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INTRODUCTION

In 2005 the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust awarded 11 Travelling Fellowships in the category Conservation of the Built Environment. The author was granted a Fellowship to study: ‘European initiatives in preventative maintenance for historic buildings’.

Gert Jan Luijendijk – the former director and evangelist of the Dutch Monumentenwacht scheme, inspired this study. Gert Jan gave an inspiring lecture at a conference, organised by the author and hosted by the Ulster Architectural Heritage Society in Belfast in 1999. He spoke of a government-funded scheme of subsidised inspection and maintenance for owners of historic buildings in Holland. Due to this scheme there are few ‘Buildings at Risk’ in the Netherlands and the general condition of historic buildings is enviable due to positive incentives to maintain.

In England a system has evolved whereby no positive incentive is given to owners of historic buildings to maintain their buildings, quite the contrary- owners can only be rewarded once their building has reached a state of dereliction so that it is classified to be ‘At Risk’- and large capital schemes will be required to set it to rights.

Over the last 10 years the author has been responsible for compiling the Buildings at Risk catalogues for Northern Ireland, as well as the Funding Directory for Listed Buildings and the Directory of Traditional Building Skills. Thus the projects, the finance and the skill base required to conserve historic buildings. She undertook an audit of 5000 vernacular buildings within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty- surveying 1038 of them to find only 48 unaltered and intact. In her own time fundraising and managing schemes for a Conservation Area in Northern Ireland- undertaking works to 8 major buildings with incremental investment of £1 million and in 2004 set up a Building Preservation Trust to restore a chapel – raising over £280,000 to repair decay due solely to a lack of maintenance. Spurred on by the amount of neglect to historic buildings she organised 2 international conferences on Maintenance in 1999 & 2003 (Ulster Architectural Heritage Society and Oswestry Borough Council)

The result of all these endeavours led to the appalling realisation that the English Heritage grants scheme (indeed the system within the whole British Isles) rewards NEGLECT. Most owners of historic buildings only receive grant aid for repair once their building is in poor condition, as there is little or no incentive to keep the building maintained. The popular TV series ‘Restoration’ hosted by Gryff Rhys Jones exemplified the problem – offering cash rewards to Buildings at Risk – whose problems were caused by lack of Maintenance.

Out of this deep despair, the author wished to understand how the funding for historic buildings is dealt with in continental Europe and if English Heritage could learn from other models with possible budgetary changes for grants to historic buildings by prioritising maintenance rather than repair. And in addition to investigate the types of advice available to owners of historic buildings, and the training for contractors in traditional building skills.

The award of the Winston Churchill Travelling Fellowship in the 2005 provided the ‘chance of a lifetime’ to travel to undertake this research.
This is what is all about:

Figure 1: Lack of maintenance can lead to...

Figure 2: …..dry rot and a bill for £300,000
AIMS

by comparison with statutory protection in 7 Western and Eastern European Countries:

- To challenge current Heritage Protection and funding in Britain where statutory protection fails listed buildings by rewarding neglect rather than sustained upkeep.
- To discover if statutory duty of care makes any difference to building condition.
- To investigate if other European countries provide positive incentives to building owners for maintenance.
- To establish what levels of VAT are levied on maintenance and/or repair
- To ascertain what level of information is available to owners of historic buildings.
- To discover what level of technical / craft training is available to undertake appropriate maintenance and repair to historic buildings
- To compare all of the above with statutory mechanisms available in England.

METHODOLOGY

Travel and research is intended to give the Fellow ‘The Chance of a Lifetime’ but also to establish professional contacts, to network internationally, and to disseminate the fruits of their study to colleagues.

Methodologies used:

- Desk based research prior to travel- using published information largely from English Heritage, Heritage Lottery Fund, Maintain our Heritage, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
- Travel to 7 European / Scandinavian countries to look at maintenance projects and initiatives
- Interviews with Statutory Bodies in each country concerned.
- Interviews with members of Non Governmental Organisations
- Interviews with owners of listed buildings
- Visits to conservation based projects and training schemes in all countries visited
- Visits to museums in all countries visited
- Web based research
Section 1 THE ITINERARY

The Winston Churchill Travelling Fellowship involved three separate trips to Europe, taking just over one month’s travel in total.

1. Holland and Belgium  10 –17\textsuperscript{th} July 2005
2. Hungary and Romania  13-27\textsuperscript{th} August 2005
3. Denmark, Sweden and Norway  5-14\textsuperscript{th} September 2005

Figure 3  Map of Europe showing study trips
Section 2 ENGLAND –BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

- There is a long tradition of advice concerning maintenance within Western societies. Indeed Maintenance is the key to prolonged life – we maintain our health, our cars, our relationships:
  ‘Principis obsta; sero medicina paratur cum mala per longas convaluere moras
  Stop it at the start. It’s late for medicine to be prepared when disease has grown strong through long delays’. Ovid, Remedia Amoris 91
  ‘A stitch in time saves nine’ Traditional
  ‘Prevention is better than cure’ Traditional
  ‘The principle of modern times … is to neglect buildings first and to restore them afterwards. Take proper care of your monuments and you will not need to restore them… John Ruskin 1849 The Stones of Venice (Appendix 2.1)

- Filled with horror at the excesses of the Victorian cathedral ‘restorers’ William Morris penned the Manifesto of the Society of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in 1877, which included the phrase: ‘stave off decay by daily care’ (Appendix 2.2)

- The need to maintain buildings has been recognised in International Charters:
  ‘ARTICLE 4. It is essential to the conservation of monuments that they be maintained on a permanent basis.’ ICOMOS Venice Charter 1964
  ‘Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction’ ICOMOS Burra Charter 1987

- In addition to English Heritage- the statutory body – a number Amenity Societies such as The Society of Ancient Buildings and SAVE Britain’s Heritage campaign on a number of issues including reduction to VAT and Maintenance, as well as offering advice and training in traditional skills.

1.2 BASIC FACTS & FIGURES

- In England there are:
  391,745 listed buildings & Scheduled Ancient Monuments, of which 30,491 (8%) are Grade I & II*. Grant aid from English Heritage is usually only available for Grade I and II* buildings.
  17,000 Buildings at Risk with £400+ million conservation deficit for Grade I & II* 9,374 Conservation Areas

- Planning Policy Guidance 15 recommends maintenance ‘Regular maintenance and repair are the key to the preservation of historic buildings’ PPG 15 1994 (Appendix 2.3)
  But there is no Statutory Duty of Care

- English Heritage impose Maintenance conditions on its grants, but does not grant aid maintenance
There is no standardised printed guidance for owners of historic buildings. Many individual Councils provide excellent printed advice but this is not uniform across the country.

There is an acknowledged UK wide lack of traditional building skills (NHTG 2005)

VAT is levied at 17.5% on maintenance and repairs, though the rate is lowered for alterations. VAT is 0% on new build – thus offering no financial incentive to owners to maintain or repair their properties

In 2004 it was calculated (Eckstein, J. 2004) that English Heritage provided £24,029,000 in grant aid towards the repair of historic buildings – the global total- to include the Heritage Lottery Fund, European finding, DEFRA, Local government and private trusts was £355,112,000.

The Dutch Monumentenwacht – Maintenance/ Inspection scheme was widely promoted in the late 1990s by Gert Jan Luijendijk.


In response Maintain our Heritage was established in 1999. (Appendix 2.5) The Bath Pilot Project – the first maintenance inspection service for historic buildings in the UK, ran in 2002-3, but was not totally successful (Appendix 2.6)
Section 3  NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM 10-17th July 2005

3.1 The NETHERLANDS
3.1.1 Holland was chosen as the first destination in Europe, as it was where the Monumentenwacht scheme has been in use since – and is the home of Gert Jan Luijendijk-who was the inspiration for the whole project

- There are 50,821 Listed buildings 353 Conservation Areas (Appendix 5.1,5.2,5.4)
- No Statutory Duty of Care
- The State Department Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg produces a number of information sheets for owners on all aspects of building maintenance and repair (Figure 6)
- The statutory budget in 2004 £71,218,325
  - Restoration £56,568,728
  - Maintenance £10,070,194  (Appendix 5.6)

3.1.2 MONUMENTENWACHT
An NGO founded in 1973 to provide preventative maintenance to buildings by regular inspection, written report and undertaking minor works .(Figure 7)

- Capital funding from Prince Bernhart Fund pays for a fleet of specially equipped vans.
- Regular inspections+ minor maintenance eg slipped slates, gutter cleaning (Figure 10)
- Creates safe anchor points/ roof lights for roof access ( Figure 11,12)
- Trained professional contractors undertake the inspections
- Provide a prioritised report for owners
- Provide printed information leaflets and advice to homeowners

FUNDING
- Annual subscription by owners, plus inspection fee
- Local, Provincial and state subsidy for the service.
- VAT reduction from 19% to 6% on maintenance eg painting

STRENGTHS
- Over 24% of listed building inspected annually, & minor works undertaken (Appendix 5.3)
- Well trained operatives (Interview Joop Jansen )
- Capital assets – vans , equipment & offices ( Figure 8,9 )
- Good advice to owners (Interviews Frits van Dulm, Edward Schmidt)
- Overall perception of better general state of repair of buildings
- Positive financial incentives to maintain-
  - Subsidised inspection& report
  - Tax breaks for subsequent maintenance
  - Report needed to apply for funding for repair, which is also tax deductible

WEAKNESS
- Organised by Province- no uniform data
- Capital costs high( vans and premises)
- Victim of its own success- too expensive to retain in present form
European Initiatives in Preventative Maintenance

Figure 6 State advice of owners

Figure 7 Monumentenwacht report 2000

Figure 8 Monumentenwacht van

Figure 9 Monumentenwacht van interior

Figure 10 Gutter inspection

Figure 11 Ladder fixings

Figure 12 Safe access
3.2 BELGIUM- FLANDERS

3.2.1 In Flanders there are 9,500 Listed Buildings
No statutory Duty of Care

3.2.2 The Flemish Government provides 2 grants- Maintenance & Restoration
Maintenance: Applies the principles of the Venice Charter by placing emphasis on
maintenance .
Provides 40% of cost of maintenance up to E15,000
E3,300,000 p.a for maintenance of listed buildings (Interview Stef Binst)

3.2.3 Tax relief is available for maintenance and restoration work to protected properties not
covered by grant e

3.2.4 MONUMENTENWACHT VLANDEREN: NGO
FUNDING  Regional government 20%
                  Provincial authorities 70%
                  Owners subscriptions 10%
STRENGTHS
• advice to owners
• small interventions
• 1,200 exterior inspections per year
• 160 inspections of moveable heritage in churches per year
• report enables application to the state for funding for Restoration grant
• database and statistical information available (Stulens, A 2004)

Figure 13 Mechelen Belgium. Water damage to vaulting
Section 4 HUNGARY & ROMANIA 13 -27th August 2005

4.1 HUNGARY
In Hungary my busy itinerary was organised by Jolan Racz and Erzebet Kovacs, to whom I am very grateful, and who took me to many important sites, projects and people.

4.1.1 There are 10,832 Listed buildings
33 Conservation Areas (Appendix 60)
There IS a Statutory duty of care (Interview Dr Peter Deme)

4.1.2 Funding is problematic— theoretically the conservation deficit can be granted, but there is no budget. Yet there are some excellent regeneration projects
Tax relief: Local authorities cannot levy tax on Listed Buildings
Reduced VAT on materials for repair

4.1.3 The State Department has trained inspectors to advise on techniques and materials

4.1.4 There is a commercial ‘Monumentenwacht’ initiative— with trained operatives but private owners have no money (Interview Lucretzia Markos)

4.1.5 Under Communism all property reverted to the State— previous owners may now buy back their property on condition it is ‘restored’ within 5 years

4.1.6 There are excellent technical training schools eg Vezprem – where conservation construction skills are taught to a high level

Figure 14 Majk Kamuldul Hermitage near Budapest
Figure 15 Barabas Villa restoration, Budapest
4.2 ROMANIA

4.2.1 23,000 Listed buildings and monuments

4.2.2 Due to recent changes in regime care of listed buildings has little funding through central government. However:

4.2.3 The Transylvania Trust, funded largely through European initiatives has two major restoration & conservation projects at Bontida (the restoration of a large stately house from a ruinous state) and Rimetea- where small grants to local inhabitants act a positive incentive to conserve and maintain a conservation area. The Transylvania Trust has been very successful as a training initiative in traditional skills for the whole region.
Some other wonders in Romania

Figure 20 Bontida. there is a lot more to be done

Figure 21 Rimetia Mud wall repair

Figure 22 Hunedoara Castle, Transylvania

Figure 23 Wooden church Maramures

Figure 24 A bit of maintenance needed perhaps!
Section 5 DENMARK, SWEDEN & NORWAY 5-14th September 2005

5.1 DENMARK

5.1.1 9,000 Listed buildings, Statutory duty of care

5.1.2 NGOS

- **Bygningsbevaring founded 1986**
  With Government sponsorship provided
  - Training for craftsmen, architects, homeowners
  - Research on traditional materials & skills
  - Documentation -production of pack
  - Inspection team
  - Advice –website & telephone (Interview with Soren Vaadstrup. Appendix 7)
    However support was removed in 2001 and given to Raadvad instead

- **Raadvad**
  Commercial scheme of Inspection & Maintenance 12,000 inspections

- **Danish Council for Built Heritage**
  - Administer maintenance grant of 30% of costs
  - interest free loan for conservation works

Figure 25 Perhaps some maintenance needed

Figure 26 Raadvad Blacksmiths shop

Figure 27 Raadvad Joinery examples
5.2 SWEDEN

In Sweden my energetic host was Christer Gustafsson. Creator of the Hallandmodel

5.2.1 450,000 SAMs
- 1,500 sites with protected buildings
- 3,000 churches

5.2.2 Hallandmodel NGO
- Using labour market funding to finance conservation training and repair schemes
- Creative use of European structural funds
- 1,100 trained in conservation construction (Appendix 9)

Figure 28 Grimeton Radio mast World Heritage site  Figure 29 Windmill at Harplinge

Figure 30 Women apprentices on Halland project
5.3 NORWAY
5.3.1 3,000 Listed buildings
   Statutory duty of care

5.3.2 Statutory Funding
   • NO tax rebates
   • 70m Kroner for repair, 104mK for maintenance
   • State maintenance survey of all buildings
   • Most listed buildings state owned

5.3.3 Strong NGO support for owners offering advice, information & training

Figure 31 NGO Advice for owners  Figure 32 State Department advice for owners
Section 6 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 No standard European model of protection and funding

6.2 Statutory duty of care doesn’t seem to make much difference. Like Britain some of the countries visited did not have a Statutory Duty of Care imposed as part of the mechanism of designation and protection, while others did.

6.3 Most other European countries have some form of positive incentive for owners to maintain their properties through a variety of mechanisms:
    - VAT reduction
    - Maintenance grant
    - Rate rebate
    - Subsidised inspection
Or the most comprehensive schemes such as Monumentenwacht.

6.4 Much of the conservation work- training and advice is undertaken by NGO’s

6.5 Information for owners
It was apparent that whilst there is information available for owners of historic buildings in England it is very piecemeal. English Heritage has a magnificent range of publications, but they are not necessarily aimed at the owners of the majority of Grade II buildings (96% of all listings.) Amenity Societies, such as the SPAB, and groups such as the Historic Houses Association provide excellent advice for members, but this is not necessarily available to all. Provision by local councils is usually the most user friendly. Efforts are duplicated unnecessarily. Generic information could be produced suitable for all owners of historic buildings, with information regional vernacular traditions in building and materials available on request.

6.6 Training in traditional building skills
Whilst there are a slowly growing number of contractors able to undertake excellent conservation work in England, it is almost embarrassing when travelling in Europe as the level of technical education and training is so much higher. This is due to technical training commencing at 11 or 13 years of age – due to selection by ability. Technical education has NO stigma attached to it- unlike in Britain, and skilled builders, metal workers, joiners, are valued. The skill base in Hungary, the Netherlands, Sweden was remarkable, with most imaginative schemes for upskilling contractors into ‘conservation contractors’ the Halland Model in Sweden. Their training allows contractors to be articulate, and highly competent. The schools at Vezprem, Hungary and the summer training schemes at Bontida in Romania were extraordinary.
Section 7 RECOMMENDATIONS

To provide positive incentives to encourage private owners to maintain their historic properties by:

7.1 Providing tax incentives – decreasing VAT on repairs and maintenance

7.2 Actively promote annual maintenance by government public information campaign – ‘How to protect your major capital asset and keep your building healthy- by annual gutter cleaning ‘- Government sponsored public campaign to encourage maintenance to ALL buildings regardless of ownership, age or status

7.3 Increase training potential at all levels, NVQ and vocational in maintenance

7.4 Provide grant aid to owners to provide safe fixings for roped access to difficult roofs

7.5 Copy European models of powered ladder lifts with pavement fixings to allow safer access for gutter maintenance

7.6 Encourage local authorities to undertake visual surveys of parapet gutters and actively support the SPAB National Maintenance Week

7.7 English Heritage to provide user friendly owners ‘toolkit’ of standardised advice and information on basic maintenance

7.8 Support start up for commercial inspection/maintenance enterprises.

www.wcmt.org.uk
Your chance of a lifetime
### Appendix 1.

**WINSTON CHURCHILL FELLOWS 2005**  
Conservation of the built environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Countries visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Appleton</td>
<td>The potential of urban waterways in post industrial cities</td>
<td>Germany &amp; Neths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bain</td>
<td>Traditional turf roof construction and repair</td>
<td>Faroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cameron</td>
<td>Conservation techniques &amp; stonemasonry training</td>
<td>Spain, Germany, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Cole</td>
<td>Sustainable city growth in the 21st century</td>
<td>Brazil, Japan, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Devlin</td>
<td>Preventative maintenance</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Scandinavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ian Dungavell</td>
<td>The role of communities in saving heritage</td>
<td>USA &amp; Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery Austin</td>
<td>Traditional stone carving</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Harkin</td>
<td>Disabled access</td>
<td>USA &amp; Scandinavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funda Kemal</td>
<td>Community and regeneration</td>
<td>USA, Canada, Mexico, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Prothero</td>
<td>Historic landscapes in modern communities</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Rich</td>
<td>Conservation of modern architecture</td>
<td>France, Switzerland, India, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

QUOTATIONS ON MAINTENANCE

2.1 Ruskin 1849 Speaking of Rouen Cathedral in The Stones of Venice
‘The principle of modern times … is to neglect buildings first and to restore them afterwards. Take proper care of your monuments and you will not need to restore them… Watch an old building with an anxious care; guard it as best you may, and at any cost , from every influence of dilapidation’

2.2 SPAB Manifesto William Morris 1877
‘ stave off decay by daily care, to prop a perilous wall or mend a leaky roof by such means as are obviously meant for support or covering,

2.3 Planning Policy Guidance 15 1994
‘7. The Upkeep and Repair of Historic Building
7.1 Regular maintenance and repair are the key to the preservation of historic buildings. Modest expenditure on repairs keeps a building weather tight, and routine maintenance (especially roof repairs and the regular clearance of gutters and downpipes) can prevent much more expensive work becoming necessary at a later date. It is a common misunderstanding that historic buildings have a fixed lifespan, and that gradual decay of their fabric is inevitable. On the contrary, unless there are intrinsic defects of design or materials, the lifespan of a historic building may be indefinite provided that timely maintenance, and occasional major repairs such as the renewal of roof coverings and other features, are regularly undertaken. Major problems are very often the result of neglect and, if tackled earlier, can be prevented or reduced in scale. Regular inspection is invaluable.’

2.4 British Standard BS 7913 1998
Guide to the principles of conservation of historic buildings
7.2.1 Routine maintenance
Systematic care based on good housekeeping is both cost effective and fundamental to good conservation. Early action can often prevent decay and avoid the need for major intervention later. Any building is best and most economically maintained by establishing a consistent level of good repair by a carefully thought out , and intelligently applied routine of maintenance and housekeeping

2.5 Maintain our Heritage 2004
Historic Building Maintenance – a pilot inspection service
Maintain our Heritage was founded in 1999 –inspired by the Dutch Monumentenwacht model with the ‘ mission to promote a new, long-term, sustainable strategy for the care of our historic buildings with pre-eminence given to maintenance rather than sporadic major repair. A shift to systematic maintenance will require a change in attitude, policy and practice in government, the construction industry, the heritage sector and historic building owners. This can only be achieved through the preparation and dissemination of a compelling research based case.’
2.6 Maintain our Heritage (MoH) 2004

**Putting it Off : How lack of maintenance fails our heritage**

**Module 6: Maintenance Education and Training for Listed Buildings**

**SUMMARY**

*Skills and experience – practical maintenance tasks*

It is again evident that the key skills and experience lie with a practical understanding of traditional materials and forms of construction, but supported by appropriate trade skills and an ability to carry out suitable forms of repair. This includes selecting and carrying out the least damaging form of repair, taking account of issues such as minimal intervention, and avoidance of collateral damage. A broad base of knowledge and experience are prerequisites for carrying out the maintenance of non-heritage properties, together with a good level of workmanship. Principal skills differences are the ability to appreciate the significance of a heritage property and having a practical understanding of the use and performance of traditional materials. Common problems relate to access provision, sourcing appropriate materials, a lack of craft skills, and the insufficiency of property maintenance.

*Identification, correction, and monitoring of skills gaps – inspection services*

It is clear ……that there is a current and growing lack of experienced practitioners capable of providing a broad range of professional advice concerning the maintenance of heritage properties. This skills gap comes from the loss of experienced individuals and a lack of practical maintenance education within conservation and heritage courses, and is reflected in the often poor standard of professional reports and other documentation. The essential difference between the supply of skills education and training for heritage and non-heritage properties is that of specialist conservation knowledge, but practical experience counts for more than qualifications. Correction of the skills gaps comes down to greater awareness, better promotion and recruitment, more targeted training, and mentoring of newly-qualified individuals by experienced practitioners.

A national, unified accreditation scheme reflecting the practical, inter-disciplinary nature of conservation is considered essential as a means of monitoring the availability or lack of key professional skills at local or regional levels. Experience is considered of greater significance than training and qualifications, and emphasis should thus be placed on making better use of the existing workforce through targeted heritage training.’
## Appendix 3
### INTERVIEWS UNDERTAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETHERLANDS + BELGIUM  10-17(^{th}) July 2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/7/05</td>
<td>Joop Jansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monumentenwacht Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monumentenwachter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/7/05</td>
<td>Fritz van Dulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands Department for Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/7/05</td>
<td>Stef Binst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monumentenwacht Flanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Founder and former director of Monumentenwacht Flanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13/7/05</td>
<td>Jan van Heesewijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monumentenwacht Noord- Brabant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13/7/05</td>
<td>Edward Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Niewhoek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13/7/05</td>
<td>Frits van Dulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14/7/05</td>
<td>Dr John van Zuylen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnhem Open air museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUNGARY + ROMANIA  13-27(^{th}) August 2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15/8/05</td>
<td>Judit Szabadhegyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majk, Cameldunum Monastery Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAG Landscape Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15/8/05</td>
<td>Vandor Andras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veszprem Technical school Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher of technical school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16/8/05</td>
<td>Dr Peter Deme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Erzsebet Kovacs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jolan Racs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miklos Okrutay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Public Relations Architect, Public Relations Architect, International relations Architect, Vice Director inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17/8/05</td>
<td>Lukrecia Markos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairwoman, Hungarian Mansions and Country Houses Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17/8/05</td>
<td>Gyorgi Vizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Headmaster of vocational training school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23/8/05</td>
<td>Csilla Hegedius, Peter Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bannfy Castle, Bontida. Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transylvania Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24/8/05</td>
<td>Arpad Furu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rimetea, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transylvania Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENMARK, SWEDEN + NORWAY  4-14(^{th}) September 2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5/9/05</td>
<td>Soren Vadstrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre for Bygningsbevaring, Raadvad, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6/6/05</td>
<td>Boum Pyndiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frilandsmuseet, Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8/6/05</td>
<td>Christer Gustafsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11/9/05</td>
<td>Terje Nypan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12/9/05</td>
<td>Francine Lampe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12/9/05</td>
<td>Havard Christiansen + Sverre Steinnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13/9/05</td>
<td>Oddvar Bjovik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13/9/05</td>
<td>Sopie Thorne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4
ITINERARY

1. NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM 10 – 17th July 2006

10th – 15th Staying with Gert Jan Luijendijk
11 July Monumewntenwacht Utrecht
Amersfort
St J Cathedral Amersfort
Fritz van Dulm State Department Zeist Interview
12th July Mechelen- Belgium Site visit
Stef Binst Monumentenwacht Flanders Interview
13th July Monumentenwacht Nord Brabant Interview
Den Bosch – St Cathedral Site visit
Niewehoek – Edward Schmidt Interview
Naaden - Fritz van Dulm Site visit
14th July Arnhem – Netherlands Open Air Museum Site visit & Interview
15th July Arnhem- Oosterbeek Airborne museum Museum visits
Museum voor Moderne Kunst
16th July Rotterdam Maritime museum Museum visits
Museum het Schielandsmuseum
Kijk- KubusKubehuis
Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen Sonne
17th July Den Haag- Mauritshuis Museum visits

2. HUNGARY & ROMANIA 13th – 27th August

13th August BUDAPEST
Szabo Erin library St Stephens Basilica Architectural visits
New Theatre
14th August Museum of applied art Museum visits
Dohany Synagogue
Terror Museum
Agricultural Museum Museum & architectural visits
Budapest Zoo
Szechenyi baths
15th August Majk , Kamaldul Monastery Regeneration project
MAG
Veszprem Technical School Interviews
16th August Meetings with KOH+ ICOMOS Visit + interviews
Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th August</td>
<td>Budapest Technical School</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th August</td>
<td>Ganz Foundry Museum</td>
<td>Industrial museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th August</td>
<td>Art Museum</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ROMANIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st August</td>
<td>Maramures Churches</td>
<td>Architectural visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd August</td>
<td>Bontida, Banffy Castle</td>
<td>Regeneration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transylvania Trust</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th August</td>
<td>Rimetea Transylvanian mining village</td>
<td>Regeneration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transylvania Trust</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alba Julia roman citedal</td>
<td>Archaeological visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th August</td>
<td>Contesti Dacian capital</td>
<td>Archaeological visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunnedoara Medieval castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arad History Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th August</td>
<td>Keskemem National Park</td>
<td>World Heritage Site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>DENMARK, SWEDEN, NORWAY 5-14th September 2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sept</td>
<td><strong>DENMARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raadvad, Copenhagen</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Sept</td>
<td>Frilands museum</td>
<td>Museum visit + interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Sept</td>
<td><strong>SWEDEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lund Cathedral</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kulturen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Sept</td>
<td>Lahholm</td>
<td>Regeneration visits +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halmstad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Sept</td>
<td>Falkenberg, Grimeton Radio Station</td>
<td>Regeneration visits +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjoloholm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Sept</td>
<td>Goteborg</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Sept</td>
<td>NORWAY Oslo</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riksantikvaren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Gallery</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandvika Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bokstad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Sept</td>
<td>Riksantikvaren</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortidsminnensforeningen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akershus Museum,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hjemmefront museum</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Sept</td>
<td>Nationalmuseum</td>
<td>Museum visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bygdøy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5

### 5.1 LISTED BUILDINGS IN THE NETHERLANDS 2003

By province and building type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.309</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.333</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>12.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.533</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>7.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flevoland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>33.068</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>50.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

01 Public buildings  
02 Fortifications  
03 Churches  
04 Objects in and parts of churches  
05 Dwelling houses  
06 Parts of dwelling houses  
07 Almshouses  
08 Farms  
09 Wind- and watermills  
10 Works of civil engineering (roads, dikes, bridges, sluices)  
11 Hotels, restaurants, pubs, etc  
12 Castles, mansions  
13 Various loose objects

### 5.2 Top ten local communities with the most listed buildings

- Amsterdam: 7,122
- Maastricht: 1,594
- Utrecht: 1,311
- Leiden: 1,200
- Middelburg: 1,112
- Haarlem: 1,111
- Den Haag: 1,062
- Dordrecht: 848
- Schouwen-Duiveland: 793
- Delft: 660
## 5.3 LISTED BUILDINGS INSPECTED BY MONUMENTENWACHT IN 2003

(NB: the Monumentenwacht also inspects c. 6,000 unlisted buildings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gron.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesl.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over. Fl.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geld.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uit.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-H.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,333</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-H.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Br.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flevol.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33,068</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public buildings</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortifications</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects in and parts of churches</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwelling houses</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parts of dwelling houses</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almshouses</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>09%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 NETHERLANDS
DESIGNATED CONSERVATION AREAS BY PROVINCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Before 1850</th>
<th>1850 – 1940</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flevoland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>325</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>353</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 LOSS OF TRADITIONAL FARMS IN THE NETHERLANDS BETWEEN 1988-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>Total Number of farms</th>
<th>% still in agricultural use</th>
<th>% in poor condition</th>
<th>% at risk</th>
<th>% lost since 1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Institute for Historic farm research in the Netherlands: Dr John van Zuijlen
From: Threats, chances and Opportunities for historic farm buildings. 2004/5

5.6 ANNUAL STATE HISTORIC BUILDING BUDGET IN EUROS 2003

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>E 56,568,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>E 10,070,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>E 4,579,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>E 71,218,325</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

HUNGARY
LISTED BUILDINGS 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential- Houses</td>
<td>3,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Vernacular</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular buildings eg mills</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Churches</td>
<td>1,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC. Ruins</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvinist Churches</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Catholic Churches</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Orthodox Churches</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogues</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial houses</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country houses – mansions</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castles</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; transport</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic park or garden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others eg telecommunication masts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sculpture, milestones, crosses etc</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,832</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.1 CASE STUDY : RAADVAD
Centre for Bygningsbevaring Denmark

Based on an interview with Søren Vadstrup: Director

The training centre at Raadvad, established in 1986, has had a troubled history over the last few years due to shifts in governmental policy and funding since the 2001 change to the right wing coalition which was 'anti environment (massive cuts in energy saving initiatives) anti development (cuts in overseas aid) and massively anti culture (slashing budgets for museums and the arts).' Boum Pyndiah – Curator Danish Frilands museum.

RAADVAD Centre for Bygningsbevaring was set up in 1986 as a government initiative in collaboration with the Danish Crafts Council. It was housed in a historic mill complex which provided suitable accommodation for offices, workshops, stores and showroom. The staff of 10 had 3 main objectives

1. to establish training courses for craftsmen and architects in traditional skills eg historic paint and surface finishes, the use of lime, traditional timber window production, blacksmithing – to produce door hinges, handles, gates etc.
2. to undertake research on traditional building skills and materials
3. to create documentation/publications for owners on aspects of building repair/maintenance.

In 1990 government subsidy was withdrawn, but the centre was financially buoyant, through the constant uptake of its training courses, and it was given many research projects by central government.

In 1998 Monumentenwacht Netherlands with Gert Jan Luijendijk gave demonstrations of the dutch model of maintenance in Denmark. European funding was achieved to train 12 craftsmen for 6 months in Holland in the Monumentenwaacht system.

May 2000-2001 Centre for Bygningsbevaring purchased its own 2 vehicles and set up a commercial operation in maintenance/inspection with a staff of 6 (3 per van), and representation from the Ministry of Culture on the Board. Unlike Holland there was no owners subscription but fees were payable at 600 Dk K per hours for 2 men. Had both advice line and website for information. Received 3m Dk K government support.

2001
1. Change of government. All funding removed from Centre for Bygningsbevaring
2. BYFO- Historic Building Owners Group, with ambitious leadership emerged in competition with CBB. Stated they had many inspections, but had only undertaken 12, while CBB had undertaken 100’s. CBB was forced to amalgamate with BYFO- auditors were sent in and, due to capital expenditure on vans, said the project was making a loss, so closed the company down.

2004-5
The CBB now rents fewer rooms in their original premises and work in reduced circumstances – can only afford 1 van.

BYFO has become the Council for Heritage as a political lobby group aiming to get further state funding, therefore the Ministry of Culture with drew its representative from the Board.
### 7.2 COMPARISON BETWEEN MONUMENTENWACHT & RAADVAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monumentenwacht</th>
<th>Raadvad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>State, province, owners subscription</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Provincial – each province having its own depot, staff and vans, with</td>
<td>One enterprise on Zealand alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different individual reporting systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per inspection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>600 Dk K per hour per team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of inspection</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>As owners require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service given</strong></td>
<td>Thorough inspection, minor maintenance eg slipped slates, gutters, written</td>
<td>Thorough inspection, minor maintenance eg slipped slates, gutters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report, clear information sheets. Suggested list of contractors</td>
<td>written report, clear technical support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priced prioritised schedule of works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix 8

8.1 CASE STUDY & SWOT ANALYSIS OF FRILANDSMUSEET COPENHAGEN

Based on an interview with Boum Pyndiah (personnel manager)

Boum.pyndiah@natmus.dk

Museum founded in 1897 by Berhard Olsen following the model of Skansen (Stockholm), Kulturen (Lund) and Bygdoy (Oslo). The 120 acre site was incorporated into the National Museums of Denmark in 1920 and received funding from them:

Size 120 acres

Aim to display the folk culture of the Danish lands (including south Sweden, north Germany, Faeroes) from 17th to 20th century.

An amazing collection of houses, farmsteads and industrial buildings, all displayed in their appropriate landscapes (as much as possible). However the buildings are not in a cultural context – no school, churches, post offices etc - purely rural farms and mills.

Finance

Restaurant Separate business

Carriage rides Separate business

Shop Separate business

Animals Grazed by local farmers for no rent

90 posts axed in National Museums post 2001 elections

Overall funding cut funding by 1/3. Government wishes to impose further funding cuts, to have FREE entry in 2006 – therefore the museum faces extreme budget difficulties.

Staff

32 in winter including office and maintenance staff

Easter – October c 140 staff- including actors, students and education staff

Volunteers

Not allowed to use volunteers due to the strength of the unions. However there is a mill volunteers group but they only meet to discuss mills, not to repair, restore or run mills

Visitor numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>150,000 – increase due to governmental requirement to lower entry price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>c110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entry price

50 Dk Kroners. Free to holders of the Copenhagen card – the museum claims back a small proportion of the fee per card user.

There is a new card being trailed – the South Sweden and Copenhagen card - not promoted widely enough in 2005 to be a success, but might increase visitor numbers as many of the buildings are from south Sweden.

Access

by public transport from Copenhagen city centre – c. 20 minutes by train, 30 minutes by bus. Poor signage from the railway station (10 minutes walk).

.Very poor parking facilities by the main entrance
European Initiatives in Preventative Maintenance

Education  Many school visits self guide , There appear to be no facilities within the houses for children. I watched 6 school parties wander from house to house with their teachers trying to keep them in order.

Display  The houses and farms are all open – fully furnished with pewter plates and textiles . There are occasional notices not to touch, but in a 5 hour visit I saw one costumed interpreter and 2 gardeners . Security seems based on trust . Animals and birds are problem as all the properties have doors wide open – a dead fox was apparent in one isolated dwelling – which was due for removal by staff. The maintenance staff do not wear uniform .

Interpretation
- There is NO information inside any of the houses , and as some portray life in the 17th century, many household and agricultural items are not explained at all.
- Building history
  The buildings were collected from various parts of the former Danish realm and re-erected to display a certain point in time. Therefore any later additions or alterations were removed . Everything is described as a museum artifact and there has been great reluctance to demonstrate use of anything in the museums. The mills are not allowed to run, the hearths are not used for cooking , though a few of the agricultural buildings house livestock
- Interpretation boards. In 2005 metal interpretation panels giving information about the date , provenance and construction methods of the house, the composition of the family and their livestock at the date chosen for display . Boards in Danish & English . However these are placed c. 50 cms above ground level and have been very badly discoloured due to fox urine as the many foxes on site use them as scent markers.
- Living history
  Unlike many of the other Scandinavian folk museums- eg.Skansen or Gamle Bergen- the Frilandsmuseum relied on the buildings alone to tell their stories, and there appeared to be great reluctance to install any kind of interpretation . However since 2000 the museum has employed ‘Living History’ with costumed staff and actors, telling stories and demonstrating rural chores. This has proved successful but too expensive for the museum budget.

  *A Museum Tent with a circus is an enterprise run during peak summer period giving circus shows- though the relevance of this is uncertain.*
- Signage within the museum
  Visitors are given a site map with buildings marked. This map is very poor with much scope for getting lost. The museum covers a huge area, which is difficult for the elderly or those with children . It is probable that relatively few visitors reach the furthest parts of the site, which increases potential problems of security , theft and vandalism.
### SWOT analysis of the Danish Open Air Museum- Copenhagen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Well established (100 years old)</td>
<td>1. Resistant to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique collection of farmsteads and associated artifacts</td>
<td>2. Strength of the Trade Unions preventing innovation in staffing eg Volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Threats</strong></th>
<th><strong>Opportunities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Politics – no change in government after 2005 elections – decrease or stasis on funding</td>
<td>1. Negotiate changes to retail outlets – shop, catering, land leasing &amp; carriage rides to be run in house, or taken over &amp; franchised out for a fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power of the unions to prevent constructive change</td>
<td>2. Increase educational opportunities – schools, adult courses, friends of the museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decline in visitor numbers due to poor signage, poor access, poor interpretation, poor facilities (toilets), intimidating size of the site</td>
<td>3. Increase use of volunteers, wardens, running craft demonstration, landscape maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Market attractions, seasonal farming events, nature trails, mushroom collection, dawn walks with breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of site for weddings, corporate events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Increase use of the buildings, with costumed staff or demonstrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Improve interpretation – either with sound guides, written sheets, guides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CASE STUDY OF HALLANDSMODEL
Halland South west Sweden: Christer Gustafsson

Background
The Halland Model grew from a recognition in 1993 of a number of factors in south Sweden
1. A number of ‘buildings at risk’
2. A lack of contractors skilled in traditional building methods- construction, the use of lime, traditional surface finishes
3. Unemployment

Aims
1. To save the buildings
2. To save the craftsmanship
3. To save the jobs

Methods
‘To pool the resources and expertise of the Regional Museum of Halland, the County Administrative Board, the County Labour market board, the regional trade Committee thereby creating a regional cross sectoral joint action network aiming at sustainable growth ‘ 10 years of the Hallandsmodel 1993- 2002 Christer Gustafsson

BALCON

Statistics
Over the years the project has been extremely successful and has been the model for similar projects in Lithuania, Poland and Russia

The project has had a tangible and lasting effect on the local construction industry with the following remarkable outputs

315 new jobs in construction
786 unemployed workers retrained
25% of the 4,000 regional constructrion workers now have conservation training
100 apprentices have received their professional training within the Halland model
86 culturally and historically valuable buildings have been preserved.
36 of these were in danger of demolition

Total cost of operations over 10years
375,000,000 Swedish Kroner
275,000,000 County Labour bBoard
58,500,000 Property owners
2,000,000 other funders

The project has been very flexible providing training for those groups supported in annual retraining by the Labour Board- eg unemployed ship yard workers, immigrants or in 2005 women apprentices .

Sample projects
The Hallandmodel has 2 core construction schools based at the north and middle of the Province of Halland. The skilled team take on the training of all the apprentices.
A great variety of buildings and structures were chosen for conservation training
Grimeton Radio station – where the site was in danger of being demolished. The six 125 meter high towers were in poor condition and Hallandsmodel trainees cleaned and repainted one tower by hand. This action drew attention to the importance of the site which has subsequently been designated a World Heritage Site.

Figure 33 Grimeton

The old firestation at Laholm - this is the subject of an all female training scheme in 2005 where the old structure is to be conserved and new built offices to be constructed to the rear.

Figure 34 Laholm

The Scottish timber barons mansion at Tjolohom which was saved from an extensive dry rot outbreak.

Figure 35 Tjolohom
And the delicate open air bathing complex at Varberg

Figure 36 Varberg
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