritage of national interest? Do added features impact the scale, shape or character in a way that negatively impacts the readability, i.e. the possibility to understand and experience the historical development (of national interest) in the landscape?

b) *Is the impact visual or functional?*

Are sightlines, scale, context, spatiality, orientation or other aspects of the visual experience of the environment changed in a way that negatively affect the understand and experience the cultural heritage of national interest? Do the plans disturb paths, communication routes or other functions or prerequisites of significance for the possibility to use, manage and move around in the area? Can the planned measures mean that availability to the area decreases, that the environment is fragmented, barriers created or that the possibility to visit the area in any way is made more difficult?

c) *Is the impact direct or indirect?*

Is it likely that the measure can be followed by other measures or specific features, which in turn can result in negative consequences? Is there a risk that the measure decreases prospects of using and managing the area, or leads to a changed use of that environment so that the readability of the context of the cultural heritage of national interest is negatively impacted in the long term?

d) *Is the impact temporary or permanent?*

Does the measure mean that the possibility of understanding and experiencing or using the area of national interest is severely deterio-

rated for a limited time? Do characteristics and expressions of national interest disappear or are added features impacting the cultural heritage of national interest in a negative, permanent and irreversible way?

e) *What characteristics are impacted?*

Does the measure impact the characteristics that are crucial for the readability and the experience of the environment, i.e. are they, or parts of their physical expressions, aspects without which the cultural heritage context of national interest no longer is readable? Does the added feature impact those characteristics that support or reinforce the readability and the experience of the environment?

f) *How are the values in the environment affected?*

Will the values, which form the basis for the national interest be lost or corrupted? Are these values so diminished by the change that the area now in a lesser way highlights the cultural heritage context of national interest?

### **Learning and knowledge**

6) Compensation entails *learning* in detailed development plans through design, investigations and documentations. Transformation of listed cultural heritage areas demands and enables studies by consulting firms. Their task is to examine the area, describe heritage values/resources and document architectural quality. New information is added to the planning process, which affects the choice of compensation measures and the design of plan proposals and alterations. If the survey concerns an area with cultural heritage of national interest, it is included in the assignment to further develop the description of that national interest, provided by the Swedish National Heritage Board. Through the assignment given to the consultants, the basis and support of the national interest is updated. New knowledge about the heritage values gives the planning process clear elements of learning.

It is the Swedish National Heritage Board that in its role as central authority establishes cultural heritage areas of national interest and produces the initial descriptions of the heritage values and resources of significance, and the important characteristics within them. The descriptions, however, give no guidance to planning or design in detailed plans. The descriptions are too short and general in their form. Because of this, architects and heritage consultants in Sweden are often hired to assess, document and illustrate

the heritage values/resources and architectural qualities in the area subject to development. The professional base for compensation is therefore found in the consultant's surveys, their identification of heritage values/resources and architectural qualities, and their report on potential consequences. The consultant's surveys and assessments are used as negotiation papers and are being relied upon by stakeholders when the planning proposals are assessed.

### **Interest and power**

7) Compensation is measures and actions linked to *interests* in society and *power* in designing detailed development plans. Power is expressed in the way heritage values and architectural qualities are taken care of in transformations. The assignment to town planning offices is to make detailed development plans that facilitate exploitation. From this perspective, compensation is a way to make plots accessible for building. By bargaining, compensatory measures can be used by town planning offices and developers to combine demolition with construction of new buildings and simultaneously take care of heritage values and architectural qualities in the area. Compensation measures are thus expressions of different ideas about the best way to use sites. The balance between private and public interests shows how power is distributed in society, which in turn influences the reach and direction of safeguarding cultural heritage and architectural qualities during transformation. Professionals defending cultural heritage have a difficult position in planning processes characterized by negotiations among key actors. They are part of the referral bodies and have to react to plan proposals developed by a project group at the town planning offices.

The concept of compensation represents a new paradigm in development and transformation in areas with cultural heritage or high natural environment values. In the heritage sector, compensation has traditionally referred to monetary compensation for intrusions in the property owners right to use their property. For example these intrusions involve protection, prohibition of demolition, preservation, listing of buildings in historical building records and the establishment of protected heritage areas. In these cases, a private interest is compensated. The new paradigm instead means that the developer should compensate damage or loss due to development that was of public interest, or the loss of a resource when the development was carried out for the common good. The shift of perspective is characterized by the "polluter pays"-principle, and the concept of compensation for impact on heritage values is, in a way, an extension of this principle. This means that compensa-

tion is a fundamental ethical issue. In planning processes, heritage values are addressed as a collective, common good and as something of public interest to the community, which is compensated when impacted by development, exploitation and transformation (Lerman, 2014). But, in current practice it is rare that the County Administrative Board (in a Swedish context) in their assessment of planning proposals demands compensation measures due to impact on heritage values. On the contrary, compensation measures are mainly a voluntary agreement, arising from the demands of municipal policies that aim to lessen negative impact, while also making plots buildable (Grahn Danielson, Rönn & Swedberg, 2015).

In Sweden the responsible authority for assessing an application for development on sites and land is the town planning office. The planning office is expected to weigh aspects for and against preservation of heritage values and architectural qualities. In this assessment of different interests, the suitability of the land for the proposed purpose is also assessed. What is most important, and how could conflicts be avoided? The town planning office is thus the body that the politicians assign to work with detailed plans with the purpose of enabling new development, while simultaneously defining which different interests and stakeholders there are tied to the site.

From a heritage point of view, this is not a situation where two equal fighters meet in the boxing ring. New development is always a priority, even in cultural heritage areas of national interest. In Gothenburg, the town planning office's solution is to combine demolition of old buildings and construction of new buildings, through requirements of caution, protection, prohibition and design regulations. It is the compensation measures that form the method for making land buildable, and they are used for strengthening the position for cultural heritage and architectural qualities and to create a better balance between stakeholders in the planning process.

#### WRAPPING UP: HERITAGE COMPENSATION

The proceedings are divided into three sections with three papers in each group. The division is based on how the authors describe and use the concept of compensation for impact in terms of history, contemporary issues and future-oriented reconstruction of heritage values and architectural qualities. The first three contributions deal with compensation from a historical perspective founded on the use of landscape and environments. This is the broad starting point for the discussion. In this part of the proceedings, gene-

ral approaches to compensation in a historical environment are explored within a social context. The contributions present a background to compensation as a concept; they point out important conditions for citizens, and the possibilities of experiencing of cultural heritage.

The second group explores compensation in specific planning contexts as measures, actions and alterations of planning proposals suggested by town planning offices. Compensation has many faces in the planning process. How key actors regard heritage values and architectural qualities is crucial for the planning and designing of plan proposals. Protected areas can be perceived both as obstacles to development, as important to save for the future due to their values and as a resource for further exploitation.

The third group of contributions presents creative solutions to compensation issues and future-oriented actions in individual projects as well as on regional levels. This part includes examples of compensation measures proposed by a consultant firm with an assignment of dealing with heritage values and architectural qualities within the work of a new detailed plan. This represents compensation as a solution to a design problem in an architectural assignment. Another alternative future-oriented understanding of compensation includes the development of landscape observatories. A third way forward for compensation measures can be a digital translation of lost values, transforming them to realistic experience through new technologies. The contributions present very different creative solutions to compensation issues:

- 1) Rethinking compensation as a general concept in a social context.
- 2) Heritage compensation in planning processes.
- 3) Creative compensation measures and future-oriented actions.

Before we go further into the contributions a short presentation of compensation thinking can be of interest. Four types of compensation for restoring cultural heritage and architectural qualities are possible to discern and reflect upon (Grahm Danielson, Rönn & Swedberg, 2017). They are: a) Same value/quality, on site; restoring similar heritage values and architectural qualities at the same site that has been damaged. b) Same value/quality, off site; restoring similar heritage values and architectural qualities, but now at a different site. c) Other equivalent value/quality, on site; restoring another kind of heritage value and/or architectural quality of equal importance, at the site. d) Another equivalent value/quality, off site; restoring other kinds of heritage values and

architectural qualities of equal importance, but on a different site. This basic model for discussing compensation in a planning process can be useful in finding measures and action enabling response to loss of values and qualities, when cultural environments are regarded as an issue of public interest and understood as a benefit/utility to all citizens and the whole society.

### **1. Rethinking compensation as a general concept in a social context:**

This first section includes three papers. We start the discussion on heritage compensation in the proceedings with a contribution by Athanasios Kouzelis. His chapter, *Vernacular architecture design principles as resources of compensation in planning process*, presents the Greek Archipelago in a sustainable and historical context. People who live surrounded by the sea have constructed buildings, practical devices and exploited material resources available from their surroundings. Compensation thinking in this context is expressed as an exchange of ideas and actions in order to overcome shortcomings in the environment. Physical limitations in the environment seem to trigger a development of compensation thinking. This means that compensation measures and actions corresponding to cultural heritage and architectural qualities can be found in many different historical environments all over the world

Kouzelis uses the Greek Archipelago as an illustrative example for compensation thinking. According to him, the forms of housing and the traditional construction techniques in the Aegean have created a specific encoding character for the purpose of bioclimatic and ecological sustainability. He suggests that this historical environment can serve as a model for other cultures as compensation by overcoming environmental challenges in planning. From this point of view, local mitigation is a tradition born out of need, and heritage compensation can therefore operate in many different societies and levels. Kouzelis argues that compensation as a planning and design principle bridges the gap between a local and a global level. Vernacular architecture and design methods can contribute to a heritage-oriented paradigm where the concept of compensation is a sustainability project.

In the second chapter, Mathilde Kirkegaard focuses on cultural heritage environments that are firmly established in the local community. The chapter, *Cultural Environments – A Social Matter*, addresses a missing link between the intrinsic potentials of the cultural environments and compensation as a concept. Her findings are part of a research project conducted in Denmark. According to Kirkegaard historical features generate new narrati-

ves for the local community that can be part of a development strategy. She considers compensation of heritage in relation to a continually changeable heritage environment that includes important social layers. Her perspective on compensation is rooted in the striving to ensure that cultural heritage is preserved and pursued by the people of today, besides securing national interest at heritage sites.

Kirkegaard argues for a balance between bottom-up and top-down methods in the development process of a cultural environment. In this approach, heritage compensation is closely connected to the everyday life. The method calls for a collective effort for finding compensation in the transformation, which in turn reflects a common understanding of the site-specific history. "The use" promotes cultural experiences for citizens. Compensation thereby becomes a matter of a collective coloured by individual perceptions and practices routed in the use of cultural environment.

Kirkegaard notes that compensation in relation to heritage values can have many outcomes. When cultural environments contain social layers, some fundamental questions must be considered during the initial phase: For whom is the development designed and who is affected by the development? These questions must be used to define compensation as measures and actions during the process of alteration. The concerns must also be a part of the negotiations. Kirkegaard argues that a collective identity can be a "product" of compensation in the transformation of sites. In this understanding of the concept, the "product" and outcome are consequently not understood to be only added physical value. Compensatory measures and actions regarding heritage values need to be a part of the process; the local perspectives should be included in order to strengthen collective identity tied to the specific site. Compensation is a social matter expressed through the tangible values in a physical setting.

The third chapter by Tom Davies is titled *Defining New Values for Cavemen and finding the Human in Heritage*. He starts the discussion by pointing out that the understanding of mitigation has changed considerably over recent decades and has become an integral part of planning systems for archaeology. Mitigation has the same meaning for Davies as compensation has for Kouzelis and Kirkegaard in their contributions. Davies continues the discussion by looking at the origins of heritage mitigation in the 19th century and how the idea is a response to loss; it is an expression for

the need to conserve the past in a rapidly changing industrial society. He ends his contribution by considering modes of, or approaches to heritage mitigation, heritagisation processes, continuity, as well as displacing and borrowing strategies in order to explore how they may deliver intangible and tangible values in a heritage context.

According to Davies, the need for an inclusive heritage narrative and the benefit of stories, can be seen by looking at the driving forces behind the conservation, documentation and record-making of heritage values/- and sites. In the United Kingdom, the current legislation protecting ancient monuments, preserving historic buildings and safeguarding cultural environment provides a stark contrast to the plundering of antiquity which preceded the heritage management of today. This reveals that mitigating the loss of our pre-industrial environment is a central motivation to the design of the legislation.

Davies argues that key actors involved in heritage mitigation measures must recognize the importance of telling stories – of intangible heritage values. For this reason, Davies seeks approaches that can comfort the individual through the familiarity of a common story of everyday lives, which in turn enables people to reconcile themselves to the sense of loss, while at the same time promoting experiences of community and heritage culture. Like Kirkegaard, Davies claims that mitigation should be expressed in a social context of a common heritage, heritage values and architectural qualities, not separated from present users. This in turn presents the need to move away from simplistic narratives that serve to preserve only the physical buildings and sites, and to move towards mitigation strategies that celebrate those places for the people who made them and for whom they have meaning.

**2. Heritage compensation in planning processes:** This section contributes to the discussion on compensation in the contemporary planning. Magnus Rönn reports from his research on compensation in detailed development plans conducted in Gothenburg. This fourth chapter in the proceedings presents findings from three case studies of transformation in heritage areas of national interest. Measures, actions and alterations of plan proposals can be defined as compensation in planning processes if the proposed plan a) comprises development that is assumed to have a negative effect on the cultural environment, b) which in turn leads to revisions of the plan proposals, c) and finally imposes new plan regulations or changes in the design of the new buildings. According to Rönn, compensation in planning processes is defi-

ned by the intention behind it. There must be critique from key actors about how heritage is treated in plan proposals. Compensation in this context is not defined as the naming of measures but through actions and their objectives in restoring heritage values or protecting architectural qualities.

Rönn claims that heritage compensation is a practice embedded in detailed development plans. Compensatory measures are expressed in planning documents, in illustrations of new buildings and maps, and in regulations at the sites. This is a hidden type of compensation that becomes visible through studying the planning process, from mission to an accepted detailed development plan. The compensation in processes is characterized as problem solving, planning method, tangible measures, and means of control over exploitation. The overall objective of this type of planning process is to provide access to the site and make the construction of new buildings possible. Depending on the critique received from key actors, at the plan proposal level, compensation is used to protect values in the area, to preserve qualities at the site and to demand appropriate architectural design.

The title of Helena Teräväinen's contribution is *Unspoken Compensations on Heritage values? Three planning examples from Finland*. This fifth chapter presents, compares and discusses three cases of transformation in cities and towns in Finland. According to Teräväinen, heritage values are considered irreplaceable and compensation measures have therefore not been transformed to a special planning concept in Finland. However, compensation does take place among professionals when designing plan proposals. In this interpretation, compensation is an unspoken practice in planning. Actions hidden in measures in the transformation of sites include consideration of heritage values and architectural qualities. Compensation is an overall concept for a professional outcome with different expressions.

Teräväinen uses three critical case studies to illustrate her perspective on compensation as an unspoken practice in town planning and urban design. Compensation is visible as an exchange of views and requirements that may lead to alteration or preservation of heritage values in a plan proposal. The first of Teräväinen's cases is from Vaasa, an old town with many listed buildings. In this case compensatory considerations are embedded in the understanding of the city by the town planning office, which maintains a tradition of safeguarding heritage values in contemporary planning. Compensation is a pre-requisite when granting a land use agreement. Case two is from

Seinäjoki, a town dominated by modern buildings. Heritage compensation in this case takes the shape of the re-use of a building – not yet pointed out as important – as an alternative to demolition. Compensation is expressed in terms of housing for inhabitants and new spaces of cultural value for citizens. The third case is Lapua, a small town with a defunct industrial site, Old Paukku. In this area, “the Canteen” is a building of great value. Teräväinen argues that the town could afford the renovation of the Canteen, but the building is threatened by the municipality’s plan alteration, which will terminate the protection. In a second plan proposal, ten out of thirty buildings in Old Paukku are to be conserved. This limited protection also causes disagreement. Twenty-five years after the initial survey of the industrial site, the town starts to sell plots to developers, a shift to which Teräväinen is critical. The transformation of the industrial estate represents a missed opportunity for compensation, which could have been achieved through the renovation of the Canteen and other historically important buildings in Old Paukku.

The sixth chapter is a contribution by Jennie Sjöholm titled *Demolition, dislocation and documentation in transforming mining towns*. The study covers the transformation of the mining city *Kiruna* and the town *Malmberget* in Northern Sweden. Both must be relocated in order to let mining operations continue, a business which is crucial to the survival of the municipalities and its citizens. In this case, demolition, relocation, and documentation are main strategies in managing the historic environments during the urban transformation. The mining company is obliged to compensate for the damage it causes. However, Sjöholm finds that the mitigation measures for the negative impact on Kiruna and Malmberget primarily cover economic values and focus on replacing functions – not heritage values and architectural qualities within the affected sites.

The mitigation strategy for the restoration of negative impact on heritage values and architectural qualities in Kiruna and Malmberget focuses on the relocation of a limited number of listed buildings, and the documentation of the built environments that will be demolished. Sjöholm argues that compensation depends on the fact that cultural heritage is socially constructed. Compensation for the destruction of Kiruna and Malmberget has been minimized by a redefinition of the significance of the built heritage. Historically important buildings are dismissed as not being part of the heritage. Thus, de-heritagisation is taking place. Cultural heritage in the built environment is considered non-significant, buildings lose their protection,

and are ultimately being demolished. Both safeguarding and de-heritagisation appear as negotiable properties in the transformation process. Sjöholm ends her contribution with a key question: How can historic environments be given a stronger position in planning processes with democratic aspirations, and how can local as well as national features of cultural significance be represented in transformations of towns and communities?

**3. Creative compensation measures and future-oriented actions:** The final section of the proceedings presents three papers concerning solutions to compensation issues. Urban Nilsson starts the discussion in chapter seven by presenting creative compensatory solutions to design problems through a detailed development plan in Nacka, Stockholm. His contribution is titled *Considerate conversion – in order to take care of and reuse cultural heritage. A practical example*. Nilsson presents a case where he himself is involved as a consultant in a large-scale project and has proposed different kinds of compensation. The area in question is the *Kvarnholmen* peninsula in the Stockholm archipelago. Nilsson summarizes several mitigation measures in a table, structured in columns for nature, topography, paths, existing and new houses, mills/silos, offices, warehouses, bakeries etc. In each of these columns he lists potential compensation actions and measures to take care of heritage values in the area, like renovating and reusing buildings with architectural qualities and constructing new houses inspired by the previous design in this historically important area. Nilsson presents an overview of the working method, which provides knowledge about the cultural environment, its heritage values and architectural qualities

In this case, heritage compensation is expressed in several ways starting in the planning strategy and followed by protection in plan proposals, by the reuse of old buildings and designing of new buildings with respect to the surroundings. Key views, streets and parks are laid out in order to safeguard the cultural heritage and nature. Compensation measures are utilized to keep the balance between exploitation and restoration, recreation and interpretation of existing and new values. Nilsson points out that many architectural interpretations of the built environment have been made in the transformation of *Kvarnholmen*. New stairs, towers and passageways replace former functions. A “true” reconstruction of the local Oat mill was constructed before the demolition of the original. In negotiations between Nacka municipality, the developer and representatives for the cultural heritage sector, the bakery (one of the significant buildings in the area) could

be saved by a new passage through the building. The preservation of the bakery was an effort undertaken by the owner of the property and is as such a good example of compensation. As a heritage consultant, compensation is a practical tool for Nilsson, used in order to safeguard the most important heritage values. Negotiation in planning processes means that sacrifices must be made. Therefore, he argues for the importance of setting the right priorities in the early phases of the process and of “fighting the right battles”. By using compensation as a concept, Nilsson claims that it is also possible to recreate heritage values that have been lost and to push the design of the new architecture towards solutions that complement and/or highlight the existing landscape and buildings.

In chapter eight, Anders Larsson provides a contribution titled *Place logic rather than project logic: Landscape Observatories as regional coordinators of large-scale projects and compensation measures*. In previous studies of compensation measures for natural environment and cultural landscapes in large scale infrastructural projects in Sweden, Larsson found that demanding compensation measures for affected ecological and heritage values was a hypothetical possibility seldom taken into consideration in practice. However, when it was taken into consideration, compensation measures took place within the formal road and railway area. The strategy in planning documents followed the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimize, restore and compensate) when natural environment- and heritage values were affected by large-scale infrastructural projects. Tangible values were the focus of mitigation and compensation processes in these large projects. Priority was given to compensation measures, which could be delimited, measured and controlled via administrative systems for quality assurance and assessments.

Larsson proposes *landscape observatories* as hubs for regionally centred coordination of landscape knowledge, which can be used for creating cultural compensation in landscapes. The fundamental division between nature and culture in planning processes and by professionals is criticized for being out of date and posing an obstacle to creative solutions to compensation issues. Compensatory philosophy is guided by language use and differing fundamental conceptions. Larsson points out that, because of this, different types of European landscape observatories have previously been established. Larsson suggest that landscape observatories could be turned into hubs for providing knowledge on compensation. He raises a controversial idea in this context, which concerns the very basics of compensatory theory: Why cannot nature

sometimes be compensated by restoring heritage values, or vice versa? Or objects be compensated with activity, or vice versa?

Landscape observatories may offer a fresh start for the discussion on mitigation as an alternative to the continued handling of projects, mitigation aspects and compensation measures within the present project-oriented system. The current practice moves incrementally in small steps towards better solutions year by year, while our landscapes are destroyed bit by bit because of unpredicted cumulative effects. Larsson's suggestions are in answer to his own negative experience of the present planning system regarding large-scale infrastructure. The current practices do not correspond to the public participation and democratic values upheld in the European Landscape Convention.

In the final chapter David Ross discusses compensation for cultural loss through new technologies and tools. His contribution is titled *Creative tourism and digital reconstruction: two approaches for heritage loss compensation*. The idea behind digital reconstruction is that archaeological sites can provide experiences after they have been physically destroyed. Ross discusses the advantages and limitations surrounding the use of technological solutions to compensate tangible and intangible heritage values. He starts by pointing out that it is the developers that are responsible for the negative impacts caused by development, and that they should therefore provide means for compensation. This can be applied to archaeological sites regardless of whether the safeguarding focuses on material remains or is intended to compensate stakeholders for the inevitable loss of heritage values. But how can the loss of important heritage values, sites and objects be compensated?

In his contribution, Ross presents two solutions for preserving and presenting the essence of place in cases of physical loss and means of compensation in order to retain their memories: a) Digital reconstruction and b) creative activities in terms of tourism development as well as other audiences, such as local communities where heritage has been impacted.

Digital technologies can provide solutions where heritage destruction is compensated by preserving a faithful and accurate replica in a digital form. This solution requires resources, both for the digital construction and maintenance of the result. Intangible values such as memory may become new attractions of regional and national interest, recognized landmarks, as well as business opportunities for the local community. Ross believes that intangible

archaeological heritage is best used by actors in collaborative compensation projects that focus on both tourism development and heritage preservation. The basic idea in Ross' proposal is that archaeological sites and monuments, destroyed by urban expansion, can still be experienced by offering access to a digital reconstruction, creative experiences and saved memories. Both approaches have advantages and disadvantages and choosing which one to develop as compensation depends on the individual case. Ross assumes that the selection of compensation approach will depend on the heritage being compensated for and on those who are singled out as having the most benefit of the new experiences.

## REFERENCES

*Architectural competition brief*. (2012). Kiruna kommun.

Churchman, C. W. (1967). Wicked problems. *Management Science*, 14, (4): B141–B142

*Compensatory measures for nature and recreation (Kompensationsåtgärder för natur och recreation)*. 2008. Gothenburg: Gothenburg City.

*Comprehensive Plan for Gothenburg (Översiktsplan för Göteborg). Del 1. Utgångspunkter och strategier*. 2009. Antagen av kommunfullmäktige 2009-02-26. Stadsbyggnadskontoret.

Gallie, W. B. (1956). Essentially Contested Concept. In *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. London: Blackwell Publishing.

Gallie, W. B. (1964). *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Grahn Danielson, B. Rönn, M. & Swedberg, S. (2017). Cultural Heritage: Changing Ideas on Compensation in Planning, *Architectural Research in Finland, No 1*.

Grahn Danielson, B. Rönn, M. & Swedberg, S. (2015). *Kompensationsåtgärder vid exploatering i kultur- och naturmiljöer*. Fjällbacka: Kulturlandskapet and KTH/Arkitektur.

*Historic Environment Act (1988:950)*. Access 2019-11-20:

<https://www.raa.se/in-english/cultural-heritage/historic-environment-laws/historic-environment-act-1988950/>.

Lerman, P. (2014). Kompensation för kulturmiljöintresse i Grahn Danielson, B., Rönn, M. & Swedberg, S. (eds) *Kulturarv i samhällsplaneringen*. Fjällbacka: Rio Kulturlandskapet and KTH/Arkitektur.

*Planning and Building Act* (2010:900). Access 2019-11-20:  
<https://www.boverket.se/sv/om-boverket/publicerat-av-boverket/publikationer/2018/legislation-planning-and-building-act/>.

Rittel H.W.J & Melvin M. Webber M. M. (1973) Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning, *Policy Sciences*, No. 2.

Schibby, K., Lanemo, E. and Lindberg, U. (2014). *Kulturmiljövårdens riksintresse enligt 3 kap. 6§ miljöbalken*. Handbok. Stockholm: Riksantikvarieämbetet.

*The Swedish Environmental Code*. SFS 2000:61. Access 2019-11-20:  
<https://www.government.se/legal-documents/2000/08/ds-200061/>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Researchers connected to the project are: Magnus Rönn, Kulturlandskapet & Chalmers University of Technology, Benjamin Grahn Danielson, Picea kulturarv & Susanne Fredholm, Freja Frölander and Krister Olsson, Gothenburg University. The reference group included in the project: Tony Axelsson, Gothenburg University, Lars Jacobzon, The County Administrative Board, and Madelene Seberbrink, City of Gothenburg.

<sup>2</sup> See: <http://www.kulturland.se/portfolio/workshop-architecture-cultural-environment-and-compensation-in-planning-processes/>

<sup>3</sup> See recommendation for choosing the right synonym for compensate in Merriam-Wester dictionary:

”pay, compensate, remunerate, satisfy, reimburse, indemnify, repay, recompense mean to give money or its equivalent in return for something//pay implies the discharge of an obligation incurred// *paid* their bills compensate implies a making up for services rendered// an attorney well *compensated* for her services remunerate clearly suggests paying for services rendered and may extend to payment that is generous or not contracted for// promised to remunerate the searcher handsomely satisfy implies paying a person what is required by law// all creditors will be *satisfied* in full reimburse implies a return of money that has been spent for another's benefit// *reimbursed* employees for expenses indemnify implies making good a loss suffered through accident, disaster, warfare// *indemnified* the families of the dead miners repay stresses paying back an equivalent in kind or amount// *repay* a favor with a favour// recompense suggests due return in amends, friendly repayment, or reward//passengers were *recompensed* for the delay.” Source: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/compensate#etymology>

<sup>4</sup> See recommendation for choosing the right synonym for mitigate in Merriam-Wester

dictionary:

"relieve, alleviate, lighten, assuage, mitigate, allay mean to make something less grievous. re-lieve implies a lifting of enough of a burden to make it tolerable// took an aspirin to *relieve* the pain alleviate implies temporary or partial lessening of pain or distress// the lotion *alleviated* the itching lighten implies reducing a burdensome or depressing weight// good news would *lighten* our worries assuage implies softening or sweetening what is harsh or disagreeable// ocean breezes *assuaged* the intense heat mitigate suggests a moderating or countering of the effect of something violent or painful// the need to *mitigate* barbaric laws allay implies an effective calming or soothing of fears or alarms// *allayed* their fears." Source: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mitigate#other-words>