

# Minutes of CHANGES Project

---

*TU Delft (NL) 11-13 January 2016*

**Attendance:** Stefano della Torre, Rossella Moioli, Dario Foppoli, Koen van Balen, Aziliz Vandesande, Nathalie Van Roy, Christer Gustafsson, Akram Ijla, Silvia Naldini, Herdis Heinemann

## **January 11<sup>th</sup> 2016**

**Guests:** Rob van Hees, TU Delft, Jacques Akerboom Monumentenwacht Noord Brabant; Manoëlle Verbeeck, Monumentenwacht Vlaanderen

### Welcome and opening word by Silvia Naldini

Silvia Naldini presented her recent publication by *Het belang van Monumentenwacht - de situatie in Noord-Brabant* (Rob van Hees, Silvia Naldini, Timo Nijland, 2015, <http://www.monumentenwachtbrabant.nl/database/Rapport%20Belang%20MW.pdf>; English version: *The importance of a Monumentenwacht system: The situation in North-Brabant*). The approach of the Monumentwacht was described and evaluated, stakeholders interviewed, and some cases and reports analysed (also by MSc students). The gained information is suitable for the research project and will be incorporated in WP4.

The English version of the report will be made available for the project members.

### Short presentation of the TU Delft and the section Heritage & Architecture by Rob van Hees

Rob van Hees: the group Heritage and Architecture links the fields of design, cultural value and technology, represented by three chairs.

**The knowledge centre Monumentenkennis** (*Monuments (and) knowledge*) is a 4-year cooperation project, started in January 2015 and involving the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency (*Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed*, RCE), TU Delft and TNO. Part of the project is the development of the system MDCS (*Monument Diagnosis and Conservation System*), based on the MDDS system (*Monument damage diagnostic system*) and presently under construction. The available  $\beta$  version can be already used: <http://mdcs.monumentenkenis.nl/>

It offers support for the identification of damage, making use of *one* terminology.

A research focus will be 20<sup>th</sup> century materials, including repair materials which were applied during the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

### Presentation of the Monumentenwacht Vlaanderen by Manoëlle Verbeeck

Manoëlle Verbeeck: last developments within the Flemish Monumentenwacht (MW). The approach is based on the assumption that "Prevention is better than cure". The two goals hereby are, on the short term, to stop decay of monumental buildings, and, on the long term, to change the mentality of the stakeholders. Their working fields include the built heritage (exterior and interior), maritime objects, and archaeological sites.

After 22 years, changes in the political environment and developments in the areas of service, informatics, and cost prices were made. Since 2014 there are 5 Flemish provinces and each MW has more autonomy.

The main changes were the following:

- Service
  - More aftercare with clients
  - More practical reports for members for advice on maintenance advice
  - Knowledge transfer to owners (workshops e.g. how to clean objects)
  - Supply of kits with tools to facilitate cleaning
  - Sensitize caretakers (students, architects, other caretakers)
  - Giving support during interventions
  - Execution of minor repair works for locations with difficult access, as is difficult for owners to find contractors for small, yet complicated, maintenance work
- Informatics changes
  - Report from WORD to ACCESS
  - MW web based database, incl. members and buildings
  - Reason for web application: data available for all users, can be integrated in provincial hardware; flexibility of use (computers, tablets, smartphones)
  - Data better accessible for research
  - Interaction with different participants possible
- MAKsbo
  - New report system with new methodology
    - Incl. maintenance calendar
    - Short report
    - More visual elements inserted
  - Follow-up inspections can use previous reports
  - Obstacles :
    - attitude changes for monumentenwachters after 20 years use of same system
    - change to new system is time consuming
    - high cost of development
  - Demonstration of the MAKsbo, including following features:
    - option to filter data
    - contents of the pages / reports:
      - general condition of whole building, roof, structure, surface finish etc.
      - characteristics of advised interventions (frequency, quantity, urgency etc.)
      - option to add pictures, drawings and to draw on pictures
      - every defect has an own page
    - Database allows to schedule required intervention

Silvia Naldini underlines importance of using same terminology (cf. MDCS, damage identification etc.). MAKsbo includes terminology lists for elements and materials; for damage identification, reference is made to the Dutch *inspectiehandboek* (Inspection handbook).

Questions about the scope of the programme included whether the (energy) performance of a historic building could also be inspected. An explicit option does not exist, yet the recommendation part gives the opportunity to address it.

- Finances

- The MW Vlaanderen is subsidised by provinces (85%), and by member fees (15%).
- Buildings have to be historic value for owners to become members
- Most members are private (48 %) and church councils (40%)
- Ca. 3200 members and ca. 6500 buildings
- Member fees (40 euros per annum) , the free basic package has been extended for members;
- Prices for paying services raised recently, as these were very low for economic context (inspection: 30 euro / hr inspection onsite, plus 15 euro / hr for writing report, with a maximum charge of hours equivalent to the hours of onsite work, 40 euros/hr for special services)
- Services are now also available for non-members for cost prices (80 euros / hr)

Christer Gustafsson was interested on whether and how MW has to apply for grants. As the employees of all provincial MWs, besides of MW Vlaanderen, are employed by the province, they do not need it. Monumentenwacht Vlaanderen, however, has to apply yearly for grants. Rossella Moioli was interested in the expectable costs for the first inspection: for a one day inspection (enough even for large buildings like churches) by two people ca. 400-500 euros, plus 500 euro for desk work and costs analysis.

Inspections focus on the historic parts. Modern installations such as sanitary objects can be addressed in case they are a possible damage cause.

Links:

<http://Int-monumentenwacht-maksbo-tst.appspot.com/#/login>

<http://www.monumentenwacht.be/sites/www.monumentenwacht.be/files/page/BrochureEnglish.pdf>

[Presentation on the Monumentenwacht Noord Brabant by Jacques Akerboom](#)

Jacques Akerboom gave an overview of 40 years of Dutch Monumentenwacht (1973-2013) and its approach. In 1975 MW Noord Brabant (MW NB) was founded. There are currently ca. 20.000 Dutch monuments. All of the twelve Dutch provinces have their own MW.

Small problems (e.g. to gutters) can cause big damage.

MW NB advises owners, carries out small scale repairs, and generates work for architects and construction companies, by suggesting the work to be done. Repeated inspections make the costs for restauration decrease. MW offers courses to owners e.g. on cleaning.

On a larger level, MW monitors the state of monuments for the ministry for policy making (*Monumentenmonitor* will be made available). Internationally, MW NB has given support to the creation of a Monumentenwacht organisations in 10 EU countries.

The inspection reports are made according to the *NEN 2767 Condition assessment*. The standard report was recently modified including a colour code for indicating the severity of the problems (green – orange- red). The standard report is further similar to that used in Vlaanderen. The inspections are recorded on a ACCESS data base. The inspected buildings are subdivided in the report into building elements (e.g. foundations, walls), their damage types are described and advice for interventions is given (including *when* recommended interventions should be carried out).

Large objects such as churches are inspected yearly, smaller objects such as houses biyearly. Inspections are carried out by two inspectors for more complicated situations, otherwise by one inspector. Standard tasks are for example the cleaning of gutters.

The financial set-up of MW NB is the following: 60% own income through members, 40% by provincial governments. The yearly member fee is 55 Euros; the inspection costs vary by province.

C. Gustafsson: in Sweden owners are keen on carrying out works themselves. What is a convincing argument for owners to join MW? J. Akerboom: owners care about their monuments and are interested in the *cost reduction* by regular inspections. S. Naldini added that MW evaluates the work done by restoration companies, thus leading to a selection of good ones. Furthermore, reports of MW are important for restoration grant applications (baseline measurement) and, once restoration works have been carried out, to evaluate their quality.

J. Akerboom: the owner is always responsible for the works, no guarantee from MW. MW can give an objective list of suitable contractors for the advised works. In the Netherlands it is not required to hire a restoration architect for the coordination of restoration works, other than in other countries, like Italy.

The different national tax and funding schemes were discussed as a motivation whether to join a system like MW. In Sweden all churches are protected by law, which includes a budget for restoration; private owners do not pay VAT for maintenance works for a house to avoid the creation of a black market. MW Brabant does not charge VAT; in Belgium MW needs to pay VAT in some provinces.

The tasks of a MW should be well defined: monitoring by experts instead of monitoring by owner.

Common problem in the Netherlands: what should be done with the advice of MW, as owners cannot be forced into carry out works. From case studies S. Naldini reported the emerging problem of financial limitations of owners. J. Akerboom drew the attention to the Dutch "*mottenballenregeling*" (Moth ball regulation), whereby subsidies are given to keep a (vacant) building watertight to avoid larger damage.

Mr. Akerboom: concluding, MW generates work for other partners, without causing frictions; their quality control improves on the long term the quality of restoration works. A. Vandesande commented that in Vlaanderen there are more tensions between MW and contractors as they are "seen as a watch dog" and try to spot out poorly carried out work.

[Project webpage](#)

Prof. della Torre presented the projects webpage and requested the participants to review their personal information and pictures.

[www.changes-project.eu](http://www.changes-project.eu)

*Lunch break*

*Short presentation by Herdis Heinemann on parts of her CV relevant for the project*

H. Heinemann joined the project as a post-doc for WP4 in January 2016. In her presentation she gave an overview of her academic (PhD conservation of historic concrete, project manager for ageing of materials) and practical experience (architect and damage surveyor) in relationship to the research programme.

*Presentation by Stefano della Torre about Milestone 3*

**Due to organisational matters (hiring of staff, availability of project money in the resp. member countries) the deadline for Milestone 3 needs to be postponed to April 2016 instead of October 2015. As the project is a 24 month project within a three year project schedule, the original deadline of April 2017 is feasible.**

The grid for the comparison of the different models as discussed in Visby was presented. Yet the grid requires a definition of the criteria used to compare the models.

Preventive conservation means more than maintenance. Every phase of the process requires changes. The following phases should be considered: programme, design, works, management, valorisation (i.e. opening sites to public etc.), maintenance, control (costs, conservation activities, safety/security, energy efficiency, sustainability...).

Each of the different models focuses on one of the phases:

- Monumentenwacht: control of conservation issues
- Distretti culturali: programme of new interventions
- Halland model: social - economic model

The underlying aim is hereby to evaluate the impact on the whole process by analysing best practices in each phase of the process, and identifying the impact of each phase on the entire process. The side effects of each models should be identified as well.

Points which still have to be discussed are the definitions of the following terms:

- Conservation quality (e.g. physical conservation, choices and material authenticity).
  - o Influencing factors to be considered: cultural differences (e.g. In Italy the project leader is a skilled architect, in Sweden an engineer), the type of monument, the choice of what should be preserved and the context
- Enhancement of capacity / skills : of people involved in the process and also people not jet involved (social impact)
  - o Which processes involve people, thus avoiding neglect after intervention and creating social capital?

- People and community: definition of private?
- Impact on the market: construction sector is more than specialised contractors. Try to avoid the risk of a small sector that cannot grow; how can a larger market be involved?
- Impact on decision making: e.g. the dependency on singular political persons (e.g. mayors, who may change their appointment and no longer be responsible for the project)
- Management / process: whether the use of the monument is necessary. Use is also related to conservation quality and resources; selective expenditure of resources

K. van Balen suggested “heritage health” following the term “structural health” for civil engineering. The question is what we need to keep our heritage healthy. The aim should be to *preserve the health*, whereas the *use* of a monument can but does not have to be an option.

Heritage is a resource which needs resources for its preservation, whereby knowledge is considered a resource as well.

The scheme of the process was presented by S. della Torre. Its aim is to identify the players in most processes (typical stakeholders: architect, owner, contractors, ...). K. Van Balen suggested to make the linear scheme into a cyclic one, reflecting the way of thinking required within preventive maintenance.

A. Ijla asked about a questionnaire, and it was agreed to discuss this topic when it is better understood how we approach each “gate” for the research.

K. Van Balen: develop a *heritage health system* by looking at components from different countries and what are crucial elements. J. Akerboom suggested to do a good description of the objects of the study, and to analyse what is possible by law in the different countries to be able to make comparisons. K. van Balen suggested a descriptive part on what made Monumentenwacht existing and legal, and thereby extracting the legislative changes necessary to implement a *MW System* (e.g. financial support for maintenance is an essential help for MW; whether VAT is charged for this type of work; risk of doing too much to receive tax profits; limitations as only grants for restoration and not for maintenance).

A. Vandesande referred to her research which includes the genesis of each method; **she has already evaluated the situation before/after MW; her research includes evolution economics and the framework to describe innovation with similar steps .**

#### Presentation of ongoing research by Nathalie van Roy

N. Van Roy gave an overview of her research progress, a short description of selected cases in Mechelen and the interviews carried out.

#### Presentation by Job Roos (associate Prof. Heritage & Design, architect Braaksma & Roos):

J. Roos pointed at the need of a new profile for architects working in the field of the re-use of buildings (*Heritage & Architecture*, combining design, cultural value and technology). The typology of buildings for conservation tasks is changing as well, as the buildings become less iconic.

From his portfolio, J. Roos presented the Faculty of Architecture, a temporary redesign by 6 architectural offices plus other stakeholders; the former Sphinx sanitary factory in Maastricht, with

challenges to reuse the building; the Lochal Tilburg, and its connection to the city centre; and the intervention in H.P.Berlage's Gemeente Museum in The Hague.

Maintenance is taken into account in the design, as in some cases clients require 30 years of use. The underlying motivation is often economic. In practice one can observe a shift from architectural tasks to maintenance cycles.

Closure of the day and dinner at *De Waag*, Delft.

**January 12<sup>th</sup> 2016**

**Welcome and opening word by Silvia Naldini**

**Presentation Distretti Culturali (IT) by Stefano della Torre and Rossella Moioli - WP 5**

Within CHANGES Rossella Moioli would start to work at some cases. The work will go on for a more than three years and then local subjects have to continue it with own resources. The research will include four cases studies.

1. Monza, villa Reale (park and various buildings)
2. Spinning mill
3. Ca' dei Bossi.
4. Usmate Velate

Overview of work carried out for the cases Monza and Brianza province

- Discussion with stakeholders on how to evaluate cases, e.g. compare granted and non-granted cases
- To evaluate a complex project by only counting newly created jobs is limited, as the impact cannot be measured on the short run and other factors should be included
- The proposed method is based on the theory behind grant: people need to change their attitude.
- Obstacles due to partial lack of clarity of responsibilities of stakeholders
- Attempts to gather necessary data for cases.
- "Living lab" relationship owner – and user of object (for cultural industry), who takes care of the building; implementing preventive/planned conservation while using a building for cultural purposes

Case Ca' dei Bossi started

- A side effect of the research is an improved contact with the involved partners
- Due to ending of funding, the last work phases are carried out without R. Moioli.
- This case represents a common problem, namely that in Italy the management of the building and its maintenance (incl. inspections) is the task of the tenant (in this case creative companies). Tenants have however too little insight into long-term conservation aspects and costs and into the cultural values of the object. For the case study, the municipality would give support; the users (creative companies) could provide services to keep the monument; R. Moioli will support the municipality.

The case of the Spinning mill has similar problems as the previous case, namely that the user will take care of the building and that there is a public tender for the maintenance contract;

Here, the owner is the municipality. In this case the study of the contract (e.g. costs) will be analysed in the project.

Vulnerability of the project: e.g. skills within the municipalities and how the problems encountered could have been avoided.

S. della Torre explained that due to the abolishment of the Italian provinces, the ownership of the project of the six Cultural Districts, which is a long-term government system, has not been relocated successfully yet.

#### Case Villa Reale di Monza

- Incl. 33 historic buildings in park, plus racing track and golf course which should be under one management by consortium
- 160 million euro needed for the restoration of the Villa , 4 million grant available which will be used for smaller projects of park and village;
- consortium now available to take leadership of process, yet problems with management of the large park with Villa ; consortium hired external (small) office ( 4 people working for consortium) to carry out the works of maintenance with limited knowledge on conservation issues
- The consortium consists of the ministry, region of Lombardy, municipality Monza and Milano, and chamber of commerce, which are also the owners of the object
- For the empty parts of the villa the financial resources for maintenance are limited
- The composition for the financing is the following:
  - o PPP for most appealing part of the royal villa (centre part) and manage this part for 22 years to pay back investment
  - o 25 million euros cost, 19 by public, 6 million euros by private for conservation; has to be paid back in max. 50 years ;
  - o Refund of private investment: expenses of private person for concession for next 20 years:
    - 1 million euros private per year (running costs)
    - 0.75% on activities win
    - 60.000 euros rent per year to pay back private investment
    - the 19 million public money are not attempted to be refunded as this is a public object
  - o Concession incl. a restricted use (compatibility), valuation contents, and also “perfect” state of repair at the end of the concession period ;
  - o Committee of public ( 3 person incl. 1 architect) and private (2) subjects to control / approve maintenance plans (NB: the members are not trained for conservation issues/historic buildings; mainly skilled for common building maintenance)
  - o User understood that they need a different software for facility management of a historic building
    - Software system PlaNet and another system linked with it that links invoices, statistics, figures; information of inspections, works; organising commission for works. An advantage of this software is that it is commercial and can be generalised



- It was discussed how far the software / data can be used in 20 years, and the fact that several groups will need access to the maintenance software (tenant, hired workers incl. cleaners, etc.). MW's software is only a tool between MW and owner, and not directly for third parties. An idea would be to compare the main point of each system (Planet with MW), and whether there is a link with C. Gustafsson research (capacity building).
- Tool used by CARIPLO to monitor whether a project was successful; data is partly available for project (within WP2)
- (NB the *economy of dust* (book); the max visitor per year (60.000) in order to avoid extra maintenance costs due to too many visitors)

#### Case Usmate Velate Municipality

- Implementation of a conservation plan for three years
  - Comparison of costs without conservation plan (previous 5 years) and now/future conservation costs with conservation plan (for 5 years)
  - Previously no clear overview of costs and exact use of money not followed (e.g. not clear for which building what repair work had been done)
  - Conservation plans were drawn by a professional architect, which followed course by Cultural District (Cariplo)

#### Planned conservation plans and permissions in national context

Planned conservation is new for Italian authorities (Sovrintendenza), as they are not allowed to give permissions for long time plans; a solution is sought for e.g. a yearly list of activities submitted. An obstacle is that at the Sovrintendenza people are trained to evaluate short time interventions e.g. not maintenance plans. In Vlaanderen there is a decree to include conservation plans, for example in Mechelen a grant will be gradually given for the intervention on 8 churches over ca. 25 years. In the Netherlands, owners are not compelled to carry out works. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the underlying (national) system of control and approval of works.

#### Presentation by Dario Foppoli presentation WP 7.1 Good practices of conservation activities of the cultural district of Valtellina

##### Case Valtellina terraced landscape

- Path of 45 km created, 3 million euros costs; involved 20 municipalities
- Maintenance plan included a GIS system due to large size
- Skills building, community engagement, maintenance as major aspects of this project

The task is similar to that of R. Moiola, as to create a conservation plan. The project includes the inspection of 44 buildings and their current state after restoration (grant of L.102/90), 10 years after finishing works. The inspections were structured as follows:

- Visual inspections and structural inspections
- Samples for lab investigations
- Safety improvement (removing detached elements)
- Small maintenance activities, assessment of risk conditions

The reports mention advised further research. A seismic assessment using Italian code has been carried out; their statistical data analysis should lower seismic risk.

#### WP 1.5 and WP 10 skills capacity enhancement

- More than 1000 person involved in training programme; these participants are from external companies; this is relevant to increase their awareness
- It is considered a successful initiative (feed back participants)
- Dissemination via international conferences

The Italian projects are comparable. The main differences lie in the aspects of regions and the sizes of the cases.

C. Gustafsson: interesting the onsite discussion with an own set of values, and the other discussion, with politicians, who use a different set of values . How can we understand these, can we see them on a another level?

K. van Balen stated that the quality of conservation depends on several factors, incl. economy, people taking care. The *crossing* of these things is local development using heritage; what is the crossing? What is the impact of conservation and where can conservation make an impact ? The core question is, what are we aiming at? *Regional development* ? This was the Italian reasoning in order to avoid a waste of money on a singular restoration without further benefit and/or perspective for the monument. Is this a case of development vs conservation attitude ?

C. Gustafsson suggested to discuss the trading zones within the conservation community. The evidence of other parties involved is therefore crucial. S. della Torre reminded that the concept of *upstream* is important. Success can depend on a more than the conservation project alone.

Lunch break

#### Site visit Van Nelle Factory, Rotterdam, and presentation by Wessel de Jonge (Heritage & Design, Wessel de Jonge architecten)

In his presentation, W. de Jonge outlined the current challenge within the Dutch re-use market. In particular the high amount of vacant buildings (apartments, office m<sup>2</sup>) are a challenge. By means of the case of van Nelle factory, he exemplifies the boundary condition for a transformation led by **private multiple ownership**.

After a historic overview of the factory and its role of introducing branding in the Netherlands, he highlighted the conservation process. Unique was the good stewardship of the previous owner. The building was regularly maintained and a possible transformation was already discussed 3 years before the factory closed. In this phase, the heritage authorities were aiming to transform the building into a living landmark. The municipality was interested in creating a location for the graphic industry, keeping it in Rotterdam. Further, the municipality was interested in an upgrade of the surrounding neighbourhood.

The transformation process started with workshops with experts of the heritage market and the real estate market. The municipality did not want to be involved, which appeared to be a good think for the building. The risks for the real estate market could be reduced allowing investment. Proposals for transformation required a sound business plan to avoid a failure and thereby a negative impact on the monument. To create more support in the public, the building was made accessible through events.

The success of the transformation was also due to the effectiveness of meetings, were the representatives had mandates to make decisions.

After 15 years, the original plan of use is being reviewed as a reaction towards the decrease of the creative industry.

The nomination process as a World Heritage Site was achieved underlining that the building expressed the Netherlands fight against water; the Golden age and the Modern architecture.

Dinner at Humphrey's , Rotterdam

*January 13<sup>th</sup> 2016*

### Welcome and opening

**For the WP 2, the following decisions were taken:**

- Contact between H. Heinemann, N. Van Roy and J. Akerboom to discuss possible cases.
- Description of the three models (MW VL, MW NB, D. C.) until deadline
  - o Use of grid for analysis to make the data comparable; synthesis via grid for cross-analysis
  - o Strength and critical points of each model
  - o SWOT analysis of the processes?
  - o Highlight similarities and differences between NB and VL
  - o Overview of terminology and definition of used terms is required; to be considered: context (local/national interpretations, international charters) and references.
    - Each definition should consist of ca. 5 lines and references. The following terms should be defined:
      - Conservation quality (Nathalie de Roy)
      - Valorisation (NB Italian context: to make available to public not only financial criteria; definition by Italian members)
      - Preventive conservation (as a system) (Aziliz Vandesande)
      - Capacity building (Akram Ijla)
      - Social capital (Akram Ijla)
      - Conservation (Rosella Moioli)
      - Preservation (Rosella Moioli)
- **Other work packages should be started /continued**

### Deliverables

Documents should be placed on dropbox, and programme updates send to S. della Torre.

- **data for project progress report to be sent to S. della Torre(3 files)**  
**20.1.2016**
  - o Selection of publications: publications should be open source for JPI
  - o Acknowledgments in papers that it is JPI funded
  - o Obstacles causing delay: hiring people and local late distribution of funding
  - o Mentioning whether members received money and how much
  - o Prof. della Torre will merge the sent data
- **Prof. della Torre will send the final version of the Consortium Agreement**

- **All members should review webpage and update their information** a.s.a.p.
- **Draft of grid and definition key words** 12.2.2016
  - o (SAHC 2016 paper by Aziliz and Report TU Delft, TNO as references)
- **Update of (time planning, status of case studies, new ideas about interviews etc.)**  
12.2.2016
- **Comparison of analysis and swot (incl. swot of Halland)** 12.3.2016
- **Report written of WP2** 12.4.2016

#### Next meeting

May 2016 planning next steps (tentative date: week 23.5.-27.5.2016)

- o site visits of cases
- o official presentation of first report
- o 2<sup>nd</sup> half of week main dates (that is to say discussions and public moments; other activities more flexible)

1<sup>st</sup> week of February 2017 in Leuven, thematic week of the Centre Lemaire focussing on preventive conservation.

Lunch

Closure