Cultural Heritage Values: Some historical background

At the very core of conservation lies ‘value’ since communities only save those things to which they ascribe some sort of value. The importance of understanding this concept is perhaps best articulated in the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, which states “Conservation of cultural heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage.” Whether quantifiable or intrinsic, economic or social, the fact remains that society conserves that which it values. In the existing planning paradigm and with finite resources, the challenge has been in understanding which values (or valued resources) have the most meaning or importance to a community and determining how to best conserve those values, or at least the material manifestations of those values, for future generations.

The study of heritage conservation is a relatively recent development. While humankind has always been influenced by a desire to transmit its past to future generations, a concerted and self-aware effort to conserve the material manifestations of the past and consider the implications of those actions has only really been made since the early nineteenth century and it was not until the 1903 publication of Alois Riegl’s *Moderne Denkmalkultur* (The Modern Cult of Monuments) that a typology of values entered into the discussion of preservation.
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2 Although histories of the development of heritage conservation theory, such as Jokilehto (2008) and Hunter (1981), are able to cite examples of self-aware preservation of commemorative or historic objects dating much earlier than the 19th century and Denhez (1997) cites legal protection of sites of historical or architectural importance enacted by Roman Emperor Marjoram, as early as AD 457 and systematic inventoring efforts in 1666 Sweden, others such as Lowenthal and Binney (1981) trace the roots of modern systematic preservation to the early 19th century work of figures like John Ruskin, Violet le Duc, and William Morris. The 19th century has been chosen as a starting point for the current discussion of heritage conservation theory.
The work of Alois Riegl has recently regained popularity in conversations on value. Appointed editor of the Austrian Journal for the Research and Preservation of Artistic and Historical Monuments in 1902, Riegl published *Moderne Denkmalkultus* as a typological study on the artistic and historical values of art and architecture. Riegl’s typology took the first steps beyond the “scrape vs anti-scrape” schools of thought that focused entirely on the physical manifestations of heritage, i.e., the buildings and monuments. More importantly, Riegl demonstrated that the adoption or acceptance of different sets of values led inevitably to vastly different results in the conservation of art, architecture and monuments. Riegl’s value typology included: art value (*Kunstwollen*), historical value, age value, commemorative value, and present-day value. Although laid out more than 100 years ago, all five of these typologies are pertinent to present-day discussion of value which is moving beyond the material bias of 19th and 20th century practitioners to a more holistic view of cultural heritage.

Riegl presented his typology of values as they applied to Art monuments and Historical monuments (*Kunst- und historiche Denkmale*), the terms used in Austrian conservation policy dating back to the 16th century. In this sense, monument spoke to intentional monuments, those which had been constructed explicitly for the purpose of commemoration, as well as to those unintentional monuments, those resulting from the continued existence of a built structure as a representation of the accomplishments, attitudes, and beliefs of an early generation. His typology was not meant to be exclusive to the built form, as demonstrated by the examples he employs, including his best known ‘scrap of paper’.
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3 It is not therefore surprising that the field is once again turning to the philosophies of Riegl as we attempt to move away from the material bias of 20th century heritage conservation.
Riegl’s value typology was faintly echoed in 1949 by Sir John Summerson when he published a list of the five types of buildings which deserved preservation, “in certain circumstances.” Summerson’s typology favours high architecture over vernacular, and reflects a post-war shift toward modern architecture and the removal of all but the very best examples of early styles. Whereas Riegl wrote from a position of attempting to preserve art, architecture and monuments from the ravages of time (and at times the re-use of raw materials), Summerson wrote from the midst of an architectural tabula rasa. Summerson’s typology of buildings warranting preservation, which follows, was purely aimed at protecting the best of the best and leaving the remainder to succumb to development.

1. The building which is a work of art: the product of a distinct and outstanding creative mind.
2. The building which is not a distinct creation in this sense but possesses in a pronounced form the characteristic virtues of the school of design which produced it.
3. The building which, of no great artistic merit, is either of significant antiquity or composition of fragmentary beauties welded together in the course of time.
4. The building which has been the scene of great events or the labour of great men.
5. The building whose only virtue is that in a bleak tract of modernity it alone gives depth in time.

Arguably a step in the wrong direction, Summerson’s typology alludes to the material bias and elitism that would underlie the international practice of heritage conservation for much of the 20th century. This particular school of thought came about following the Second World War while Europe was rebuilding and the prevailing architectural style, which had emerged prior
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5 Summerson, 1959 as quoted in Bruce Dawson, “Why are you protecting this crap?”: Perceptions of Value for an Invented heritage—a Saskatchewan Perspective, Value Based Decision Making for Conservation, Canadian Studies Heritage Conservation Programme Symposium, Carleton University November 18, 2005, 2.
6 Summerson, 1949 as quoted in Dawson, Why are you protecting this crap?, 2.
to the war, emphasized clean lines and stridently promoted the removal of highly ornate architectural predecessors.

Modernist architects emerging from early 20th century Europe were motivated by progress. The Modern buildings that dominated the first half of the 20th century were touted as superior constructions and economic circumstances provided a convenient argument for more streamlined Modern designs that did away with frivolous ornamentation of the past. Canada followed suit. During the Second World War, Cyril James, Principal of McGill University, lamented to his audience of architects the “comparative misfortune, in that none of the Canadian cities have yet been levelled by the war,” offering as solace the prediction that once the war had ended the existing building stock would certainly be demolished, “in order that you may rebuild effectively the cities and communities of which you have long been dreaming.”

In the age of the Garden City and financial incentives from the federal government to generate an industry of mass-produced, cookie-cutter housing, the uniqueness of earlier built form was being systematically annihilated by prevailing architectural trends and public policy. Denhez demonstrated in his study of the impact of early 20th century public policy on the evolution of domestic architecture in Canada that demolition and new construction was the preferred policy for economic stimulus. What resulted from this architectural tabula rasa was a call to arms to protect the most worthy of saving, the best of the best; consequently, the most readily identifiable.

The 1964 Venice Charter and its predecessor, the 1931 Athens Charter, reveal the material bias and best of the best mentality which stemmed from a response to the era of
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Modernism and pro-demolition and construction public policies. The Venice Charter, written by the International Committee of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), focuses entirely on the built form. Although Article 15 does provide guidance on archaeological excavations, it focuses on the care of ruins, artifacts and reconstruction. The Venice Charter recognized only two types of values, historic and aesthetic, and stated that “the intention in conserving and restoring monuments is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence.”

The preoccupation with the built form persisted in Canada and abroad.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed in the United States in 1966 in the midst of the material preoccupation of heritage conservation. As a matter of necessity, a series of criteria for evaluation of the quality of significance of sites were developed in order to create and administer a National Register of Historic Places. Similar criteria have been adopted across North America.

It was around this same time that Canadian interest in historic sites, places, and buildings was growing. As early as 1951, the Massey Commission noted an ‘urgent need for more government investment in preservation.’ The National Historic Sites and Monuments Act was passed in 1953, but it was not until the 1960s and early 1970s that government investment in heritage conservation began in earnest. As a sign of the government’s support of (or at the very least recognition of) the growing interest in preserving historic buildings, the Heritage Canada
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10 Examples include *Ontario Regulation 9/06 Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the Ontario Heritage Act*, which is derived from the earlier National Parks criteria.
12 The National Historic Sites and Monuments Board created in 1919 was given the mandate of identifying and commemorating historic places, people, and events (primarily related to the theme of war), but cannot be said to have been concerned with heritage conservation more generally.
Foundation was formed in 1973, originally intended to act as a Canadian version of the British National Trust. In 1976, Canada became a signatory State to the World Heritage Convention and its first World Heritage Site, l’Anse aux Meadows in Newfoundland was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978.

The 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Property (World Heritage Convention) is aimed at the identification, protection and preservation of humankind’s shared cultural and natural heritage. This system of international cooperation set the stage for renewed discussion of values. The World Heritage process required a system of evaluation for those properties to be considered for inclusion on the World Heritage List (the List) and from that operational necessity sprung a set of criteria for determining outstanding universal value. The criteria themselves have remained unchanged since their adoption, but have evolved from two separate lists, six criteria for cultural heritage and four for natural heritage, to one list of ten criteria. A site meeting one or more of the ten criteria and the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity is considered to be of outstanding universal value.\(^\text{13}\)

The ten criteria for inscription offer a high level overview of the values that the List is meant to reflect. The intention of the criteria is to offer opportunities for a wide range of site typologies to be included on the List; it is the onus of the State Party to demonstrate to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee that its site meets the criteria of outstanding universal value. Although the language used in the criteria reinforces the best of the best attitudes of the time of its writing, flexibility in the operations of the World Heritage Committee has resulted in a change (or at least an attempt to change) the values represented by the List. The

---

Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible List which has emerged since 1994 has also greatly changed the values expressed on the World Heritage List as a result of efforts to include a more diverse array of vernacular sites and landscapes.

Canadian heritage conservation organizations and authorities began to look at the issue of values as it applied to our built heritage resources in the early 1970s. Whereas previous attempts to inventory and organize the country’s historic building stock had broken buildings down to their component parts and architectural features, new attempts were made to research, list and evaluate a deeper set of values represented by those buildings. The ultimate goal, influenced by a positivist methodology, seemed to be the creation of a scientific system to make value judgments “rationally, objectively and confidently,” free of the subjectivity of individual experts.

In 1979, Parks Canada published Harold Kalman’s *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings*. The basis of Kalman’s system is the application of empirical values to the five weighted criteria of: architecture, history, environment, usability, and integrity. At the time, the approach presented a quasi-scientific method that lent credibility to the process of evaluating historic buildings. The Kalman approach offered a threshold for cultural heritage value that could be applied to the management of building stock and decision-making processes related to those
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15 The Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings (CIHB) was a national undertaking that resulted in the recording of over 200,000 older buildings across Canada between 1970 and 1975. Over the course of several years, students were given record forms and sent out to survey the existing building stock. Information recorded during these surveys was inputted into a computerized database to be analysed by staff and used to undertake comparative studies. Cameron, *Spirit of Place*, 79.
buildings. Although the system draws criticism, a modified version of it continues in use as a credible and feasible method of valuing and ranking resources in a planning system with finite human and financial resources.

The modified Kalman evaluation, which uses the criteria of historical associations, architecture and environment, is an integral part of the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office’s (FHBRO) administrative duties. FHBRO was established in 1982 from the Treasury Board Heritage Buildings Policy which was replaced in 2006 by the Treasury Board Policy on Management of Real Property. The role of FHBRO is to evaluate federally owned buildings of 40 years of age or older and to consult with custodian departments to ensure the preservation of the heritage character of those buildings designated as “Classified” or “Recognized.” One of the major drawbacks to the Kalman evaluation system is its material bias; the maximum score for architecture accounts for just over 40% of the total possible score for all three criteria in the version used by FHBRO. Similar versions of scoring systems have been adopted across the country.

One of the major concerns instigated by the integration of a scoring approach into the planning system is the concept of legal designation. Legislation for the protection of heritage properties was introduced in provinces and territories across Canada during the 1970s and with the advent of scoring systems and empirical thresholds for the valuation of cultural heritage resources came the identification and designation of sites and buildings. The 1974 Ontario Heritage Act, for example, made it possible to apply legal protection to buildings of significant value in Ontario. Although of monumental importance to the heritage conservation movement in
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Ontario, it has been a double-edged sword because it has contributed to the belief among many decision-makers that only legally-designated buildings need be considered in the project planning process.

As previously mentioned, one of the other major problems with Kalman’s evaluation system was its material bias and weighing of certain values above others. The Australian Burra Charter provided a means for solving these dilemmas. When ICOMOS Australia revised their Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter) in 1981, the document was prefaced with a statement that the purpose of heritage conservation was “to retain the cultural significance of a place.”

The system of evaluation presented in the Burra Charter was superior to the Kalman system in that it could be applied to all places, not exclusively buildings, and that it weighed all values equally, except where certain values are more important to a site based on site typology or context. What resulted was an approach to the evaluation of heritage places that entails the creation of two separate documents: a written statement that summarizes the values of site, or statement of cultural significance and a written analysis of the site’s values, or assessment of cultural significance. This cultural significance approach was adopted by Parks Canada in the 1990s when the practice of writing Commemorative Integrity Statements for National Historic Sites became part of the Cultural Resource Management Policy.

The cultural significance approach was also made a part of the FHBRO evaluation process. Although the empirical Kalman evaluation has not been replaced, it is now preceded by a written research report to support the evaluation. A Heritage Character Statement was also
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20 Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter, the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, (Burra: Australia ICOMOS, 1999), Article 2.2. The 1981 text stated that the aim was “to retain or to recover the cultural significance of a place” (emphasis added).
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prepared for designated buildings based on the findings of the written report and evaluation in order to help explain the values of the property and to guide decision-makers on how to best preserve the property’s heritage character.\textsuperscript{22}

What the cultural significance approach introduced by the Burra Charter highlighted was the systemic material bias in heritage conservation theory, practice and legislation. Up until this point, heritage conservation tools were heavily focused on preserving the material manifestations of the values being protected. The flexibility of the cultural significance approach allowed non-built resources to be identified, evaluated, and ultimately protected. The Florence Charter on Historic Gardens, adopted by ICOMOS in 1982, was the first international charter to deal with landscapes that included both natural and built components as well as associated systems and processes.\textsuperscript{23} The charter lays foundations and articulates issues specific to the study of cultural heritage landscapes such as the nature of historic gardens as living monuments and the interconnectedness of the sum of inorganic and living components within the garden landscape system.\textsuperscript{24}

In 1992 cultural landscapes were included in revisions to the \textit{Operational Guidelines} for the World Heritage Committee.\textsuperscript{25} Cultural landscapes were not a new concept; the term was introduced in the United States in the 1920s by Carl Sauer.\textsuperscript{26} It was not until the 1990s,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} FHBRO, \textit{A Guide}, 12.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Gustavo Araoz, "Preserving heritage places under a new paradigm," \textit{Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development} 1, no. 1 (2011): 59.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} The timing of these revisions is of particular importance to this topic given that the expert meeting that recommended these revisions met in France only four months following the \textit{Earth Summit} in Brazil. The resulting \textit{Rio Declaration on Environment and Development} declared in Principle 17 that “environmental impact assessment, as a national instrument, shall be undertaken for proposed activities that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are subject to a decision of a competent national authority”.
\end{itemize}
however, that the term took hold among heritage conservation professionals. Based on the recommendations of an international expert meeting, the revisions to the Operational Guidelines made a number of key changes to the World Heritage system that represented changing attitudes towards how cultural heritage values are identified, categorized and protected. Firstly, the revisions recognized the associative cultural values of landscapes and landscape features, particularly for indigenous peoples. They also acknowledged the importance of protecting the biological and cultural diversity of cultural landscapes and set precedents for the legal protection of cultural heritage values that could not necessarily be managed in the same way as buildings. In addition to challenging conventional tools, practices and legal protections of participating States Parties, the revisions also introduced the term ‘sustainability’ into the World Heritage lexicon. These changes brought heritage conservation further in line with the EA approach that was taking hold of the public planning process in Canada and abroad during the 1990s.

The cultural landscape approach to heritage conservation required new tools to identify, evaluate and protect cultural heritage, that reached beyond the material bias and elitism of earlier approaches. The cultural significance approach developed in the 1980s provided a method to present the values embodied by specific cultural landscapes through written statements of cultural significance, and the identification of character-defining values in these statements could be applied to management plans. Yet the very nature of cultural landscapes raised new questions of authority, ownership, and participation of various communities in the identification, evaluation and management of this new type of cultural heritage. Cultural landscapes are, by
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very definition, the direct result of past or ongoing land-use by a people that may or may not still be inter-related with that landscape.

The recognition of the significance of cultural landscapes, and the subsequent recommendation from the 1999 experts meeting in Bialystok, Poland, that States Parties extend existing designations and management systems to include cultural landscapes,\(^\text{29}\) required that tools be developed to work with communities to conserve their cultural heritage. Throughout the 1990s the importance of community involvement in heritage conservation was recognized and mechanisms for participation were developed. The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM) undertook pilot programmes focusing on the management of heritage values in landscapes beginning with the 1995 creation of ICCROM’s Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation (ITUC) Programme and, shortly thereafter, the Living Heritage Programme in order to “integrate community members in the identification and care of landscapes of heritage value.”\(^\text{30}\) ICCROM’s approach to cultural landscapes in the 1990s and early 2000s reinforced the importance of implementing a sustainable management strategy through community stewardship.

The prominence of sustainable management strategies and processes in the cultural landscape approach was, no doubt, influenced by international attitudes regarding sustainable development. The World Commission on Environment and Development released *Our Common Future* in 1987. The report encouraged a new approach to planning that invited communities and governments to consider the causes of negative development patterns rather than simply fighting


against the results of development.\textsuperscript{31} Sustainable development suits the cultural landscape approach, which is a more holistic view of cultural heritage than earlier approaches that focused almost entirely on the material.

The 1990s also saw the adoption of the Nara Document on Authenticity which had a profound impact on heritage conservation practice and paved the way for the evolution of theory and practice in the new millennium. Written in 1994, the Nara Document was the culmination of an international experts meeting responding to concerns regarding the test of authenticity in the Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Committee, but it also speaks to questions of authority. With regard to values, Article 11 of the document states:

\begin{quote}
All judgments about values attributed to heritage as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgments of value and authenticity on fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect due to all cultures requires that cultural heritage must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which it belongs.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

The Nara document was a step away from the Euro-centric nature of the World Heritage system, and while it did little to align the practice of heritage conservation with natural conservation, it did broaden the dialogue surrounding diversity in heritage conservation practice and highlight the importance of communities in valuing and conserving their heritage. This attitude was certainly consistent with aspects of the burgeoning cultural landscape approach, including ICCROM’s community-based Living Heritage Programme, which focused on sustainable management through community involvement.
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Heading into the 2000s, heritage conservation had evolved from a field that focused entirely on high architecture and monuments to one that was exploring concepts and methods that considered stakeholder communities and the natural environment in their approach.

Although the theory and practice of heritage conservation had developed greatly over the 20th century, and throughout that time values had remained at the heart of the dialogue, very little concerted examination of value had been undertaken since Alois Riegl published *Moderne Denkmalkultus* in 1902. The NHPA and Kalman’s evaluation did not so much discuss values as try to apply existing value typologies to a planning process, and while international charters recognized the importance of value and outlined typologies and tests for value, none were focused on understanding or explaining the construction of cultural heritage values. Recognizing the paucity of comprehensive research on the subject of values and the lack of understanding of the economic value of cultural heritage, the Getty Conservation Institute undertook an examination of the values and economics of cultural heritage beginning in 1995. Although much of the research relating to economic values addressed tourism, the focus on economic values of heritage, in general, was especially relevant because prevailing attitudes associated with sustainable development called upon communities and governments to identify underlying causal factors of development patterns.

Among these underlying causes in Canada and the United States are investment and tax policies. The economic realities of cultural heritage cannot be underestimated, yet at the same time they remain very difficult to quantify and address. Denhez (1997) outlined the development of public policy as it relates to sustainable development and the built environment, specifically the historic built environment. Although much of his argument is focused on the very real and very negative impact that early 20th century post Second World War economic policy and its pro-
demolition tax system has had on the built environment, he also points to pro-designation policy that has established a system of pedigree for older building stock that ignores the majority of the built environment\footnote{Denhez, \textit{The Heritage Strategy Planning Handbook}, 42.} and all but avoids the relationship between people, the natural environment, and the built environment. The 20\textsuperscript{th} century compulsion to identify and designate exceptional examples is unnecessary in a sustainable planning system. Based on the concepts presented in \textit{Our Common Future}, a sustainable development system would promote the management and extension of the lifespan of a wide variety of cultural resources as ‘investments.’\footnote{Ibid., 42.}

At the start of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, cultural heritage was increasingly associated with the processes of sustainable development, and \textit{vice versa}. In 2005, UNESCO adopted the \textit{Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions}. The convention was the first international normative instrument to explicitly discuss the protection of cultural heritage and sustainable development as being inter-related.\footnote{Pereira Roders and Van Oers, "Editorial: bridging cultural heritage and sustainable development." \textit{Journal of Heritage Management and Sustainable Development} 1, no. 1 (2011): 7.} Paragraph 6 of the \textit{Guiding Principles} (Article 2) states in no uncertain terms that, “the protection, promotion and maintenance of cultural diversity are an essential requirement for sustainable development for the benefit of present and future generations.”\footnote{UNESCO, \textit{Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions}. (Paris: UNESCO, 2005), Article 2, Paragraph 6. Accessed October, 2011 at http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001495/149502e.pdf} The 2005 Convention further emphasizes the necessity of cultural heritage as a “strategic element in national and international development policies.”\footnote{UNESCO, \textit{Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions}. Preamble.} Decision-makers are increasingly becoming aware of and understanding the benefits of cultural heritage within a dynamic planning system. The European Union has made a concerted effort to integrate heritage into the legislation and policies that govern sustainable
development. This remains an inconsistent process in Canada, yet more and more municipal governments are adopting planning policies that emphasize – or at the very least recognize – the necessity of a vibrant cultural fabric, composed of both tangible and intangible cultural elements in sustainable communities.

A decade into the new millennium, the heritage conservation paradigm in Canada has clearly changed, and we have yet to find a system for the evaluation of both values and potential project impacts that truly addresses this new understanding of how heritage should fit into a sustainable planning system. Cultural heritage does not exist within a vacuum, and the danger of having focused on the material vessel for so long is a lack of understanding of how to effectively maneuver within the planning and policy process to serve the interests of cultural heritage. Addressing this very problem at an international level, Gustavo Araoz recently wrote that heritage professionals have never really protected or preserved values, they have protected and preserved the physical embodiment of those values, the materials.”

The philosophy of conservation, its resulting doctrinal foundation, and the protective legislation and professional protocols for intervention “are all fixated on the protection of the material vessels that carry the value.” Araoz points to this material bias as the primary cause of façadism as a function of a building’s value on the real estate market without perhaps attempting to understand the socio-economic, historic or functional values of the subject building. The emerging paradigm that Araoz discusses is related to less tangible aspects of cultural resources, including building morphology and patterns of use. Community involvement is needed to identify these less tangible values, identify potential project impacts, and properly conserve both tangible and
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intangible aspects of cultural resources, particularly if the end goal is sustainability. Mr. Araoz posits that “the range of values attributed to heritage places has expanded to reflect its new social role as well as the many ways in which it is appreciated by stakeholding communities whose voices had not been given major consideration in the past.”[^41]

This type of holistic and sustainable approach to a planning process that encompasses cultural heritage has been examined in Canada in recent years. It is not unlike the approach supported by many indigenous groups in Canada and abroad. Paci et.al., argue that the formal nature and politicization of the Environmental Assessment (EA) are barriers to truly integrating traditional environmental knowledge into the assessment of project impacts, adding, “Aboriginal lands are influenced and conditioned by historical, cultural, political and environmental variables that reflect very unique conditions.”[^42] The current planning system seems unable to effectively incorporate traditional environmental knowledge in much the same way cultural heritage, more generally, remains on the fringe of the study of planning. The fluid and consultative approach to planning lobbied for by a number of indigenous groups does not seem possible in the existing rigid legislative and bureaucratic framework driving the planning and development process. The result is discord that continues to grow as resource extraction projects in Canada’s north increase in size and number. A number of on-going high profile energy projects will likely have implications regarding consultation and assessment practices, particularly with respect to cultural heritage.

[^41]: Ibid., 57.