

THE ORIGINAL ARCHITECT'S ROLE IN CONSERVATION OF THE RECENT ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

*H. İlke ALATLI * , Demet BİNAN ***

ABSTRACT

The scope of heritage conservation, as well as the definition of cultural heritage is inevitably broadening. Starting from 1960's, conservation experts conducted studies for early modernist buildings to be listed as heritage. Over time, similar studies were made for many Modern, Brutalist, even Postmodern buildings claiming that some of them are cultural heritage. Recently, buildings such as Heydar Aliyev Centre in Azerbaijan by Zaha Hadid (2012), Museum Liaunig in Austria by Querkraft (2008) and B2 House in Turkey by Han Tümertekin (2001) are listed as cultural heritage.

In this regard, adoption of heritage status when a building is relatively young can mean that the original architect is still alive, and even continues professional life. From the perspective of conservation practice this can be a very favorable situation. Madrid – New Delhi Document (ICOMOS-ISC20C, 2017) suggests the importance of gathering information from primary sources in order to apply an appropriate conservation planning and management method. Undoubtedly, the original architect is the main resource to understand a design's essence.

In the late 1990's, like most of the performance spaces, Sydney Opera House needed improvements. However, the Opera House being a national heritage in Australia, a Conservation Management Plan was to be made before any intervention. For this purpose, the experts first contacted the original architect, Jørn Utzon, and with an exemplarily collaboration the Utzon Design Principles, which constitute a framework to the Conservation Management Plans, were created.

However, as much as this single example seems ideal, the original architect's involvement to the conservation processes has many paradoxical sides such as legal, theoretical, practical and ethical. In some cases, conservation experts are obliged to obtain the consent of the original architect for any intervention according to the Intellectual Property Rights Act. On the other hand, sometimes this encourages the architect to make material, even design

* Res. Assist., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Department of Architecture, Istanbul, Turkey, ilke.tandogdu@msgsu.edu.tr

** Prof. Dr., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Department of Architecture, Istanbul, Turkey, demet.binan@msgsu.edu.tr

alterations that may damage the authenticity in the first place. In other cases, the original architects oppose to the heritage status of their design.

This paper aims to discuss these paradoxical issues from an architectural conservation perspective. Overall, as conservation of the architectural heritage of recent past is a dynamically evolving subject, it seems possible to state that, as conservation experts, we will be encountering many more similar cases.

Keywords: Heritage Conservation, Recent Architectural Heritage, Conservation Of Modern Architecture

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, number of the architecture, that accepted as cultural heritage has increased. With this increase, relatively young structures are subjected to conservation. Consequently, we began to encounter several paradoxical issues during the conservation processes as conservation experts and architects. An important example to these issues is the role of the original architect in conservation of the recent architectural heritage.

The original architect's contribution to the conservation process can be inspiring, as well as challenging for the experts. There are still some undefined gaps in current legal and theoretical frameworks that form paradoxical issues with the original architect's involvement. These paradoxical issues have legal, theoretical, practical and ethical sides. Moreover, the causes of these issues have not been systematically defined.

Although the subject of original architect's involvement in conservation was not specifically researched, there have been studies that expressed views and experiences on the topic. "Re-engaging with Original Designers" theme in Australia ICOMOS Conference "(Un)Loved Modern" can be an example of such. With this regard, an evaluation was made by interpretation and assessments of publications by the conservation experts who previously had such experiences.

In this study, an overview of the challenges and opportunities that architectural conservation experts encounter with the involvement of the original architect, as well as the legal, theoretical and practical issues were presented. Furthermore, it is aimed to discuss the role of the original architect when his/her building subjected to any conservation process, such as cultural heritage listing, conservation planning or restoration, from the perspective of architectural conservation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

At the beginning of the 20th century, the scope of conservation slowly slipped away from the influence of archaeology and the first steps of systematic

approaches to conservation were taken. By the mid-20th century, Venice Charter drew the first frame of today's understanding of conservation. Since the second half of the 20th century, the number and effectiveness of international organizations in conservation have increased, ICOMOS was established in 1965, UNESCO's World Heritage Convention was established in 1972, and DOCOMOMO¹, an international non-profit organization which played an important role in the conservation of modern architectural heritage, was established in 1988. By the end of the 20th century, there were over 900 artefacts in the World Heritage List, dozens of ICOMOS scientific committees and dozens of statutes. In such an environment, the scope of the conservation of cultural heritage has expanded. The impact of the international organizations and publications have contributed to the conservation laws in many countries, including Turkey.

By the 21st century, cultural heritage definitions, heritage values and the architecture that subjected to conservation have evolved; inevitably this caused an evolution in the conservation approaches as well. The most tangible case of this evolution can be seen with the conservation of recent architectural heritage.

2.1. Recent Architectural Heritage

The term "Recent Architectural Heritage" began to be used in the field of conservation in the last quarter of the 20th century. Terms such as Heritage of Recent Past, Recent Heritage or Buildings From the Recent Past area also commonly used in order to address recent architectural heritage. Today, the scope of the recent architectural heritage is not defined by strict date boundaries, but each study has developed a perspective of its own and created a framework that draws the boundaries. In this study, it is preferred to be associated with the living memory. By doing so, it is aimed to set a broader range, including all kinds of architecture created under the influence of modern movement, as well as relatively young structures, which claimed to have any cultural significance.

Starting with the early 20th century, heritage conservation often related with the age value, which identified by Alois Riegl (Riegl, 2015). But conservation itself being a modern concept, the values that emphasize the significance of an asset have evolved with the architectural heritage subjected to conservation. Today, newness value, use value or reference values are often substantial in order to determine heritage significance (Omay Polat, 2018).

Prudon (2008) states that "the change is fundamental to the preservation of modern architecture... As the ...places of the 20th century increasingly become

¹ DOCOMOMO International's full title is International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement.

the focus of preservation efforts, traditional preservation values will have to shift" (Prudon 2008, pp: 53-75). Indeed we are able to observe this change through the documents and charters on conservation of architectural heritage.

Burra Charter (1979-last version adapted in 2013), adopted by ICOMOS National Committee of Australia, established criteria for the evaluation of the significance of a place. It proposes value-based strategies for the preservation of culturally significant places in Australia. The Nara Document of Authenticity (1994) explains the relativity of authenticity and expands the concept beyond material notions. Eindhoven Statement (1990) by DOCOMOMO, was the first international statement specific to the architecture of modern movement. The statement was revised in 2014 as Eindhoven-Seoul Statement, focusing on the theme of sustainability and reuse. ICOMOS International Scientific Committee of 20th Century Heritage developed the Madrid Document (2011, Second edition in 2014) "Approaches for the conservation of 20th century architectural heritage", aiming to provide an international benchmark (ICOMOS-ISC20C, 2017). With the participation of many international members, third edition of the document was adopted as Madrid-New Delhi in 2017, which offers principles for the management of 20th century heritage.

2.2. Theory Against Legal Structure

Despite the many national and international theoretical guidelines to address the recent architectural heritage, there are still many problems we encounter because of the legal frameworks. It wouldn't be fair to say that legal frameworks are outdated. However, it is possible to state that legal frameworks sometimes fail to catch up with the theory.

First example on this topic is the time frames of heritage listing. Although it could be stated that architecture of recent past is recognised internationally by conservation experts, the legal frameworks can stand in the way of heritage listing. In many countries, the legal framework limits the age of the cultural assets to be listed. These legal time limits differ across the world.

In some countries, these limits are set by the time passed since the creation or construction of the cultural asset. In England the limit is 30 years, in Russia 40 years, in the United States of America 50 years, in Italy 70 years, in Iceland 100 years. In some countries, a certain date is considered as the limit, such as 1899 in Turkey, 1960 in Romania, 1990 in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In many countries, there are no time limits between the creation and heritage listing dates of the works. For example, The Christus Hoffnung der Welt Church (architect Heinz Tesar), of which the construction was completed in 2000 in Austria, has been listed as a monument,

being an outstanding example of the contemporary architecture built in a suburban area in Vienna. Similarly, Baku Crystal Hall, of which construction was completed in 2011, was added to the national registration list shortly after hosting the Eurovision Song Contest in 2012. Carughi (2017) studies the relativity in time limits in comparatively in a synoptic table (**Table 1**) (Carughi, 2017).

Table 1 Synoptic Table on Time Frames by Carughi (2017)

Synoptic table

	100 years	75 years	70 years	50 years	40 years	30 years	25 year	Date	No limit
Africa								Ghana (1900)	Algeria, Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia
Americas				United States of America				Ecuador (1940)	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador (1940) in Americas/Datc, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela
Asia	Bangladesh	Pakistan		Bahrain, Philippines, South Korea	United Arab Emirates	Singapore	Macau	Oman (1920) Qatar (1940) Hong Kong (1960s)	China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam
Australasia									Australia, New Zealand
Europe	Iceland		Italy	Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, San Marino	Belarus, Russia	United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales)		Turkey (1899) Romania (1960) Bosnia and Herzegovina (1990)	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Kosovo, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, Vatican City State

Despite this, the legal frameworks do not completely stand in the way of the theory. Although the time limit is 1899 in Turkey, B2 House by Han Tümertekin (2001), which was the winner of the Aga Khan Award for Architecture in 2004, is listed as cultural heritage in 2017. Similarly, despite a building must be at least 30 years old to be listed in England, The Alexandra Road Estate in London England was listed in 1993, 15 years after its construction in 1978. Croft (1996) states that this is only possible “if the building met two criteria, it had to be of outstanding national interest, and had to be shown to be at risk of demolition or damaging or alteration” (Croft 1996).



**Figure 1 B2 House in Çanakkale Turkey, by Han Tümertekin.
(Photo taken by Koray Güler, 2019)**

With the changes, which came with the modern lifestyles, daily needs and necessities have changed as well. Expectations from new buildings changed with new demands. Consequently, many new and ever-changing standards are constantly evolving, such as life safety, health codes, electrical and mechanical systems. Paradoxically, sometimes loss of authenticity is accepted by the stakeholders, in order to follow the legal standards and regulations. In a much dramatic example, reconstructions of the modern architectural heritage are justified by the regulations. For instance, the Building Earthquake Regulations in Turkey, are commonly pointed for justifying the reconstruction of recent architectural heritage which have reinforced concrete structures.

It is ethical to ask for consent from the original architect for any intervention to his/her initial design. However, it can also be a legal obligation according to the Copyright Laws. Madrid – New Delhi Document (ICOMOS-ISC20C, 2017) suggests the importance of gathering information from primary sources in order to apply an appropriate conservation planning and management method. Overall, original architect's involvement in the conservation process is not only theoretically, but also legally possible. A problematic situation is created when the relations with conservation law and copyright law are not clearly described. In Turkey, Law of

Intellectual Property Rights (Law Nr. 5846) states “without the consent of the owner, any deductions, additions or alterations cannot be made”. For instance, the architect of the Inonu Stadium in Istanbul, Fazıl Aysu opposed the additions to his designed structure as project owner (Omay Polat, 2018) during the restoration of the stadium. On the other hand, one of the paradoxes with the copyright laws is that architect’s legal right to change his/her initial design, which is one of the most important part of its significance. According to conservation laws in Italy, a creation, whether art or architecture, cannot be listed as heritage as long as its creator is alive. The Copyrights Act reserves the creators right to change the work in his/her lifetime.

3. DISCUSSION

It is possible to say that conservation of “modern” architectural heritage is almost simultaneous with the international recognition of conservation as science. Prudon (2008) states that “in large panorama ..., the preservation of modern architecture began in Europe, where the style developed, with the icons of the movement” and gives the example of conservation efforts for Bauhaus in 1960s (Prudon, 2008, p:7). A highly mentioned fact about the first efforts in the conservation of modern architectural heritage is that the creator taking the first steps for the conservation of his/her own building. Murphy (2002) claims that “Le Corbusier himself was instrumental in advocating for the preservation of the house in Poissy (Villa Savoye), though the building was not designated a national historic monument by the French Ministry of Culture until after the architect’s death” (Murphy, 2002).



Figure 2 Villa Savoye in Poissy, France by Le Corbusier. (URL 2)

In the early examples of conservation of recent heritage, or modern architectural heritage in this context, original architect's active involvement is understandable. Since the older buildings outnumbered the modern buildings, first conservation efforts were for the iconic buildings, which had architectural, aesthetic and scientific significance. Most of the conservation attempts were taken by the architects and intellectuals of the period, as conservation was not an internationally recognized scientific specialty yet.

For a long period, design intent has been a very hot topic in philosophical debates about conservation of modern architecture. In Prudon's (2008) words "it is the visual and conceptual expression of the designer's creativity". In this regard, it could be said that the original architect's interpretation of his/her building's design intent is, in a way, interpretation of his/her own creativity. Therefore, it is a great opportunity for the conservation experts to consult the original designer, if possible.

Undoubtedly, the original architect is an invaluable source of information; as he/she can give insight about the original ideas, design process, technical and material decisions.

One of the most significant national heritages in Australia Sydney Opera House sets an outstanding example of collaboration between the conservation experts and the original architect. Being a highly active performance space, the opera house needed improvements in the late 1990's. James Semple Kerr, the expert assigned for conservation management planning of the building, contacted the original architect, Jørn Utzon. With an exemplarily collaboration the Utzon Design Principles, which constitutes a framework to the Conservation Management Plans, were created. During this process, Utzon was the key contributor to the planning. He strongly argued that as a performance place, "as time passes and needs change, it is natural to modify the building ..." (Crocker, 2017).

Alexandra Road Estate at the time of its listing (1993), was the youngest building ever listed in United Kingdom (Croft, 1996). It was designed by architect Neave Brown, the only architect in United Kingdom, of whom all buildings are listed as heritage. Although the estate's need for urgent repair first triggered conservation efforts, such as heritage listing, proper restorations weren't held until 2005. The architecture firm Levitt Bernstein, with Neave Brown as consultant, worked on the restoration projects (URL 1). Brown shared his vision and design decisions, and together with the experts, architects created repair solutions for the details of the building. The restoration project was a good example of an original designer, conservation expert and architect's collaboration.

Contacting the original architect for information can sometimes offer unexpected insights about the design influences. Reeves (2009) states that even an architect's

own library is a great source of information about the influences she/he had during the design process (Reeves, 2009).

As stated previously, it is mostly favourable for conservation experts to consult the original architect for a better understanding of the design. In addition to being recommended by the ICOMOS ISC20C in Madrid-New Delhi Document (2017), in some countries it is also a legal obligation to take consent from the project owner. Nevertheless, responsible authorities can find it very practical to consult the original architect for improvements of the structure.

Churchill Gardens Estate in London is one of the first post-war social housing projects in United Kingdom. In the late 1980's and 1990's, many of the structures needed improvements according to the new housing standards and regulations. Although buildings in the estate were not listed, the site was designated a conservation area. During the planning and implementation of restoration projects significance and heritage values were considered. English Heritage contacted the original architect Sir Philip Powell. The local authority responsible for the Churchill Gardens Estate included the architect to the conservation process. After considering the residents demand, the architect designed new window frames, which were not contradicting the original design and suitable for the housing standards. (Harwood, 1996)

Collaboration with the original architect can be an opportunity for the conservation experts. However in some situations, original architect can interpret the restoration project as a design challenge and make changes in the original design (Prudon, 2008, p:37), which contradicts with the integrity of the building. In some cases, the original architect embraces the role of conservator and can take over the process from the conservation experts.

Mehmet Konuralp was one of the key figures during the heritage registration campaign of his renowned Istanbul Regional Directorate of Highways building (Karayollari Genel Mudurgulu). Being one of the first high-rise buildings with a curtain wall facade in Turkey, the architect fully supported the cultural heritage registration process, which conducted by conservation experts. After the registration, he was eager to contribute to the conservation processes of his building. But him being the original architect, in legal terms the project owner, he volunteered to restore his own building. (Aygen, 2012) He proposed a restoration project according to the original design intent, but with a different curtain-wall facade. He claimed that his original design was created with the materials and facade systems available in the 1970's and he would have naturally chosen different materials if they would have been available back then. An argument that contradicted the registration document in the first place, which pointed out the

buildings technical value. Finally the process ended being on hold with the buildings demolition for reconstruction.

A very common challenge of recent architectural heritage is the public opinion. The age value and lack of usual patina, which is almost ordinary on a traditional architectural heritage, can be unconvincing for the public and sometimes even the professional. Reeves (2009) state that “places associated with the recent past, so often untested by scholarly attention and comparative analysis, invariably provoke public (or even professional) apathy” (Reeves 2009). There are times, which the original architect objects to his buildings heritage status. In one case, a retired Australian architect strongly opposes the heritage status of his building stating that it does not have any cultural significance (Reeves, 2009).

Although the adaptive re-use is an outstanding topic in terms of sustainability for todays field of architectural conservation, as well as architecture, it could be argued that it is contradicting to the acknowledged principle of modernism “form follows function”. Modern buildings are often designed for a specific function. One of the main philosophical issues in the conservation of modern architecture has been the temporality of the buildings, which argues that modern buildings were designed for the time required by its function. How can we conserve a building, which was not built to last?

Some architects claim that with the loss of original function, design intent is lost as well. Thereby they may oppose the heritage status, or even any conservation attempt. In an interesting case, the original architect Peter Muller gives permission to demolition of his building Lance House (1962). He claims that the original user, his clients, is an important part of the design integrity. Without the original users, the buildings sense of place is lost; therefore the integrity is lost (Jones, 2009).

It must be stated that, in this paper only a few cases were exemplified in order to argue the mentioned paradoxical issues. But an important fact is that there are many more structures of recent heritage, which haven't been subjected to any conservation process. Therefore, these structures' original architect's views on the process have not been discussed yet. It is possible to indicate that with future studies, more data on the role of the original architect gained for further evaluations.

4. CONCLUSION

As conservation of the architectural heritage of recent past is a dynamically evolving subject, it seems possible to state that as conservation experts we will be encountering many more cases that involve the original architect. In time, we will also encounter issues different from those discussed here. Overall, the above-

mentioned issues are evaluated in the context of present legal and theoretical frameworks.

It can be stated that collaboration with the original architect can be very beneficial in terms of conservation. Yet, how this collaboration will take place is an important matter. Burke (2013) states that the experiences she previously had with the original architects "was largely driven by the personality of the individual architect and his sympathy or lack of sympathy for the conservation process and philosophy" (Burke, 2013). In this regard, the conservation experts' stance plays a significant role.

The original architect is undoubtedly an invaluable source of information in the conservation process. In addition, it is also ethical to consult the original architect (project owner) for conservation implementations such as renovations or restorations, even without any legal obligations. However, the responsible conservation experts should determine the limits of the architect's involvement.

It could be very beneficial to consult the original architect for specific design solutions during the conservation process. Nevertheless, according to Croft (1996), it shouldn't be suggested that the architect should be responsible for any of the shortcomings of his design, and states that "refurbishment of post-war buildings, just like the conservation of buildings of any period, is a very different specialization to designing new buildings" (Croft, 1996, p:54).

Overtime, with the accumulation of new conservation experiences that involve the original architect, there will be more research attempts for a systematic approach to the matter. Any future studies are important for raising awareness among conservation experts and architects who continue their professional life. There are over 1000 heritage of the recent past in the inventory of DOCOMOMO Turkey National Committee (DOCOMOMO_Turkey, 2019). In this regard, it's possible to state that there is a major potential for future studies.

REFERENCES

- Aygen, Z. (2012). Modernizm , Tarihi Çevre ve Mehmet Konuralp. In Konuralp, M. and Güngören, E. (Eds.) *Mehmet Konuralp* (pp. 154-173), İstanbul: TMMOB MİMARLAR ODASI
- Burke, S., (2013, March). Sydney Opera House: Practical Conservation Management Tools for Daily Use. In E.E. Chairperson (Chari), A Colloquium to Advance the Practice of Conserving Modern Architecture. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g_uF2Jqty1E&feature=emb_logo
- Carughi, U. (2017). Contemporary architecture and the idea of protection. In Visone, M and Carughi, U (Eds.) *Time Frames, Conservation Policies for Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage*. (pp. 60-73). NewYork: Routledge.

- Crocker, A. (2017). *Respecting the vision: Sydney Opera House - a conservation management plan*. Sydney, N.S.W.: Sydney Opera House.
- Croft, C. (1996). Alexandra Road, London. In Macdonald, S. (Ed.) *Modern Matters: Principles & Practice in Conserving Recent Architecture* (pp. 48-57). Shaftesbury: Donhead Publishing.
- DOCOMOMO_Turkey (2019) *DOCOMOMO Turkey National Inventory of Modern Architectural Heritage*. Archive of DOCOMOMO Turkey National Committee.
- Harwood, E. (1996). The Windows of Churchill Gardens. In Macdonald, S. (Ed.) *Modern Matters: Principles & Practice in Conserving Recent Architecture* (pp. 48-57). Shaftesbury: Donhead Publishing.
- ICOMOS International Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (2017). *Madrid New Delhi Document 2017*. <http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/pdf/madrid-new-delhi-document-2017.pdf>
- Jones, D. (2009). Moral Rights, Heritage and Australian Contemporary Architecture: Thoughts & Designs of Peter Muller. In *Australia ICOMOS 2009 (Un)Loved Modern*.
- Murphy, K. D. (2002). The Villa Savoye and the modernist historic monument. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 61(1), 68–89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/991812>
- Omay Polat, E. (2018). "Güncelleme: Türkiye'nin Modern Mimarlık Mirası". *Mimarist*, 62: 44-47
- Reeves, S. (2009). MEMORIES OF MODERNISM: THE ROLE OF ORAL HISTORY IN THE ASSESSMENT OF POST-WAR HERITAGE. In *Australia ICOMOS 2009 (Un)Loved Modern*.
- Prudon, T. (2008). *Preservation of Modern Architecture*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Riegl, A. (2015). *Modern Anıt Kültü*, (1903), (Trans.) E. Ceylan, İstanbul: Daimon Publishing.
URL 1: <https://www.levittbernstein.co.uk/portfolio/alexandra-road/>
URL 2: <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/3/3c/VillaSavoye.jpg>