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ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWHF</td>
<td>African World Heritage Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGTA</td>
<td>Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Department of Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Department of Minerals and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Department of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Department of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOM</td>
<td>International Council of Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>International Council of Monuments and Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSF</td>
<td>Medium Term Strategic Framework, South African Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIKSO</td>
<td>National Indigenous Knowledge Systems Office, Department of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>National Heritage Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHCA</td>
<td>National Heritage Council Act (Act 19 of 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRA</td>
<td>National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRA</td>
<td>Provincial Heritage Resource Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHRA</td>
<td>South African Heritage Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Spatial Development Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

In its foundational act (Act 11of 1999), the National Heritage Council (NHC) has been mandated to advise the Minister of Arts and Culture regarding heritage policy. In fulfilling this mandate, The NHC has embarked on a research programme to develop policy recommendations on Mainstreaming heritage in development.

The programme was introduced with an expert meeting on heritage conservation and development held on 1 - 2 April 2009 at the CSIR International Conference Centre, Pretoria. Speakers from various backgrounds were invited. The meeting was followed by research consisting of desktop research as well as interviews with experts and stakeholders. Desktop research was limited to publications and information available on the Internet with an emphasis on international and national policy and strategy frameworks and declarations. The papers of the expert meeting also informed the research process.

Although the interviewees were mainly governmental role players, academics and representatives of organisations, the selection process was inclusive in order to allow for a wide spectrum of opinions. The opinions of experts who work outside the heritage and development sector were also sought with the objective to provide fresh approaches and ideas.

A draft discussion document was completed and workshopped by a focus group on 16 March 2010, followed by an open workshop held on 4 May 2010 in Cape Town that was advertised in the media. The workshop was attended by 109 delegates. The format of the open workshop allowed for extensive input from delegates divided into three groups, namely:

- Heritage and development with a special emphasis on social development
- Heritage and economic development
- Heritage resource management and development planning.

This draft document takes into account the input of the participants at the May 2010 workshop as well as continued discussion with stakeholders.

1. Motivation and rationale

The purpose of the document is firstly to make recommendations and provide guidelines to align the heritage sector with the developmental mandate of the South African government as stated in the Constitution of South Africa (Chapter 10) as well as the Medium Term Strategic Framework (2009 – 2014) titled: Together doing more and better.

Secondly, the document aims to redirect the heritage resource management towards current international practice that is based on an integrated environmental and spatial approach. Although South African legislation makes provision for such an approach, heritage practice is still dominated by concepts of memorialisation and monumentalisation developed under the National Monuments Council (NMC). The NMC has been experienced as authoritarian and biased towards colonial heritage. Although much has been done since 1994 to be more inclusive regarding the identification of heritage sites, heritage resource practice does not reflect fully the
opportunities created by the South African Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) to introduce pro-active integrated spatial approaches as opposed to reactive responses to threats to particular sites. This document aims to re-emphasise the heritage area and integrated environmental management approaches as reflected in international practice as well as South African legislation.

It is an open question whether a change in approach will improve public perception of heritage conservation. The heritage sector is fighting an ongoing battle to protect our finite and fragile heritage resources against property development and environmentally destructive economic activities such as mining. One can ask: What is the root cause of this situation? Why is the public not coming to the defence of heritage and demand that more funds should be given to heritage agencies which are tasked to safeguard our heritage? Why does the heritage sector sometimes experience apathy or overt opposition from the same communities it claims to serve? Why is heritage viewed as an expense item in the government budget – a big black hole that devours funds without delivering “real” value to society?

It is argued in this document that the heritage sector should take cognisance of its environmental, economic and social environment and that in order to fulfil its primary mandate to conserve, the sector has to reposition itself as a significant and irreplaceable asset to the South African society. Only once the South African general public values heritage and understand the demands of heritage management, the heritage sector will have the support to successfully protect our heritage resources. The point of departure for this project is to position heritage as a contributor to development. The concept of development is complex and needs to be unpacked in all its facets in order for heritage to find its place in development.

Although the document is critical of current heritage practice, it is written in the spirit of a firm belief in the value of heritage and that a strong case for heritage as a core player in delivering on governmental priorities can be made.

Please note that this discussion document does not provide an extensive discussion of heritage management and conservation in all its facets and should not be understood to limit heritage practice to development programmes and projects.

2. Conceptual framework

The position paper contains recommendations to align the heritage sector with the national imperatives as set out in the South African Presidency’s Medium Strategic Term Framework (MSTF) titled: Together doing more and better. South Africa’s objectives are defined in the MTSF as:

- Halve poverty and unemployment by 2014
- Ensure a more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic growth and reduce inequality
- Improve the nation’s health profile and skills base and ensure universal access to basic services
- Improve the safety of citizens by reducing incidents of crime and corruption
- Build a nation free of all forms of racism, sexism, tribalism and xenophobia.

In order to deliver on the above demands, the following aspects have been prioritised:
More inclusive economic growth, decent work and sustainable livelihoods
- Economic and social infrastructure
- Rural development, food security and land reform
- Access to quality education
- Improved health care
- The fight against crime and corruption
- Cohesive and sustainable communities
- Creation of a better Africa and a better world
- Sustainable resource management and use
- A developmental state including improvement of public services.

As part of the MTSF, government has also developed a shared agenda titled Vision 2025, developing a set of strategic objectives which define the kind of society the country aspires to become. Vision 2025 covers the following themes:

1. The nature of society, the state and the environment
2. The structure of the political economy and its level of technological development
3. Social development
4. Legitimacy, effectiveness and efficiency of governance
5. Extent of social cohesion
6. Integrated regional and continental development
7. Globalisation and the interconnectedness with the world.

Development goals in South Africa are therefore not only defined according to security and material needs, but include the development of a society which enables its citizens to lead fulfilling lives. Social programmes, including heritage, can contribute to the development of the country by nurturing and supporting a stable society which allows citizens to innovate and contribute to national well-being.

The objectives with this policy position paper are firstly to reposition the heritage sector as a role player in the development process including participating in the development discourse regarding a vision for a “developed South African society”.

A second objective is to create an environment where heritage is acknowledged as an asset. The position taken in this policy position paper is that the heritage sector should take cognisance of its external environment that prioritises economic development and poverty alleviation. The concepts heritage and development are often seen as conflicting terms and discussion around development issues within the sector which often seems to focus on infringements of development projects on heritage conservation, for example the prevention of “undesirable” or “inappropriate” development. This document aims to redirect the discussion towards heritage as a valuable asset in terms of both economic and social development. It will be argued that heritage conservation should be described by what it contributes to society and not purely in terms of responsibilities given to society. Again, this approach ties in with providing a vision for South Africa and heritage’s role in obtaining that vision, rather than mere guidelines and regulations. In other words, the heritage sector should play and active role in society as opposed to a passive role.
A third objective with the policy position paper is to provide an integrated approach towards heritage. In this document a more integrated approach is taken which includes and foregrounds intangible heritage. According to this approach, material culture such as buildings is an expression of intangible values and beliefs and conservation practice should take this principle into consideration.

3. Defining heritage

The UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) defines cultural heritage in terms of tangible and intangible culture. According to the Convention, cultural heritage consists of:

- **monuments**: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding value from the point of view of history, art and science
- **groups of buildings**: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity, or their place in the landscape are of outstanding value from the point of view of history, art or science
- **sites**: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

The same Convention defines natural heritage as:

- Natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view
- Geological and physiological formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of value from the point of view of science or conservation
- Natural sites or precisely delineated areas of value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

However, the above definitions are in the process of being redefined to reflect the Historic Urban Landscape approach. The Historic Urban Landscape approach deals with a site in its broader context to include land use patterns, spatial organization, social and cultural values, visual relationships, topography and other natural features, geomorphology, vegetation and all elements of the urban infrastructure. It also includes dynamic processes, economic aspects, intangible dimensions of heritage and aspects of cultural diversity and identity.

The White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage: *All our legacies, our common future* (1996) defines heritage in broad terms as: “...the sum total of wildlife and scenic parks, sites of scientific and historical importance, national monuments, historic buildings, works of art, literature and music, oral traditions and museum collections and their documentation which provides the basis for a shared culture and creativity in the arts. “

The NHRA (Act 25 of 1999) does not define heritage *per se*, but provide a detailed description of the national estate that include both cultural and natural heritage. According to the NHRA, the national estate includes:

- Places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance
- Places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
- Historical settlements and townscape
- Landscapes and natural features of cultural significance
- Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- Archaeological sites including:
  - Ancestral graves
  - Royal graves and graves of traditional leaders
  - Graves of victims of conflict
  - Graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette
  - Historical graves and cemeteries
  - Other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No 65 of 1983)
- Sites of significance relating to history of slavery in South Africa
- Movable objects including:
  - Objects recovered from the soil of waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens
  - Objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
  - Ethnographic art and objects
  - Military objects
  - Objects of decorative or fine art
  - Objects of scientific or technological interest and
  - Books, record, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined by the National Archives of South Africa Act (Act 43 of 1996).

Living heritage is defined in more detail in the draft national policy on South African Living Heritage circulated by the Department of Arts and Culture in February 2009 as: “Living Heritage means cultural expressions and practices which form a body of knowledge and provide for continuity, dynamism and meaning of social life to generations of people as individuals, social groups and communities. Living heritage allows for identity and a sense of belonging to people as well as an accumulation of intellectual capital for current and future generations in the context of mutual respect for human, social and cultural rights.” Living heritage includes, but is not limited to:
- Orality and performances – incorporating dance and music
- Rituals and festivals
- Memory
- Skills and techniques
- Indigenous knowledge systems
- Cultural traditions
- Holistic approach to nature
- Society/social relationships/Ubuntu.

This definition has been informed by the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage (2003) and is also reflected in the NHC Act (Act 11 of 1999) and the NHRA Act (Act 25 of 1999).
The Geological Society of South Africa defines geoheritage as being “places and sites of geological importance [that] are recognized and preserved as outstanding natural sites. These sites are in many cases, localities, the study of which has led to fundamental breakthroughs in the understanding of the Earth, its life forms and its history through ‘deep time’…. In South Africa, geoheritage is not complete without including the vast and unique mineral deposits which have been instrumental in fuelling the economic development of the country.”

From the above it can be concluded that heritage is a broad concept that include both cultural and natural heritage that can be tangible (immovable or movable) and intangible. Heritage is about what is valued as significant in terms of cultural terms, i.e. socio-economic, aesthetic, historical, scientific terms. Heritage can be produced by people or can be natural features that have meaning to humans.

5. Defining development

A policy framework on heritage conservation and development begs the question: “What is development?” There are many approaches to development ranging from a narrow economic approach to a human development approach that includes quality of life indicators. In this section the term “development” will be discussed with the aim to provide an appropriate framework for the policy.

The concept of development has changed over time and continues to change. Therefore one does not have to accept a specific view of development uncritically, but should participate in the discourse with the aim to influence and direct understandings of development.

In the 1940s, development was conceptualised within the modernisation discourse. Within this discourse, development was equated with industrialisation, urbanisation and specialisation. Culturally and socially, development was defined as the opposite of traditional lifestyles, values and practices. In fact, the disintegration of traditional lifestyles, values and knowledge systems was seen as a key component of development. Indicators of development were limited to:

- Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and specifically its increase over time;
- Income, or specifically its increase annually;
- Employment – the spread and deepening of income within society; and
- Industrialisation and technological advancement, including that of agriculture.

However, the concept of development has evolved to take different levels of human well-being into account and came to recognise traditional socio-cultural and knowledge systems as viable systems in their own right. Growth defined as an increase in GDP is now recognised as a poor indicator of development, as experience borne out that:

- fast growth in terms of GDP does not necessarily translate into equitable improvement of quality of life across populations,
- some industrial nations, though having a high GDP, suffer in terms of a lack of quality of life due to substance abuse, homelessness, violence and breakdown of community relations,
Mainstream development thinking has moved away from industrialisation towards a greater emphasis on employment, redistribution of incomes and investment in human capital. Human development is defined by the United Nations Development Programme as: “creating an environment in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive creative lives in accord with their needs and interests. The Human Development Index is widely used to measure Human Development and consists of indices related to:

- Ability to live a long and healthy life
- Ability to acquire knowledge and be creative
- Access to resources to enjoy a decent standard of living
- Freedom to participate in the social, economic and political life of a community.

Locally, the Department of Social Development (DSD) has developed a vision and indicators for community development. DSD defines community development as a “caring and integrated system of social development services that facilitates human development and improves the quality of life”. A developed community is characterised by the following attributes:

- Community members are empowered to manage their own development
- People in communities need to have a shared understanding of issues that affect their development and plan for joint action
- People should be enabled to access adequate and affordable goods and services
- People should be confident and skilled when presenting their needs to authorities
- People must be capable of finding enduring solutions to their problems
- People need to be able to mobilise the commitment of others and resources to achieve common goals and solve problems
- The community needs to be able to identify, attract and manage the resources and capacities they require to meet most local needs
- The community has to play a major role in protecting their environment and respond creatively to changing circumstances
- Community leaders and representatives must be properly selected and held accountable.

The aim of community development is to:

- Promote social justice and empowerment
- Ensure access and choice for all groups and individuals in households and communities
- Reverse inequality and imbalances of power relationships in households and communities, thus promoting social cohesion
- Promote change that is long-term and sustainable
- Be community owned
- Assist communities to be more self-reliant and access external resources which they are entitled to.

The concept development in terms of human and community development therefore refers to the growth of empowered communities in which individuals has control over political, social and economic forces affecting their economic livelihoods as well as social and cultural lifestyles. Quality in life does not necessarily correlate
positively with income. However, to have quality of life, one has to have the economic means to satisfy basic needs such as adequate and healthy food, shelter and access to education. At the same time, high income does not ensure freedom of choice regarding social and cultural life as well as ability to actively and freely participate in community decisions. Therefore, development should be addressed in a holistic manner that integrates indicators of economic and social development.

The Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies adopted by the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, 26 July – 6 August 1982 states that “Culture constitutes a fundamental dimension of the development process and helps to strengthen the independence, sovereignty and identity of nations. Growth has frequently been conceived in quantitative terms, without taking into account its qualitative dimension, namely the satisfaction of man’s spiritual and cultural aspirations. The aim of genuine development is continuing well-being and fulfilment of each and every individual.” It continues that “It is vital to humanize development, the ultimate goal of which is the individual in his dignity as human being and his responsibility to society. Development implies for every individual and every people access to information and opportunities to learn and to communicate with others.” And, “...[people] do not only seek the satisfaction if basic needs but also the development of human beings, their well-being and their possibilities of living together in fellowship with all peoples.”

In this document, the approach has been taken that heritage conservation should not only be considered in terms of its contribution to economic and physical development, but also in terms of human development and creating a cultural environment that informs development strategies. From this perspective the central question is: “What is the vision that the government and people of South Africa have for themselves and what informs that vision?”

In terms of the process, sound development strategies involve people as active participants as opposed to people being passive beneficiaries of development projects. Therefore development can only take place if people become actively involved in development processes. Development should be enabled self-help.

6. The heritage sector and economic development

However much the heritage sector would like to emphasise social development and quality of life issues, we have to accept that economic development is and will always be important in a developmental society such as South Africa. Poverty alleviation, job creation and the improvement of material living conditions through service and infrastructure development are prioritised in a society such as ours.

An important part of economic development is job creation and poverty alleviation. Heritage is seen as contributing to economic development through:

- Creative industries
- Create products for and/or support to the information and knowledge sector
- Create products for and/or support to the leisure sector
- Heritage tourism including museums and interpretive centres at heritage sites
- Creating capital value through the conservation of the built environment
- Creating small and medium size enterprises in urban and rural locations
- Creation of specialist heritage and conservation employment
- Creation of unskilled support services to heritage and conservation professionals.

These aspects will be unpacked in more detail in the section below.

6.1 Capital investment

The physical conservation of the built environment in South Africa raises complex issues such as whether capital value can be created through conservation. It is acknowledged that the conservation of built environment contribute significantly towards urban regeneration while irresponsible conservation can hold regeneration back. In Europe, the re-use of historical buildings forms an important aspect of urban renewal. Conserving historical landscapes and heritage sites contributes toward the development of a distinctive identity of a settlement. International practice is based on the assumption that an increase in the capital value of property by enhancing its heritage status is necessarily positive.

However, the situation regarding increased property values is more complex as it can also lead to a process of gentrification or Chelseafication that exclude poor to middle class communities from their roots. For example, poor to middle class communities living in heritage areas such as the Bo-Kaap in Cape Town have been negatively affected by dramatic increases in the value of their properties. Increased property values led to increased property rates and taxes which in many cases forced residents, whose families lived in the same house for two or more generations, to sell the houses as they cannot afford the rates and taxes. Heritage value thereby becomes a gentrification threat that in turn can threaten the heritage value of an area when that value is informed by local cultural and social patterns. In addition, legislation and local regulations place responsibilities on the owners of heritage sites which add additional financial pressure on them.

This situation is in conflict with the transformation of the sector as heritage sites are not and should not be limited to impressive architectural structures owned by the very rich. There are models used internationally to address these challenges, for example the creation of a Restoration Fund and rebates on property taxes or the introduction of a covenant system. In a covenant system, the local authority undertake to repair a historical house on attaining a commitment from the owner that once the property has been repaired, the owner will maintain the property to a set standard for the next 15 – 20 years. If the owner reneged on the agreement, they become liable for repaying the original investment by the local authority. The NHRA (Act 25 of 1999) does make provision for a covenant system, but such as system is not supported by housing schemes managed by provincial and local housing departments. It is proposed that DAC in partnership with its agencies and provincial and local counterparts should investigate and develop models to support owners of heritage sites in maintaining their properties.

The gentrification of older neighbourhoods is a real threat not only to the fabric of society, but also to the safeguarding of intangible culture in the form of memory and cultural traditions. Heritage landscapes in danger of gentrification should be actively identified and rescue plans should be put in place.
In addition to a rise of property value, the conservation of immovable property contributes to the economy and quality of life by creating specialist jobs within the construction sector. Using international models, heritage conservation is labour intensive and requires specialist restoration experts. Such a programme will move away from a purely massed based programme and would achieve similar results while allowing for more variety in urban environments and more tolerance for diversity of design which would be positive for conservation in poorer areas. In other words, heritage conservation creates quality jobs using traditional trades and skills.

The potential of specialist conservation has not been fully developed in South Africa. The country is very poor in terms of material conservation skills and there are already more job opportunities than skilled workers available resulting in poor workmanship and the gradual neglect and destruction of our built environment. However, South Africa does need specialist conservation and artisan skills as the country is rich in heritage sites that require specialist conservation and maintenance. DAC and its agency SAHRA, in partnership with local expertise held by internationally affiliated bodies such as the African World Heritage Fund (world heritage sites), ICOMOS-SA (monuments and heritage sites) and ICOM-SA (conservation within museum contexts), should undertake a study with the objective to prepare a business plan for the development of a skilled conservation and restoration sector that include specialist artisans. Such a study should also include projections in terms of employment opportunities for such a sector.

6.2 Creative industries and small business development

Creative and new media industries are growing in number and are playing increasingly prominent economic and social roles. They also provide high quality jobs in terms of creative environments as well as flexibility in terms of work environment. These industries tend to be located in small businesses and/or home environments. For these reasons they often attract young professionals. In addition, many traditional practices can also be considered to be creative industries that create employment opportunities within communities whether urban or rural based.

Creative industries include: advertising, fine art, antique markets, crafts (including indigenous craft), design, fashion, film, digital media, television, radio, music, software and computer games, the performing arts (including traditional performances and poetry), publishing, graphic arts and cultural tourism.

Cultural tourism has been identified as a potentially strong contributor to the South African economy while traditional crafts tend not to create medium to high income jobs as the crafters have to compete with mass produced products. However, the craft sector can supplement the tourism industry. South Africa is producing designer craft for the luxury market which often draw on distinctive South African trends or our heritage for inspiration. The inspirational role of heritage is acknowledged by the fact that heritage artefacts are used in training and creativity programmes for crafters. Not all of these industries can be considered to be part of the heritage sector – still many make use of heritage objects or history as inspiration.

Heritage initiatives are ideal for community economic development and heritage structures should be re-aligned to enable small heritage initiatives to access private corporate funding attracted in terms of the BBBEE provisions. Such a Fund can also be developed into an easily accessible platform from where to negotiate
Public Private Partnerships. Such a fund needs to show a return on investment in addition to benefits for investors in terms of their BBBEE scorecard. A clear strategy should be put in place regarding the division of funds between new projects and the maintenance of existing projects. Developing black-owned heritage initiatives should be informed by a transformation strategy for the heritage sector. As a national funding agency for heritage, the NHC should investigate the possibility of such a Fund, including the legislative and operational implications of establishing such a Fund. The study should include a business plan.

According to the Constitution of South Africa, heritage is a national and provincial mandate. However, important processes of economic and development planning in government sector takes place on a local authority level. A better understanding of how heritage can interface with planning structures on a local authority level is required amongst heritage conservation specialists. Heritage planning should be integrated with social and economic planning processes. Furthermore, DAC through its agencies should commission an extensive study into the economic and social impact of heritage on South Africa.

6.3 Indigenous knowledge systems

Indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) refer to traditional and local knowledge and are manifested in areas ranging from cultural and religious ceremonies to agricultural practices and health interventions. The Department of Science and Technology adopted a policy which amongst other objectives, aim to develop IKS in order to contribute to the economy. In addition, IKS can contribute to a more accessible health system. The contribution of traditional architecture is also under-utilised.

IKS should not only be seen in terms of commercially viable knowledge systems or infrastructural development, but also in terms of social development. However, this section deals with IKS within the context of economic and infrastructural development.

Indigenous knowledge systems, in particular indigenous medicine, provide opportunities for the development of local products that can be marketed world wide. However, the recognition and protection of local intellectual property issues within the context of western dominated international intellectual property rights approaches as well as the just sharing of proceeds from such products is an important factor to resolve. In addition, traditional products have to be developed to enhance applicability and use within modern lifestyles. This requires additional research, for example methods to produce traditional products in large quantities. Indigenous products should also be marketed in order to create local markets outside the source community for the products.

Traditional medicine is used world wide to a large extent and in many developing countries; it is the only affordable health care for a large section of the population. In addition, there is strong growth in the need for holistic treatments amongst all sections of the population. DST is leading a programme to make traditional health care safer, to ensure quality control and appropriate use. In addition to supporting the use of traditional health care within communities, traditional health care products can be further developed to be commercially viable.
IKS still plays a pivotal role in sustainable livelihoods in a large number of South Africans. Although contested by some, traditional agricultural methods are seen as being more ecologically friendly and sustainable. It also plays an important role in food security as opposed to the increasing vertical concentration of commercial seeds and supplements to food production in the hands of a small group of transnational companies. Some indigenous vegetables are also being studied in order to increase the diversity and sustainability of food supply.

Indigenous architecture has been neglected. The building standard for mass produced housing is the RDP house where each house looks the same, distributed in a spatial pattern that enable cost effective supply of services and does not make provision for social patterns or local climatic conditions. IKS can positively contribute to mass housing as it uses local material and is adapted to local climatic conditions. In addition, it takes social and cultural patterns into consideration. In order for such a programme to succeed, people should be trained in traditional building methods. In addition to IKS design, housing programmes should also take cognisance of traditional cultural value systems where it is important for the head of the house to provide housing and shelter. Current systems where housing is supplied by an external agency and where the household has little input in design disempowers future owners and contributes to creating a society of receivers rather than doers.

The future of IKS depends both on the IKS practitioners, communities as well as continuing research. Indigenous knowledge will survive only if it actively been practiced and valued by communities. Indigenous knowledge can be sustained only if it continues to evolve to adapt to current circumstances. Programmes to safeguard indigenous knowledge should therefore focus on the continued use of IK and steer away from situations where IK becomes frozen in the past.

Although the National Indigenous Knowledge Systems Office (NIKSO) based in the Department of Science and technology is the primary agency driving the safeguarding of IKS, the heritage sector can play a prominent role in acknowledging the role and raising the status of the IKS practitioner. In addition, heritage institutions such as museums have played an important role in documenting traditional practices and promoting awareness of the value of these practices. Both roles should be supported and continued.

**6.4 Tourism**

Tourism is often seen as a significant contributor to economic development and heritage tourism immediately comes to mind as one way in which the heritage sector can contribute to economic growth, job creation and poverty alleviation. It is identified as a lead sector in the MTSF. However, the relationship between tourism, heritage and development is complex and a sector that should be carefully managed and monitored to prevent irreparable damage to the environment and heritage sites. Efficient and effective management processes have to be developed and implemented to maximise the positive and to contain the negative impact of tourism.

Tourism is internationally recognised as an important economic sector. In 2009 there were about 880 million international tourists worldwide. South Africa received approximately 9.9 million international visitors who made out 25% of the tourist numbers. The rest, 75% of tourists, are domestic tourists. Cultural tourism, which includes heritage tourism, forms approximately forty percent of the total tourism figures. Tourism is expected
to grow exponentially with an expected 13.5 million visitors in 2015 and South Africa’s Department of Tourism has identified heritage tourism as a major growth area in the domestic tourism sector.

At the moment only crude statistics are available to calculate the contribution of heritage tourism to South Africa’s GDP, as heritage tourism in all its permutations are not clearly identified as a tourism category. For example, natural heritage sites are not included in the definition of heritage activities. Using the statistics available, tourism contributed 7.9% (R189.4 billion) to the GDP of South Africa in 2009. Domestic and foreign tourists spend 3% and 17% of their time respectively on cultural, historical and heritage activities in South Africa translating into a contribution of heritage tourism of 1% to the GDP. In Europe, 50% of tourist activities is driven by cultural and heritage tourism.

International studies have shown that the economic benefits of heritage tourism relate directly to the profile of cultural tourists: they are more educated and have higher incomes than other tourists, which results in more money spent per visit and longer stays on average. Besides visiting heritage sites, the impact of heritage tourism is includes the development of physical infrastructure such as roads, public transport and public amenities. Other sectors that benefit from heritage tourism include transport, accommodation, food & beverage and arts & crafts. Survey research has shown that tourists usually buy at least one local craft item. Thus, heritage tourism also creates markets for traditional as well as design arts and craft sector.

The Department of Tourism (DOT) is developing a heritage tourism strategy that includes a review of definitions of heritage. Several heritage role players, including DAC, the NHC and SAHRA, actively supports the process to develop the heritage tourism strategy.

Although heritage tourism has important economic spin-offs, it could potentially have negative impact on the environment, heritage site as well as the social and cultural environment of the host communities if not carefully managed. For this reason, several international and supra-national bodies have developed tourism guidelines and Codes of Ethics for both heritage site managers as well as the tourism sector. Internationally, the tourism and heritage sectors have engaged with the objective to arrive at a common understanding regarding tourism activities in heritage sites.

Tourism Charters that are supportive of the heritage sector include the following principles:

- Sustainable tourism is built on mutual respect between the visitor and the host community.
- Tourists and the tourism industry have to respect the sanctity of spiritual places, practices and traditions related to heritage resources.
- The participation of the host community, property owners and relevant indigenous peoples who may exercise traditional rights or responsibilities over their own land and its significant sites should be respected in tourism product development and management.
- Tourism should benefit the host community. Therefore, a significant portion of the income derived from tourism activities should be ploughed back into the maintenance of the heritage resource and for skills development amongst the host community.
- Heritage resources are long-term assets in themself and care should be taken to avoid making it subservient to needs of tourism.
 Lesser known heritage resources should be marketed to ensure equitable access to the benefits of heritage tourism.

Using heritage resources as tourism destinations have to be supported by heritage management plans to ensure that tourism activities are within the carrying capacity of site. The heritage management plans must establish appropriate limits for acceptable change, particularly in relation to the impact of visitor numbers on the physical characteristics of the site, ecology and biodiversity of the place, local access and transportation systems and the social, economic and cultural well being of the host community.

Heritage resources must be managed within its environmental, social and cultural context. This includes the creation of buffer zones and safeguarding the character of nearby destinations.

Tourists are entitled to high quality information based on accepted research methodologies. Interpretations should have integrity, must reflect diversity and must be intellectually/emotionally accessible.

Authenticity must be retained.

Heritage tourism contributes positively to socio-economic development in the following way:

- Physical infrastructure such as roads are created that benefits both the tourists as well as the host communities.
- Improved sustainability for cultural and heritage sites and events through higher profile and educational awareness.
- Increase investment in the development of heritage products.
- Local development including new residential and commercial areas often follows tourism developments. Such developments contribute positively to job creation and economic growth, but can also be destructive to the cultural, natural and social environment if not managed appropriately. Tourism related development such as hotels should be carefully managed to prevent environmental destruction. If not, this could lead to the loss of a site both as a heritage resource as well as tourist destination.
- The tourism industry creates jobs, especially in the hospitality and retail sectors. Heritage institutions, although labour intensive, tend to be small enterprises that do not employ large numbers of people. In addition, the process of job creation have to be managed to ensure that the host community have access to professional employment opportunities and to prevent the member of host communities to be limited to low-level (often seasonal) service jobs.
- Tourism can contribute to the promotion of social cohesion on a national and international level by creating opportunities for increased exposure to and more interaction between different communities. It is hoped that cultural exchange will create more understanding for other cultures and more tolerance for diversity. However, it should be acknowledged that cultural exchange will also lead to changes in the cultural and social fabric of the host community.
- Heritage tourism has the potential to provide benefits to urban and rural areas across the country.

To realise the full potential of heritage tourism, tourism should become an integral part of local economic planning. Furthermore, marketing strategies have to take cognisance of research showing that people are experiencing increased pressure in their everyday lives and have less time to spend on planning their vacations.
Therefore, they require comprehensive, easily accessible and understandable information to inform pre-trip planning.

Arts and Culture departments on a national, provincial and local level should interact with their tourism counterparts to develop synergy between the two sectors. International Heritage Tourism Charters such as that of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) should be integrated in local policy, programmes and regulations.

7. Heritage and human capital investment

The social and developmental role of heritage institutions is not particular to South Africa, but an international trend. Internationally, there is a move towards heritage institutions as agents of social change, specifically to increase tolerance and appreciation for diversity and working towards social harmony.

South Africa faces a number of challenges in order to obtain its social developmental goals. This includes:

- Creating a safe and secure environment for all.
- Promoting cohesive and sustainable communities.
- Creating an environment where people can acquire knowledge and be creative.
- Enhancing the ability of communities to make informed decisions about matters that concern them. This aspect includes access to information, capacity to debate and interpret information and make decisions within an environment free of autocratic and/or intimidating influences.
- Creating a tolerant society by addressing both tolerance for diversity and xenophobia.
- Promoting national pride.

In this section, the issues firstly related to identity and social harmony and secondly to education and knowledge production will be addressed.

7.1 Heritage, identity and social harmony

Social cohesion is one of the strategic priorities in the Medium Term Strategic Framework and is defined as “that which gives members of a society the capacity to cooperate in ways that create the possibility for positive change”. Under this strategic objective the following goals have been identified:

- Implement comprehensive social assistance and social insurance support to reduce the social and economic vulnerability of the poor by focusing particularly on maintaining and, where possible, enhancing real value and reach of social transfers…”
- “Promote a shared value system and a greater sense of community solidarity – including promoting people’s confidence and ability to enter mainstream economic activity”
- “Implement programmes that promote national unity and inclusiveness including intensification of the nation-wide process to complete the first and major complement of name changes”
- Build a society that does not only await/anticipate government to provide services, but that consciously contributes to it, i.e. a balance between rights and responsibilities: enabling people to take initiative and exercise self-reliance”
Support the **development and strengthening of community organisations** such as school governing bodies, community policing fora, ward committees, and others that are meant to organise and develop the cultural and recreational life of communities”

**Use arts and culture** as mechanisms for promoting the cultural diversity of our society and for bringing people together”

Vigorously monitor not only the implementation of programmes but *how* this is done and contributes to **enhancing the legitimacy** of the State in the eyes of the citizens

Promote culture and the arts as well as sport in order to consolidate community and national pride, positive values as well as economic development (including tourism).“ (emphasis and italics in original text).

Heritage institutions can and should play an important role in developing a sense of identity and promoting social harmony. This is reflected in the UNESCO aligned International Council of Museum’s (ICOM) annual themes of the last decade, for example:
- **2000:** Museums for peace and harmony in society
- **2005:** Museums bridging cultures
- **2008:** Museums as agents of social change and development
- **2010:** Museums for social harmony.

In November 2009, one of ICOM’s International Committees, INTERCOM, accepted the following declaration: “INTERCOM believes that it is a fundamental responsibility of museums, wherever possible, to be active in promoting diversity and human rights, respect and equality for people of all origins, beliefs and background”. The Declaration was made at the 2009 annual meeting of INTERCOM which was held in Torreon, Mexico.

The above indicates an international trend for heritage institutions to take on social and development roles. The call for taking a stand regarding human rights, tolerance, developmental goals within a context of critical debate is an accepted role for heritage institutions. Heritage institutions do not only research and reflect heritage, they also interpret, critically engage with and take a stand regarding people in relation to each other and their natural environment. Heritage institutions, including museums, are well situated to play this role as they provide a network of institutions with the infrastructure for community interaction across the country in urban, semi-urban and rural environments.

An Australian study found that museums provide spaces and programmes that support a sense of belonging, provide public spaces that allow for community members to express them and through programmes, create a sense of belonging and create intergenerational contact and understanding. As they are public spaces, they can play a formative role in developing democratic skills and confidence. Although this role may not be the *de facto* situation in all museums and interpretative centres, it is a role to be aspired to and should be included in transformation programmes for government-aided organisations and be financially supported in private heritage organisations.

Transformation of heritage organisations should include an emphasis on these organisations as agents of social change with a special responsibility to promote understanding and tolerance amongst diverse groups. Tolerance defined in UNESCO Declaration of Principles on Tolerance (1995) as: “Tolerance is respect,
acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of the world’s cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human. It is fostered by knowledge, openness, communication, and freedom of thought, conscience and belief. ...“Diversity is more encompassing as cultural groups and includes diversity in terms of social roles and opinions. Diversity therefore includes tolerance of differences within cultural groups and acceptance of differences regarding race, culture, sexual orientation and religion.

Diversity should be seen as a positive factor rather than a negative one. Efforts to create national pride and social cohesion should be built on an acceptance of diversity as a key characteristic of the South African identity. While cultural practices should be safeguarded according to the wishes of the practitioners, it should not artificially be frozen to protect the status quo. Intercultural tensions are often bound up with conflicts of memory, competing interpretations of the past, conflicting values and conflicting value and meaning attached to heritage sites and objects, and may lead to debates based on a either/or approach. Shared heritage does not necessarily imply shared memories, meaning and values regarding a site or event. Intercultural dialogue should be conscious of sensitivities regarding values and modes of engagement within groups.

The heritage sector plays a role to promote intercultural dialogue within context that sees diversity as a positive attribute providing the South African nation with multiple knowledge and value systems that together strengthen South African society. National pride should not be dependent on uniformity and enforced sameness, but commitment towards cooperation and a common future. National pride and cohesiveness requires transformation of museums and sites to be inclusive and to portray multiple voices, including multiple perspectives of the same event in a sensitive way.

The National Heritage Council’s Ubuntu programme aims to contribute to social cohesion. Ubuntu emphasises mutual welfare between people and is aligned with the constitutional principles of equality, freedom and respect between people. It promotes human rights by adding a strong element of social responsibility. Flowing from the principles of Ubuntu, the Moral Regeneration Movement aims to affirm and promote moral values to which all peaceful South Africans can aspire as a basis for reaching out to one another. The Movement’s Charter of Positive Values reads:

- Respect for human dignity and equality
- Promoting freedom, the rule of law and democracy
- Improving material well-being and economic justice
- Enhancing sound family and community values
- Upholding honesty, integrity and loyalty
- Ensuring harmony in culture, belief and conscience
- Showing respect and concern for all people
- Strive for justice, fairness and peaceful co-existence
- Protecting the environment.

Heritage institutions can promote national pride with programmes focusing on strengths, achievements and positive encounters. South Africa is very rich in terms of geoheritage, biodiversity and contribution to science and globally acknowledged social values of tolerance. These attributes should become the foundation of a national identity.
In South Africa, acknowledgement by a museum or interpretive centre in the form of an exhibition or research project is widely regarded as validating an event or person. Therefore, the heritage sector can play an important role in recognising marginalised or neglected groups and individuals through nominations of heritage sites, research, documentation and exhibitions. One should be careful regarding the trend to create new site and/or museum for every individual event.

For development projects to take root, it must be grounded within local values systems and social structures of mobility. Values and structures vary from area to area and group to group. In some areas traditional structures and values dominate, in others, modern global values and yet in others, a combination of traditional and global values. Development projects would be more accessible if it is coined in vernacular terms and situated within traditional concepts such as *ubuntu* and *letsema*: The principles underlying both *ubuntu* and *letsema* are:

- The principle of unconditional collective contribution in collective work
- The principle of unconditional collective solidarity which is important in teamwork
- The principle of unconditional acceptance, dignity and stewardship
- The principle of unconditional collective hospitality, which is critical in creating service quality in organisations
- The principle of continuous consultation and consensus which is important in establishing empowerment
- The totality principle which is critical in holistic community development. The African perspective holds that life is an indivisible whole.
- The principle of legitimacy which would minimise mistrust among people and facilitate speed implementation of plans and strategies
- The inclusivity principle which would help to accelerate racial and cultural tolerance and would facilitate effective implementation of development projects/programmes.

Traditional values can also be the space transferred through intergenerational dialogue can be used regarding conflict resolution, manage displacement, marginalisation and help people adapt to urban life.

### 7.2 Heritage, knowledge production and education

The countries that have been most successful in the implementation of development policies put great emphasis on education. Education does not only capacitate and empower the individual to participate in social life, but also to develop the skills for individuals to participate in economic activities. One of the characteristics of human capital such as education, is that it cannot be redistributed. Therefore investment must be made into each individual with the acknowledgement that education and training is a long term process. It takes 25 years to grow a child from his/her first year in school to a specialist - and then a specialist without practical experience. The time delay between starting implementation and reaping the results makes it so much more urgent to give immediate attention.

The UNESCO Declaration on the Responsibilities of the Present Generations towards Future Generations (1997), article 10 reads: “Education is an important instrument for the development of human persons and societies. It should be used to foster peace, justice, understanding, tolerance and equality for the benefit of present and future generations”.
The previous section focused on informal education towards tolerance and peace. This section focuses more on formal heritage education and knowledge production, but also recognising traditional forms of education such as storytelling. Both education programmes conducted by heritage institutions as well as education regarding heritage in general are included in the discussion.

International studies found that museums are seen as sources of trusted, reliable and credible information. Although similar studies have not been completed in South Africa, the heritage sector is recognised as a knowledge producer. Not only is research and documentation conducted regarding traditional heritage practices, but these institutions contribute towards wide-ranging scientific fields such as biodiversity, geological science, IKS and social sciences. Research in heritage institutions should be aligned within international and national research priorities and closer cooperation with the Department of Science and Technology and its agency, the National Research Foundation should be developed further.

In addition to the research conducted by heritage institutions themselves, they play supporting roles to the training of specialists at universities in natural and social sciences. They also curate important research collections including biological type specimens and archaeological and paleontological objects. The research and training component of the heritage sector is not always well understood and supported. Research and collection management has been neglected which in the long term will undermine the quality of public programmes and exhibitions. Museums need more support in terms of research and support services to universities and their programmes and formal linkages between heritage institutions with research departments, universities and other research institutions should be encouraged.

Heritage should also inform education in both teaching methods and in content. Not all education has to be formal. It can be informal such as museum exhibitions and interpretive text at heritage sites. It can also include traditional ways of teaching such as story telling and intergenerational programmes providing opportunities for the transfer of knowledge and values from one generation to the other. In addition, programmes related to volunteer tourism can also be useful in terms of education where volunteers participate in formal programmes to generate knowledge and transfer skills to the local population.

Successful economies need creative and innovative people. For a person to be creative and innovative they must be open to new ideas and technologies. The heritage sector carries joint responsibility to create a safe environment where people feel free to integrate new ideas with cultural practice and values. However, new ideas and technology should be built on the foundation of past achievements and traditional knowledge.

8. **Heritage resource management and spatial development**

An important aspect of heritage conservation is the conservation of our landscapes. Too often, the role of heritage is seen in negative terms, in other words to protect heritage structures against development, rather than a positive role where heritage becomes an agency for determining the character and nature of urban development in particular.
There are different approaches to heritage resource management. The first approach is a process controlled by a complex set of legislation and regulations where developers have to submit proposals to various authorities for consent. These legislative requirements and regulations focus on preventing damage to cultural and heritage resources and to ensure that the historical fabric of environments stay intact during development. An alternative approach, which is widely practiced internationally, is the integrative approach where heritage conservation becomes part of spatial and developmental planning and is not seen as a separate and special set of regulations imposed over the planning system. At the heart of the latter approach is the notion that heritage management goes far beyond being custodians of the past to become an integral part of development and environmental management.

8.1 Legislative and policy framework

The international policy framework for heritage management has evolved with the Historical Urban Landscape (HUL) policy proposals as reflected in the Vienna Memorandum (2005), Jerusalem Statement (2006) and Zanzibar Recommendations (2009). As stated in the Vienna Memorandum:

“7. The historical urban landscape is the physiognomic record of cumulative social experience in a particular localized urban setting, and represents the continuous visual self-identification of the community in its inherited habitat. As such it offers psychic identity and social rootedness for successive generations of the local urban society, and represents an irreplaceable cultural asset requiring sensitive and knowledgeable management. It consists principally of three form complexes, namely ground plan (including site), building form and land utilization.

8. The historical urban landscape acquires significance from both evolutionary, and planned development by embodying economic and socio-cultural attributes. It includes individual monuments recorded in protection registers, as well as ensembles of forms, notably buildings, other structures and spaces.”

The Zanzibar Recommendations (2009) place historical urban environments into an environmental and developmental context. An extract of the Recommendations reads:

Stated that urban conservation is not limited to building preservation but is a component of environmental policies rather than an isolated action not acknowledging the dynamic, ever changing process nature of urban environments, hence the importance of strengthening the relevance of urban landscape to our built environment,

Recommended to identify the historic driving forces of cities, villages and settlements while anticipating their evolution, enhancing their connectivity and to consider heritage as a socio-economic and environmental resource;

Further recommend to improve, when appropriate, with focus on the continuity of the intergenerational links, the transmission of local knowledge, its global relevance, ecologically sound restoration, participatory urban planning and management, the development of technical assistance in areas such as building techniques, land-use;

Emphasized that detailed studies of the physical and social morphology, cultural, spiritual and economic components should be used as planning and decision making tools and that consideration be given to: custodians and local communities’ management systems, coordination and integration of global and local interventions, trans-generational skills transmission processes and practices, natural resources, land rights and infrastructure, which needs to include housing and social amenities, mobility, access to work, water and waste management;

Underlined that the Outstanding Universal Value of these layered urban landscapes lies in the long tradition of the linkages between tangible and social-cultural heritage, urban and rural components which create a unique form of patrimony;
Urged to take measures to integrate at a local, regional and national scale the adaptive planning of infrastructure projects taking into account their cumulative effects on the cultural environment as a whole and warned against the threats of non integrated public works and infrastructure works;...”

To incorporate the HUL recommendations into heritage practice, heritage impact assessments have to be integrated with environmental impact assessments and secondly, the teams doing the assessments have to be multi-disciplinary teams that not only understand environmental and heritage issues, but is also well versed in spatial and infrastructural planning and socio-economic development.

The South African legislation makes provision for an integrated environmental approach. The two primary pieces of legislation are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). These two Acts should be read together with other relevant legislation such as the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (act 28 of 2002), the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000), the Development Facilitation Act (Act 67 of 1995) that creates provincial planning tribunals as well as provincial planning regulations and local authority zoning and planning requirements.

Art 2(2) of the National Environmental Management Act (act 107 of 1998) requires that:

“Environmental management must place people and their needs at the forefront of its concern, and serve their physical, psychological, developmental, cultural and social interests equitably” and art 2(4)(a) states that sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors including “that the disturbance of landscapes and sites that constitute the nation’s cultural heritage is avoided, or where it cannot be altogether avoided, is minimised and remedied (2)(4)(iii) and lastly in art(2)(4)(g) that “decisions must take into account the interests, needs and values of all interested and affected parties, and this includes recognising all forms of knowledge, including traditional and ordinary knowledge.” “In order to give affect to the general objectives of integrated environmental management laid down in this Chapter, the potential impact on –

a) the environment;
b) socio-economic conditions; and
c) the cultural heritage,

of activities that require authorisation or permission by law and which may significantly affect the environment, must be considered, investigated and assessed prior to their implementation and reported to the organ of state charged by law with authorising, permitting, or otherwise allowing the implementation of an activity.” (art24(1)).

The NHRA (Act 25 of 1999), Section 38 also makes provision for specific development activities which is subject to obtaining a permit. According to Section 38:

(1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as-

a. The construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;
b. The construction of bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;
c. Any development or other activity which will change the character of a site-

i. Exceeding 5 000m² in extent; or
ii. Involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
iii. Involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
iv. The costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;

d. The re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent; or

e. Any category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority,

must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.

(2) The responsible heritage resources authority must, within 14 days of receipt of a notification in terms of subsection (1) –

a. If there is reason to believe that heritage resources will be affected by such development, notify the person who intends to undertake the development to submit an impact assessment report. Such report must be compiled at the cost of the person proposing the development, by a person or persons approved by the responsible heritage resources authority with relevant qualifications and experience and professional standing in heritage resources management; or

b. Notify the person concerned that this section does not apply.

The Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act no 28 of 2002) also include historical and cultural aspects within the scope of the environmental management plan (EMP). According to article 51(b) the outline of the must include:

(i) a description of the appropriate technical and management options chosen for each environmental impact, socio-economic condition and historical and cultural aspects for each phase of the mining operation

(ii) action plans to achieve the objectives and specific goals contemplated in paragraph (a) which must include a time schedule of actions to be undertaken to implement mitigatory measures for the prevention, management and remediation of each environmental impact, socio-economic condition and historical and cultural aspects for each phase of the mining operation.

Art 52 (1) An applicant who’s application for a prospecting right or mining permit was accepted in terms of the Act, must submit an environmental management plan at the office of the Regional Manager in whose region the application was lodged within 60 days from the date of notification by the Regional Manager.

Art 52(2) the environmental management plan must substantially be in the format provided by the Department and must contain (b) an assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed prospecting or mining operation on the environment, socio-economic conditions and cultural heritage.

As heritage resource management requires a holistic approach, it becomes important that heritage impact assessments should become part of the broader environmental impact assessment conducted by multi-disciplinary specialist teams. Both the environmental and heritage agencies should receive the same set of reports as decisions should be taken with a holistic understanding of the proposed development. However, in practice, the heritage agencies, whether national or provincial, do not have access to the EIA report. Archaeological Impact Assessments are often conducted in isolation of other Impact Assessments while Environmental Impact Assessment Teams do not always include a heritage specialists in their teams but rather use independent consultants who are unable to integrate their work in the overall report. The impact assessment profession is to a large extent unregulated resulting in a vast difference in quality and depth of reports which makes evaluation difficult for compliance authorities.

In addition, neither SAHRA nor the provincial heritage resources authorities (PHRAs) nor heritage departments in local authorities have been capacitated in terms of human and financial resources as well as technological
requirements to fulfill their mandates. In addition some PHRAs have not devolved authority to local authorities that does have the required capacity in heritage resources management. Furthermore, provincial and local governmental departments and agencies have their own legislation, regulations and ordinances to manage development as defined by the NHRA (1999). The result is an onerous process whereby developers have to submit the same application to up to three different authorities delaying development and adding costs. This situation is exacerbated by slow response times due to inadequate resources to process applications for development in contravention of reasonable response times guaranteed by the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (PAJA)(Act 3 of 2000). These shortcomings lead to heritage legislation and authorities as being regarded as obstacles for development; an attitude coupled with low monitoring capacity of heritage authorities, results in unscrupulous developers ignoring processes.

Furthermore, planning authorities on a local level have little knowledge or interest in heritage resource management as part of their mandate. The objective should be to integrate heritage resource management as part of the normal urban or settlement planning processes and not as a separate process. The heritage resource management authorities have to be capacitated to conduct research to provide input in planning processes and not to rely on re-active methodologies such as responding to permit applications. At the same time, professional planners training should include heritage conservation planning to enable professional planners to include heritage conservation aspects in spatial planning processes.

Heritage Resource Management should be re-imagined where it becomes part of an integrated spatial planning. Impact Assessments should be conducted by multi-disciplinary specialist teams that include a heritage specialist that works together with environmental and other specialists to conduct impact assessments. Furthermore impact assessments should become an integral part of the planning process that is conducted at the beginning of the planning process of a development in order to inform the developer in advance about the limitations and constraints of a site and thereby avoid costly delays and mistakes. Compliance agencies should be capacitated to evaluate heritage impact assessments within the context of the natural and socio-economic environment. UNESCO’s Heritage Urban Landscape (HUL) programme that incorporates tangible and intangible aspects and that takes the larger context into account should inform decisions.

8.2 Spatial planning

Heritage resource management in South Africa is facing severe challenges due to a lack of resources as well as the isolation of heritage agencies from planning agencies. Although heritage resource management in terms of the immovable heritage has everything to do with spatial planning, heritage is not part of the core planning structures within local authorities. Furthermore, the conservation of immovable heritage is fragmented across all three tiers of government, creating challenges for a cohesive response to planning proposals.

With reference to the legislative framework, developers and property owners are currently subject to a complex set of legislation that requires permits from various authorities and Tribunals. This policy confirms existing legislation. However, the agencies and authorities created to manage the legislative framework should be capacitated in terms of skills and resources to implement the NHRA (1999). Developers are requesting the introduction of a streamlined “one-stop shop” system and the capacity within the heritage sector to deal with
applications speedily and professionally. This entails alignment with the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (Act 3 of 2000) which makes provision for reasonable response times. In fact, some of the PHRA’s actions are currently in contradiction to the PAJA as they take up to two years to respond to an application. Developers have suggested that the structures and processes of the environmental authorities should be explored by the heritage sector as environmental authorities also set strenuous assessment criteria, but are able to respond within 30 to 60 days to applications.

Heritage should become an integral part of the development process. One has to move away from intervention to a situation where heritage practitioners and officials work alongside developers to the greater benefit of society. This view is based on acknowledgement that South Africa is a developmental state and that economic development is an important deliverable identified by government. This approach echoes the NHRA art 5(7)(d) that the identification, assessment and management of the heritage resources of South Africa must […] contribute to social and economic development. Heritage resources in the built environment consist of “lived-in” spaces and that daily living should be considered in the way in which heritage conservation is done.

A first requirement for a development-friendly heritage management is for heritage management to be integrated with broader planning initiatives. Heritage authorities have to steer away from situations where heritage becomes an intervention after planning processes have been completed to being part of the planning process right from the beginning. Therefore heritage management should be included in Infrastructure Development Plans (IDP) and Spatial Development Frameworks (SDF). The Land Use Management structures potentially provide scope for heritage management to become integrated with broader development plans. However, the Land Use Management Bill barely mentions heritage and the heritage sector is not engaging with the review process. Such a planning framework should provide a clear map for developers and investors, a point that is pursued below. This spatial planning includes addressing past inequalities in terms of urban fragmentation and in spatial separation.

This requirement can be augmented by comments from both the heritage and development sectors that closer cooperation between practitioners in the two sectors can benefit both. This includes including heritage practitioners in the planning phase of a development project in order to include the heritage resources on a site in the planning and design of the project right from the beginning. In that way heritage becomes an integral part of a development and not something that have to be protected through mitigatory measures. In addition, heritage practitioners with a good knowledge of an area can highlight potential and known heritage resources and thereby save developers money by avoiding plans and designs that are unlikely to be approved. Therefore, a heritage impact assessment should be conducted at the start of the planning process and not at the end and simply become another factor in the planning process.

Secondly, an environment of certainty has to be created for developers. A database of heritage sensitive areas and known heritage resources should be developed as has already been done with sensitive environmental areas. The first target would be to develop a nation-wide database with high level information only. Additional information can be added using completed heritage impact assessments and new surveys. Some local authorities, such as the City of Cape Town have been conducting surveys for twenty years while others such as Johannesburg have embarked on similar processes. The objective of a database is to be able to create an
environment where a developer can estimate potential impact of heritage legislation on a proposed
development before detailed planning start.

Criteria should be set for heritage impact assessment practitioners as well as the format of heritage impact
assessments following the example of Environmental Impact Practitioners who are in a process to develop a
professional registration procedure and the Geological Society which have developed a standard reporting
format which enable the capturing of data on a national database.

The identification of heritage resources has lagged behind and should be undertaken as a parallel process with
the development of the database as the broadening of identified heritage resources to be more representative
is an important element of the transformation of the sector. The lack of progress regarding the identification of
heritage resources is considered to be a serious issue that impact both on the transformation of the sector as
well as on planning processes.

The NHRA makes provision for formal and general protection. As heritage resources have not been identified
or identified resources are not been protected by formal (specific) protection, each area is dealt with as
applications are being submitted and general protections is used to protect against potential heritage resource
destruction. This has serious implications.

- Firstly, it means a delayed application process. If formal protections are in place, a developer would
  know what to expect and how to plan accordingly.
- Secondly, using general protections means that the heritage sector is reacting to situations instead of
  guiding development planning.

The lack of nomination of heritage resources is partly due to a lack of resources as well as the huge
administrative load in nominating and declaring a site.

From a transformation point of view, the lack of new nominations means that most declared heritage
resources have been nominated and declared under the Monuments Council and is not representative of South
Africa diverse legacies. However, many sites and objects are protected by special protections and one has to
question the domination of nomination process thinking against the recent developments in international
heritage practice that emphasise landscapes rather than specific sites. This approach also makes provision for
spatial planning taking into account intangible aspects of heritage. According to this approach a city or
settlement should be seen as an organism of which the immovable fabric is just one of the elements
constituting the organism. It is the organism with all the symbolic meanings attached to it and the environment
that sustains it that must be preserved and not only the immovable fabric.

This approach is partly a reaction on the lack of diversity of heritage resources as well as the boutique or
romanticised view of heritage and partly an acknowledgement of the rich intangible heritage resources in cities
and settlements. Focusing on the intangible relates to focusing on the spirit or sense of place as well as
people’s relationships with space. This approach takes issue with a conservation approach that the fabric of a
building should be retained and conserved irrespective of the integrity and the meaning of the space. To
understand meaning and use of space, one has to understand the relationships taking place in space and social
nodes in cities and settlements. It is these relationships that should inform conservation decisions. Exploring
relationships with space should take cognisance with cultural diversity in terms of relating to space and different experiences of the same space by different individuals and groups. Conservation of space should be supported by social programmes that reflect critically on the legacies of space and nurture meaning and sense of belonging to space.

This approach requires the interrogation of concepts of city/settlement and social and cultural values. A Council of Europe document on the promotion of tourism published in 2003 raises the questions: “And what kind of city do we want today for tomorrow? What does the city mean to the society of today? What is our ideal city? A city in which you can trespass on the flower beds? A virtual city or a city in which you can put your graffiti on the walls to affirm your personality? A city in which you can decide your own future and find the inspiration you need to build a tomorrow? What is the deep meaning to be given to it?” Even though the document is of European origin, the issues raised are important from a South African perspective. It requires a future-oriented approach where cities/settlements are developed for people as opposed to a past-oriented approach where tangible heritage is conserved for heritage sake.

The heritage resource management and living heritage approaches are compatible and should be integrated. The heritage resource approach has moved toward the identification of cultural landscapes and an acceptance that cultural heritage is a social construction based on a value judgement. An integration of the two approaches requires vision of a city or settlement that corresponds to existing relationships with the city or settlement as well potential relationships. It is based on the assumption that relationships and intangible heritage are more flexible and representative than tangible heritage. Only when there is a clear understanding of the vision for the city/settlement, can one decide which tangible heritage resources should be conserved to conserve the intangibles. With this approach cultural landscapes become important.

Although this means that not every building or site which is conservation worthy according to the NHRA and SAHRA guidelines will be conserved, it also does not mean that the fabric of the city is not important. The physical structure of a city reflects the spirit of a place and influences the culture of a city or settlement. Conserving the essence of the built environment is therefore important. An integrated approach is also a critique of a boutique heritage approach and will hopefully result in a more representative and diverse national estate.

The planning of cities, including conservation planning should have as its objective to create liveable and sustainable societies. This includes not only the physical but also social dimensions of a city/settlement. An integrated process takes cognisance of both dimensions.

9. Policy recommendations and the way forward

In this position paper, policy directions as well as research and programmes required to align heritage with developmental goals have been identified. A wide range of recommendations have been made that address issues such as:

- The need for greater cooperation on an executive level between government departments to ensure the integration of heritage policy and programmes with that of other departments, e.g. housing
programmes, job creation programmes, social development programmes, urban planning & land use programmes as well as education and training. Cooperation with Departments such as Tourism, Trade and Industry, Social Development, Science and Technology, Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs together with their provincial and local counterparts is required. In addition, cooperation with provincial and local planning structures whether economic or spatial, should also be established. In terms of heritage resource management, structures to ensure cooperation between DAC, SAHRA, PHRAs, local government heritage departments and the Departments of Environmental Affairs and Energy and Minerals is required.

- Research programmes to create greater understanding of the impact and role of heritage in society as well as the development of models for the implementation of policy guidelines.
- The capacitating of the heritage sector to fully implement their mandates as well as providing support to private owners of heritage sites.
- Review of training requirements within the heritage sector as well as associated professionals such as professional planners and architects.

Recommendations regarding cooperation and integration:
- A study should be undertaken to investigate all planning related legislation, policies and regulations that have a bearing on heritage practice. A road map should be developed to enable developers and heritage practitioners to develop an integrated approach and guidelines towards planning processes that impact on heritage. This study should take into account the HUL approach to heritage management and that integrates the requirements set by NEMA and NHRA. The latter approach requires multi-disciplinary specialist teams that produce integrated reports giving a holistic picture of the proposed development.
- In partnership with the Department of Trade and Industry, draft and implement plan to support small business development in creative industries in terms of business skills and funding.
- A study should be undertaken to investigate models to establish Public Private Partnerships and to attract private funding to heritage in terms of their BBBEE scorecard.
- Closer cooperation between the heritage and tourism sector should be developed regarding the identification of heritage tourism resources as well as the sustainable management thereof.
- To encourage traditional architecture as well as contemporary architecture based on IKS in the planning of mass housing projects.
- Linkages and cooperative structures should be developed between research departments within heritage institutions and the Department of Science and Technology and the National Research Foundation.
- Linkages between museums, universities and other research institutions should be supported and encouraged.

Recommendations regarding research:
- An extensive study into the current and potential economic and social impact of heritage on South Africa should be undertaken.
- Though the principle of grassroots participation is applauded, it is recommended that a review of heritage resource management authorities and legislation be undertaken with the objective to streamline and integrate processes between different authorities to find a balance between the need...
of developers for reasonable response times to applications and our responsibility to conserve our heritage. Decentralisation and capacitating provincial and local authorities should form part of the study. Parallel to the recommendation above, a study should be conducted to develop an organisational structure required to deliver on legislatives mandates of heritage authorities and to determine human resource and financial requirements to implement such a structure.

- DAC and its agency SAHRA, in partnership with local expertise held by internationally affiliated bodies such as the African World Heritage Fund (world heritage sites), ICOMOS-SA (monuments and heritage sites) and ICOM-SA (conservation within museum contexts), should undertake a study with the objective to prepare a business plan for the development of a skilled conservation and restoration sector that include specialist artisans. Such a study should also include projections in terms of employment opportunities for such a sector.

Recommendations regarding restructuring and capacitating:

- Models to support the social and cultural life of heritage areas such as rebates and a covenant system should be investigated. Social and cultural impact of urban improvement programmes should also be considered fully in planning processes.

- Greater awareness regarding sound heritage management practices should be created in order to train practitioners to manage the impact of tourism on heritage resources, for example the development of visitor management plans. Such plans should focus on the sustainability and conservation of the heritage resource as well as the positive experience of the visitors.

- Research conducted by heritage institutions for example natural and social sciences should be supported in terms of strategic direction and financial support.

- Professional Planners training should include heritage conservation training.

Recommended heritage programmes:

- To allocate adequate resources in order for SAHRA to implement the proposed national database of heritage resources as part of an extended inventory of the national estate.

- To hold a consultative forum to explore programmes and processes to re-imagine cities and settlements.

- To draft and widely disseminate good practices in relation to tourism development with a view to maximising its positive impact on cultural diversity.

- To develop programmes and guidelines for the promotion of tolerance and intercultural dialogue through heritage experiences.

- To promote and capacitate museums and related heritage institutions to play the role of social agents in order to promote tolerance and human rights.

- To provide guidelines for and capacitate education programmes in the heritage sector to support creativity and innovation.
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