

Rethinking Lasem: Some Notes and Challenges on Heritage Conservation

Widjaja Martokusumo¹, Erika Yuni Astuti², Febriyanti Suryaningsih³,
Nadia Purwestri⁴, and Agni Malagina⁵

^{1,2}School of Architecture, Planning, and Policy Development, Institut Teknologi Bandung,
Bandung 40132 Indonesia

^{3,4}Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur, Jakarta, 12810, Indonesia

⁵Lasem Heritage, Lasem, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: September 27, 2024

Received in revised form:

November 7, 2024

Accepted on: November 1,

2024

Available Online:

December 2024-May

2025

Keywords: socio-cultural construct, intangible heritage, people-centered conservation, Lasem (konstruksi sosial budaya, warisan tak benda, pelestarian berbasis masyarakat, Lasem)

Corresponding Author:

Widjaja Martokusumo

wmart@itb.ac.id

ORCID ID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1756-5916>

ABSTRACT

Diskusi warisan budaya terus berkembang, dengan paradigma baru yang menggabungkan aspek berwujud dan tak berwujud dalam pengelolaan warisan budaya perkotaan. Konservasi warisan budaya kini menghadapi tantangan terkait sumber daya dan kondisi elemen perkotaan. Dalam menilai signifikansi budaya, perspektif perlu diperluas untuk melihat objek lanskap perkotaan sebagai konstruksi sosial, bukan hanya entitas fisik. Proyek revitalisasi Lasem fokus pada perbaikan ruang publik dan koridor jalan, namun perlindungan fitur urban bersejarah sering terabaikan, yang menimbulkan masalah baru. Data dikumpulkan melalui survei, wawancara, dan pemetaan partisipatif. Kerangka analisisnya berlandaskan pemahaman ciri-ciri sejarah perkotaan, signifikansi budaya, dan konservasi yang berpusat pada masyarakat. Penelitian ini menekankan pentingnya pendekatan holistik yang memperhatikan warisan berwujud dan tak berwujud di kawasan bersejarah Lasem, serta menyimpulkan bahwa konservasi yang berfokus pada masyarakat memperkuat warisan budaya sebagai konstruksi sosial budaya.

The discussion on cultural heritage has evolved to integrate both tangible and intangible aspects in urban heritage management. Heritage conservation now faces challenges related to resources and the condition of urban elements. When assessing cultural significance, it's important to look beyond physical objects and consider social and cultural factors. The Lasem revitalization project has focused on improving public spaces and street corridors, but the protection of historical urban features is often overlooked, causing new problems. This research used surveys, interviews, and participation mapping to gather data. The analysis framework is based on understanding historical urban features, cultural significance, and people-centered conservation. The study emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to both tangible and intangible heritage in Lasem's historic areas and finds that people-centered conservation views heritage as a socio-cultural construct.

1. Background: New Paradigm and Challenge in Heritage Discourse

The discussion on cultural heritage, including architectural and urban conservation, has evolved over time (Wells, 2010; Muñoz Viñaz, 2005). Initially, cultural

heritage protection in Europe was largely influenced by art historians and focused on individual monuments (Smith, 2006). According to Taylor and Lennon (2012), this led to a "museum-like" or physical-based approach, where only specific objects at a particular moment in time were preserved, often ignoring the social context and processes involved (Wells, 2010; Smith, 2006).

As urban dynamics grow and awareness of humanistic approaches to landscapes as cultural constructs increases, the concept of cultural heritage has shifted from focusing on individual objects to broader area-based policies. This new approach integrates both tangible and intangible aspects of urban heritage management (cf. Martokusumo and Wibowo, 2020; Veldpaus, Roders, Colenbrander, 2013; Gutschow and Weiler, 2017; Wells, 2010; Muñoz-Viñas, 2005). Heritage conservation practices now face challenges such as limited resources and the condition of urban elements. While cultural significance is still largely assessed through tangible, intact objects, it's increasingly important to recognize that urban landscapes are also shaped by mental processes, not just physical form. Therefore, understanding these objects as part of a larger urban context is crucial for preserving their integrity (Albert *et al.*, 2013).

Conservation efforts have become a priority to preserve the unique historical remnants of Lasem from the 15th century. The Lasem revitalization project focuses on improving public spaces like *Alun-alun* and street corridors. However, because the socio-cultural aspects (constructionism) are often overlooked, historical urban features are not always designated as protected, leading to new environmental issues (Walter, 2021).

2. Materials and Methods

The data for this research were collected through field surveys (2021-2024), literature reviews, and interviews. The field surveys, conducted over several stages from 2021 to 2024, focused on observing changes in urban features such as street corridors, public spaces, Chinese walled houses, and other important architectural elements. These observations were then compared to the planning and implementation of the Lasem revitalization project.

As part of the literature reviews, a collection of local and national development plans and documents, including the building and environmental planning document (RTBL), detailed engineering document (DED) 2021, and national cultural heritage area (KCBN) study for Lasem (2019) as the pilot project of 2013 revitalization was conducted by the Ministry of Public Work and Housing (PUPR). All those planning documents were compared to the latest theoretical discourse on heritage studies and urban conservation and respectively analysed. Methodologically, the framework of analysis is derived from the understanding of historical urban features, notion of cultural significance and people-centered conservation, including the indicators. The indicators, i.e. heritage notion, urban features, local involvement have been formulated according to the appropriateness of planning and design guidelines towards Lasem's unique character.

During the field surveys, interviews with the locals were also conducted such as Non-Government Organization, cultural interest groups, heritage professionals, local communities, and local batik makers. In addition, inputs and insights from the local-initiated socialization program of Rembang Regency during the implementation of the revitalization were also considered. Prior to that, participatory mapping with the locals was done in 2021 with the support from Lasem Heritage Foundation. There were direct inputs and concerns from the locals on the impact triggered by the revitalization.

This paper highlights the importance of both intangible and tangible aspects of heritage, which have been overlooked in the conservation of Lasem's historic districts. It reveals the gap between heritage-sensitive conservation efforts and the concept of cultural significance. The discussion also emphasizes the need for a comprehensive understanding of urban history, noting that the shift from focusing on physical elements to considering socio-cultural factors is inevitable. Protecting cultural resources must prioritize a people-centered conservation approach. Additionally, a critical discussion is needed to rethink how urban heritage in Indonesia should be understood. Ultimately, the paper suggests new opportunities for interpreting and understanding Lasem's rich, multicultural history, particularly for tourism purposes.

Since the Venice Charter in 1964, the focus of conservation has primarily been on historic monuments, with an emphasis on preserving physical objects, often overlooking dynamic processes and socio-cultural context. In 1979, the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance) broadened this understanding by addressing cultural significance. The Burra Charter expanded the concept of heritage to include more than just historic monuments, defining cultural significance through aesthetic, historic, scientific, social, or spiritual values for past, present, and future generations. It also recognizes that cultural significance can change over time and may vary or even conflict among different people (cf. Walter, 2021).

Smith (2006) asserts that heritage should be understood as a social and cultural process, not just as a physical object. This idea emerged from cultural and development theories in the 1980s and 1990s, which viewed heritage as a dynamic, social activity tied to development potential. In this view, heritage shifts from being a static, tangible object to a process that shapes identity. The concept of identity also changes—from something fixed within an object to something that evolves continuously, making heritage a dynamic, ever-developing process. Smith (2006) argues that all heritage is intangible, based on the idea that realities are socially constructed. Social constructionism suggests that knowledge is created, not discovered. As Byrne (2008) notes, the meaning of heritage places is both inherited and constantly redefined by people. This helps give some stability to the otherwise fluid nature of socially constructed heritage. This idea is important when responding to changes in historic environments, which are often contested socially, culturally, and politically. If the significance of a historic site is socially constructed today, it will continue to be constructed and reinterpreted in the future. In this view, heritage is always open to contestation and change, confirming that culture is hypermutable (Walter, 2021).

Nowadays, conservation is seen as a key tool to address environmental issues like ecological destruction, depletion of non-renewable resources, and loss of biodiversity. Historic buildings, structures, and landscapes are valuable, non-renewable assets that contribute to place-making. Additionally, conserving urban forms affects urban functions and becomes an important part of urban management. Therefore, conservation is about managing inevitable change (Tiesdell *et al.*, 1996; Stubb, 2009). Since conservation has been ruled by more of a sense of history, the idea of conservation to some degree has respectively changed. The most essential development in the heritage conservation movements is that it has expanded its area of interests into dimensions where environmental concerns (area-based) are more dominant than the historical associations of a place, i.e. natural or cultural landscape, topography, social and cultural traditions, and other environmental objects are becoming the current concerns (Eichstaedt, 1996; Taylor and Lennon, 2012; Wells, 2010; Martokusumo and Wibowo, 2021; Muñoz Viñas, 2005).

Given the above context, the shift from focusing on physical features to understanding heritage as a socio-cultural construct is both inevitable and significant. Based on data from field surveys, literature reviews, and interviews, this paper examines the importance of both tangible and intangible heritage, which have often been overlooked in the conservation of Lasem's historic quarters. It also highlights the gap between heritage-sensitive conservation efforts and the concept of cultural significance, particularly in relation to empowering the local community and building a sustainable, resilient Lasem. The following sections will analyze and discuss the heritage engagement in Lasem's revitalization, which has been ongoing for the past two years.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Lasem in Rupture: Urban Realities and Challenges

Lasem is currently going through a period of exciting yet challenging development (Astuti *et al.*, 2023). As Stubb (2009) notes, the rapid changes brought by globalization can be unsettling, especially in Asian cities. Globalization and modernization have exposed cities to a flood of information, leading to significant changes in landscapes. However, this has also resulted in the spread of design homogenization, causing the unique identities of cultures to fade. Many urban development projects have modernized areas using a "tabula rasa" approach, disregarding the original character. As highlighted at the Habitat III conference on Urban Culture and Heritage, threats to cultural heritage have increased over the past 20 years, with historic areas facing significant pressure from development.

Lasem (Hokkien: Lao Sem) with its unique historical remnants of the 15th century was the centre of Chinese immigrants after Semarang. Previously it was also known as Little Chinatown. The city of Lasem is nowadays part of the Rembang Regency and has a long history as a former vital *entrepôt* of the Majapahit Empire. Lasem is situated on the northern area of Java coast, close to Rembang, and is crossed by the Great Postal road.

According to the preliminary study for the National Cultural Heritage Area (Kawasan Cagar Budaya Nasional-KCBN) in 2019, there are ca. 360 objects that are worthy for protection which are found in an area of 156 ha. Nowadays, the city of Lasem (ca. 45.04 km²) consist of 20 villages. The population in Lasem is about 47.000 people (2005), and the town is also known as *Kota Santri* and famous for its Batik Laseman.

In 2012, the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (PUPR) organized the Heritage City Planning and Preservation Program (*Program Penataan dan Pelestarian Kota Pusaka-P3KP*) to achieve the implementation of a consistent urban spatial planning based on the strengths of urban spaces with heritage values, as well as to encourage the recognition of Indonesian Heritage Cities as World Heritage Cities. Based on the P3KP manuals, this program is run nationwide through the following stages: (1) preparation of proposals, inventory, and action plans; (2) signing of the MoU between the regional government and the Ministry of PUPR; (3) preparation of a building and environmental plan (RTBL); (4) formulation of a detailed engineering design (DED) document for selected urban areas; and (5) implementation (physical interventions) in the area.

As reported, by a certain year, more than 50 cities/urban districts had been nationwide participating in the Heritage City program, and several heritage cities had been reorganized by the PUPR. Lasem is one of the cities (or districts) participating in this program. Later, due to its historic urban structure, and uniqueness of its architecture and urban setting, Lasem was chosen as a pilot project of revitalization in 2013. This was initiated and organized by PUPR in relation to the delineation of a National Cultural Heritage Area (KCBN) in the inner city of Lasem. The project has been addressing the improvement of public space (*Alun-alun*) and main street corridors of Lasem (Jalan Jatirogo and Karang Turi corridor). Like other previous projects, this revitalization program has been carried out in stages from 2020-2022.

In the first stage, an inventory of heritage assets, both tangible and intangible, was carried out with the assistance of the local community in Lasem. Afterwards, a proposal of historic building inventory and action plan were submitted to PUPR, which was then followed with the preparation of a Building and Environmental Planning Document (*Rencana Tata Bangunan dan Lingkungan-RTBL*). The preparation of the document went through a review process by both experts and the Lasem community.

The preparation of the RTBL is then continued with the preparation of the Detailed Engineering Design (DED) document in the selected areas in early 2021, i.e. the *Alun-Alun*, Jalan Jatirogo and street corridors in Kampung Turi. At the period of 2021 - 2022, Lasem was designated as a Cultural Heritage Area (at the Regency's level) by a Cultural Heritage Expert Team (TACB), attached to Rembang Regency. In the preparation of the DED, the community and local interest groups in Lasem, which were represented by the Lasem Heritage Foundation, assisted the long process of consultation. There were many criticisms provided by the community, especially concerning the planning and design of street furniture, street corridors and the use of city icons that do not represent Lasem's cultural identity.

The RTBL has faced significant public criticism, especially regarding urban planning and design guidelines that are borrowed from other places and do not fit Lasem's cultural identity and urban context. The guidelines fail to address the actual needs of Lasem. The community also gave feedback on the layout of roads and sidewalks along Jalan Jatirogo, pointing out that key activities like loading, unloading, parking, and accessibility for elderly and disabled people (e.g., ramps, drop-offs) were not properly considered. Another issue is the potential discovery of ancient water channels, which have not yet been added to the heritage inventory or recognized as cultural heritage fabrics. These objects are located in areas protected by the National Cultural Heritage Law (No. 11/2010) and the National Cultural Heritage Area research (2019-present). Therefore, proper management of these sites has become an important issue in heritage conservation discussions.

Although the PUPR made commendable efforts to involve the community in preparing the RTBL and DED documents, the implementation of the people-centered approach was not fully effective. Legal frameworks such as the National Cultural Heritage Law (UU Cagar Budaya No. 11/2010) and the Government Regulation on Heritage Registration and Conservation (PP No. 1/2022) support this approach. However, local community participation in the revitalization process was not fully realized, and they were not involved in the monitoring phase during implementation. Despite this, efforts to involve the community have created opportunities to improve the democratic planning and design process.



Figure 1. *Alun-alun* Lasem, Pasar Kreatif and existing old structure/building

(Source: W. Martokusumo, 2024)

The city of Lasem is shaped by unique urban and architectural forms, reflecting its rich cultural mix. Its multi-ethnic character is evident in the architecture and urban layout, with lasting influences from Chinese, Javanese, and European cultures. *Alun-alun* Lasem, one of the key elements in traditional Javanese settlements (along with the market, palace, and mosque), was redesigned into a larger public space. Commercial activities are now housed in a new three-story building on the southern side of the *alun-alun*. However, the new *Pasar Kreatif* building has not considered the existing old structures well, particularly in terms of permeability. As a result, the building blocks access to homes on the eastern side of Alun-alun and damages the remnants of old walls and doors (figure 1).

The PUPR's physical improvement project aims to conserve historic buildings and structures in Lasem. The revitalization focuses on the main commercial area of Jatirogo Street, including *alun-alun* (public square) and Kampung Turi. The program emphasizes protecting historic structures while improving the quality of public urban spaces. During the planning stage, the local community and their representatives provided input on commercial activities, such as loading/unloading and passenger drop-offs. However, these concerns were not properly addressed by the consultant and contractor during execution, leading to traffic congestion and issues for shop owners and the community.

In the case of the Kampung Turi corridor, the improvements involved replacing the asphalt pavement with paving blocks, turning the street into a pedestrian zone, and adding street furniture and light poles. However, trees or shaded areas were not included in the project. This reflects a physical-focused planning approach that lacks consideration for people-oriented design. Lasem, being a coastal city with a tropical climate, has average daytime temperatures of 32°C and nighttime temperatures of 25°C, with around 70% humidity. Given these conditions, it's uncomfortable to walk during the day, making late afternoons or evenings more suitable. After the intervention, green spaces along the corridor were removed, increasing the heat due to lack of shade. Furthermore, there is a misalignment of DED with the actual field conditions. It is likely that the contractor merely followed the plan drawings without investigating the actual conditions. This has led to the placement of lighting poles, which did not take into account the entrance doors of the walled houses that constituted Lasem's Chinatown identity. Thus, lighting poles were carelessly placed in front of old doors, blocking access for residents. The lack of both DED quality and supervision by the contractor resulted in the uncoordinated installment of lighting poles in a massive number (figure 2).



Figure 2. The installment of light pole that has not taken into account the existing building entrance, and the distance between two pole is too close.

(Source: left, Lasem Heritage Foundation 2022 and right, W. Martokusumo , 2024)

The installation of many closely spaced streetlights has changed the character of the small town, making it feel more like a big city. Additionally, the high number of lights has led to increased electricity costs for the local government. Despite this attempt, the corridors remain dark in the evenings. Local groups, cultural activists, and tourism stakeholders have criticized this change. This oversight highlights that the revitalization

program and design interventions were not fully supported by up-to-date information about the area's existing condition.

The Kampung Turi corridor is unique due to its traditional Chinese house design, featuring large outer walls and intricately decorated house entrances. However, after uncoordinated physical changes, the corridor's streetscape, which once showcased Fujian-style walled architecture and detailed entrances, has been significantly altered. The fourth case involves the destruction of ancient water channels in Lasem. During the DED phase, the community had provided input and it was accommodated in the design regarding the protection of ancient channels. In the implementation, the contractor was not accompanied by a conservation expert, so when the road surface was excavated, the ancient brick-made channels, estimated to have been worthy for protection, were demolished and replaced by modern mass-product culverts (figure 3).



Figure 3. Before (two pictures in the left) and after (right) the construction works of ancient water channel (Source: F. Suryaningsih, 2021)

Another issue concerns with the urgency to replace the existing ancient brick-made channels. The physical conditions of the existing channels were previously still intact and worked properly with no flood has ever been reported. Referring to the basic principles of conservation, i.e. minimal intervention and prudent, the above condition is contrary to the main basic principles. This again confirms the lack of substantial knowledge and ignorance of stakeholders and local resources.

3.2. Discussion

Although the protection of cultural heritage in Lasem's inner city is regulated, the revitalization program highlights the need for a more sensitive approach to heritage management, both physical and non-physical (Wehdorn, 2005; Wells, 2010). This approach is needed not only in decision-making and procedures but also in national project classifications and development policies. The protection of Lasem's cultural heritage is outlined in Rembang Regency Regional Regulation Number 5/2014, which recognizes the city's valuable historical, cultural, economic, and religious assets. However, a decade later, the revitalization program has not been carried out according to national

regulations or the core principles of heritage conservation. In short, conservation efforts have been misunderstood and poorly executed.

Building guidelines are typically designed for non-heritage objects, making it difficult to apply them to ancient relics. To address this, experts have been brought in for specific projects. However, there have been instances where repairs failed, such as with the ancient water channels, due to improper handling. Despite the need for protection, excavation work was carried out as if the water channel were a non-heritage object. This damage to protected items was mainly caused by a lack of expertise or understanding of cultural heritage and conservation practices. The DED for the RTBL Lasem Historic District did not meet the basic requirements for protecting the area's historic and urban characteristics. Additionally, there was poor coordination among the institutions responsible for the revitalization. One issue was the tendency to apply designs and features from other heritage projects without proper study, leading to a loss of local uniqueness and diversity. This approach resulted in homogenization, reducing the quality of each Cultural Heritage District. Furthermore, the execution of the DED was weak because the project operator did not properly align the objects with their surroundings. A lack of construction monitoring, limited mechanisms, low enthusiasm for public participation, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic all severely hindered the progress of the revitalization program.

In conclusion, the challenges in Lasem were varied. Many buildings/structures have not been officially designated as cultural heritage, so owners feel they are not obligated to follow regulations. Additionally, locals did not receive clear, ongoing information about the programs in progress. Their complaints during the revitalization were largely ignored by the responsible authorities. A key issue is the limited representation of locals, which goes against the Burra Charter principles, which emphasize the need for involving all stakeholders, including the local community, in the conservation process (Walter, 2021; Schmidt, 2008). In light of the above, physical improvements must align with conservation principles, such as highlighting heritage values, understanding the significance and spirit of the place, and fostering community participation. Additionally, Lasem's identity, rooted in its historical, cultural, and social dimensions, must be conserved in a sensitive and context-specific manner. According to McKercher & Du Cros (2020), heritage management is guided by two main challenges: (1) the rapid pace of urban development, which threatens physical cultural heritage, and (2) the risk of losing knowledge about the cultural significance of these assets.

4. Conclusion

The discussion highlights that urban changes and the transformation of space and time have caused people to become disconnected from their cultural environment. In Lasem, the challenge is to reconnect people and social relationships through interactions, giving people more control over their local spaces, and reinforcing elements of local cultural traditions to build social resilience (cf. Rudolph-Cleff, 2017). Heritage

conservation and revitalization are not just about aesthetic preferences but also reflect social responsibility. This reinforces the vital connection between landscape, people, and society, as noted by Taylor and Lennon (2012) (Engelhardt and Rogers, 2009; Smith, 2006). Achieving this requires active participation in the planning and design process. In decision-making, integrated design solutions can address urban challenges, especially by considering the risks society should bear (cf. Hüther, 2013). Quality in urban spaces cannot remain abstract; it must be actively debated and implemented in real projects. In Lasem, the design of public spaces is essential for creating an inclusive urban environment that encourages interaction and community engagement.

This paper highlights the need for a comprehensive area-based policy for revitalizing Lasem. Understanding the city's historic urban identity is crucial, and the shift from focusing on physical aspects to socio-cultural ones presents an opportunity. However, the local government will face challenges due to limited resources and institutional issues. Professionals and academics in related fields should work together to empower the local community and create a more sustainable and resilient urban environment for Lasem.

The revitalization of Lasem emphasizes the importance of public spaces in urban planning and design. These spaces must meet public needs while preserving the urban elements that carry cultural meaning and value. The process also raises questions about how spaces like *alun-alun*, street corridors, historic walled architecture, and other culturally significant sites can improve the quality of life for the community and become vibrant public places. The revitalization should avoid unnecessary focus on tourism and instead prioritize meaningful improvements to the historic environment. Ultimately, people-centered conservation in Lasem should be viewed as a rethinking of how human existence shapes and interacts with these spaces.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Lasem community for their support and communication during the field research. Special thanks to the Lasem Heritage Foundation and the *Pusat Dokumentasi Arsitektur* for providing data and resources for this paper.

References

- Albert, Marie-Theres *et al.* (eds.). (2013). *Understanding Heritage. Perspectives in Heritage Studies*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Astuti, E.Y. *et al.* (2023). Urban Infrastructure Changes and Their Influences on Inhabitants' Well-Being: A Case Study of Transcultural Heritage Conservation in Lasem, Indonesia. *Heritage and Society*, Vol. 16

- Engelhardt, R. and Rogers, P.R. (2009). *Hoi An Protocols for best conservation practice in Asia*, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000182617> (accessed 27 November 2023)
- du Cros, H., and McKercher, B. (2020). *Cultural Tourism* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429277498>
- Hüther, G. (2013). *Kommunale Intelligenz: Potenzialentfaltung in Städten und Gemeinden*. Hamburg: CPI-Clausse und Bosse
- Martokusumo, W. and Wibowo, A. S. (2021), *Pelestarian Arsitektur dan Lingkungan Bersejarah*, Bandung: ITB Press. Second Print
- Muñoz Viñaz, S. (2005). *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Rudolph-Cleff, A. (2017). Soziale Resilienz: Was Städte stark macht. *Der Architekt*, Vol 1, pp. 20-27
- Schmidt, L. (2008). *Architectural Conservation: An Introduction*, Berlin: Westkreuz-Verlag GmbH
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*, New York: Routledge.
- Stubb, J. S. (2009). *Time Honoured, A global view of architectural conservation*. New York: John Willey and Sons.
- Taylor, K. and Lennon, J.L. (eds.), (2012). *Managing Cultural Landscapes*. London: Routledge
- Taylor, K. and Altenburg, K. (2006). Cultural Landscape in Asia-Pacific: Potential for Filling World Heritage Gaps. *International Journal and Heritage Studies*, Vol. 12, No.3, pp. 267-282
- Tiesdell, S. et al. (1996). *Revitalizing Historic Urban Quarters*. Oxford.
- Veldpaus, L., Pereira-Rodgers, A., Colenbrander, B.J.F., (2013). Urban Heritage: Putting the Past into the Future in *The Historic Environment*, Vol. 4 No. 1, April, pp. 3-18
- Walter, N. (2021). *The Narrative Theory of Conservation. Change and Living Buildings*. New York: Routledge - Taylor and Francis Group.
- Wehdorn, M. (2005). *Das kulturelle Erbe. Vom Einzeldenkmal zur Kulturlandschaft*. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag GmbH.
- Weiler, K. and Gutschow, N. (eds.), (2017). *Authenticity in Architectural Heritage Conservation: Discourse, Opinions, Experiences in Europe, South and East Asia*. Heidelberg: Springer
- Wells, J., (2010). *Valuing Historic Places: Traditional and Contemporary Approaches*. School of Architecture, Art, and Historic Preservation Faculty Papers, pp. 22-27 http://docs.rwu.edu/saahp_fp/22 accessed 12th May 2024).