

Peter FISTER

## Urban rehabilitation - a borrowed novelty

### 1. A brief »Slovenian« history

Urban rehabilitation, seen and shown in the last years as an important novelty in urban management in Slovenia, is in fact a concealed and underestimated type of urban design methodology, used in the developed parts of the World for at least four decades. It had been offered in the early seventies, but has been since then formally and »professionally« prevented, as if it was intended only for the select few units of protected, listed monuments.

Moreover, especially urbanism (if uniformly understood as a discipline) and politics repeatedly refrained from the methodology and positioned it amongst unimportant components of spatial development strategies or those segments of public interest in which moral obligations demanded symbolic financial support (expressed readiness to protect the national cultural heritage). Today proof is sought for to proclaim who was the first to »discover« rehabilitation as a special method of urban management, conferences and urban design workshops are organised, special thematic issues of magazines etc. Suddenly even amongst experts one finds specialists for the activity, even though everybody shunned it until recently. The question is, why hasn't it been so for the last three decades, when relationships towards rehabilitation were quite different. A short analysis of certain events could raise some basic dilemmas and issues that one can encounter by uncritical generalisation of the term »rehabilitation«.

In the early seventies an experiment was conducted. The idea was to produce an urban planning document that wouldn't only proscribe conservation decisions with a special ordinance about protecting monumental properties of an old town core, but would join the protected parts into a comprehensive and planned development act in the central part of the town. Responses from the government and profession were negative. The plan involved rehabilitation of the Tržič town core. It did turn out rather rigid and searching for new types of planning, but simultaneously brought novelties from more developed environments and trying to enable amendments to the existing laws. After two years of refusal, a seldom-used type of participation was employed: a referendum amongst the towns' population was organised. Only then was it possible to transform the document into a strategic rationale, although it was never granted the formal status of a plan.

Similar occurrences were witnessed several years later when numerous »rehabilitation plans« for old town cores (some 15 in all!) were at best, pendants to expert guidelines to urban planning documents. Without exceptions they were strictly limited to dealing with solutions pertaining to listed heritage. It was necessary to build new things and get rid of the »old«, except in the mentioned examples of morally obligatory formal protection of cultural heritage, which has of course right up to the present times, been subject to the mercy of the financially weak cultural sector.

Even if such a plan did become an official document, it could be enforced only as a »rehabilitation development plan«. This is however nonsensical. After all the plan had nothing to do with development, but everything to do with preservation and renewal of the extant part of a town including all its existing contents. That was for example the fate of the rehabilitation plan for Škofija Loka. All the arguments speaking for a special type of planning with special methodology of planning, as well as implementation, were discarded, despite the fact that even many foreign experts argued for the cause. Even experts provided by the European Council and European Union on other projects (Škofija Loka, Štanjel etc.) were not successful in convincing the legislators, national or local, that rehabilitation was a special type of urban planning with special methodology of work, decision making and implementation.

### 2. Rehabilitation as part of urban planning or conservation methodology

The short introductory history of rehabilitation would be incomplete without the following conclusions:

- since the early eighties, when amendments were made to the physical planning laws, until today, there were numerous initiatives to integrate rehabilitation into physical planning as an integral part and important starting point;
- the initiative was not included in the social system before 1991, neither after the independence of Slovenia, nor in the accession framework to the European Union by a future member state; it was even opposed by experts themselves and consequentially by politicians;
- proposals elaborated in detail, to set up Rehabilitation agencies and numerous proposals for special types of institutions, governmental or non-governmental organisations, comparable to the rich experiences of European countries, that could in reality bring rehabilitation closer to rational management, were simply silenced;
- today all these initiatives are reappearing as completely new inventions - albeit a decade too late and unfortunately often without knowledge about causes and possible consequences!

Even the term rehabilitation itself has in Slovenia experienced interesting transformations. First it was called clearing (orig. *sanacija* or even *asanacija*) and implied the consolidation of listed buildings. In the early seventies, following the European model, the term »revitalisation« was introduced, adding content to the artistic features, again only of monuments.

Immediately a new term was offered »rehabilitation«, that should encompass the whole built structure of important urban areas and other settlements. It should join preservation of important cultural heritage monuments with formally unprotected parts of the built environment, whose ambience, content, physical and symbolic qualities were valuable, into a common development goal. The goal was the preservation, development and use of high quality components of the built environment with all their meanings and influences. Since then the term »rehabilitation« was much too often used only for the so called ambient protection of preserved parts of settlements. For this reason official circles dealing with the protection of cultural heritage have proposed usage of the words »heritage« and »rehabilitation«. They apply

only to the formally protected (listed) part of the built environment although during the whole period, rehabilitation meant that the activity was extended to all built heritage: listed as cultural heritage, preserved by use or degraded.

On the other hand »rehabilitation« is also used in urban planning for activities that deliberately change, renew, substitute existing built structures and of course have nothing to do with the preservation of any already existing values.

Both the ideas are of course unacceptable, after all true rehabilitation happens only when we simultaneously preserve all that is valuable and develop within the thus set framework of new possibilities! It is a conclusion made even elsewhere. It was also the reason for a special European initiative in the seventies to change the priority given exclusively to new development. Sensible renewal of the existing building stock was promoted, especially of high quality built heritage. The concluding analysis showed that particular countries managed to diminish the costs of extensive construction by more than 20 % and redirect them into the development of the economy (e.g. Germany). Simultaneously costs for the renewal of listed architectural heritage dropped by 24 %.

Parallel to such European experiences new rationales were created on the international level, especially within the framework of UNESCO. These were later built into numerous recommendations concerning policies, protection and development of space and cities. In professional and political circles they are renowned world-wide, sadly not in Slovenia, although some of them would be extremely useful. The international guidelines from numerous charters, recommendations, agendas and even conventions and with respect to Slovenian specifics present the most comparable experiences. Most of the conventions however relate directly or indirectly to cultural and natural heritage of the highest quality. Certain recommendations that otherwise elaborate only economic, social and other, similar aspects of spatial management nevertheless position rehabilitation and comprehensive protection of high quality spatial heritage as their basic rationale. In this sense the best known amongst them have been given adequate attention (Habitat II, Granada Convention etc.).

Suggestions, formulated in 1997 at the European conference of ministers responsible for regional planning in Cyprus (CEMAT) are a summary of their contents. In relation to rehabilitation, as a special component of urban management, the following suggestions are beneficial for comparative analysis:

- »Integrally high quality heritage is becoming increasingly important even as an economic asset that demands sufficient protection, careful maintenance and a development oriented approach. Especially important is its environmental value for cities and other settlements, as well as their surrounding areas and is therefore becoming an important investment target. Decisions concerning new economic activities (especially those that demand a higher level of specialisation) are as a rule, already tied to the environment and its characteristics. Simultaneously this heritage is an important factor in the dynamic growth of the tourism industry.«
- »New tasks stemming from sensible directions for planning sustainable spatial development and urban management have to contain comprehensive protection and development of the natural heritage, tied to regional charac-

teristics ... besides preventing pollution they also demand the rehabilitation of wider areas and their protection and creative management of influential cultural landscapes. Neither prevents economic development, but often brings important investment opportunities while preventing human activities that degrade the landscape. Protection of settlement heritage coupled with creative economy should prevent pressures of commercialism and cultural uniformity, the most dangerous negative components of modern planning in the development of European cities and settlements.«

- »Much more attention has to be given to creative management and development of natural resources, water resources, as well as urban and rural landscapes. Cultural heritage should have adequate recognition and be comprehensively included as a significant part of spatial development policies.«

*At the international level rehabilitation has become an extremely important part of spatial development policies, special goals for the future quality of the built environment and the only possibility for preserving cultural heritage. Rehabilitation is part of urban planning and architecture and it has facilitated the development of specific technologies and methodologies.*

### 3. Slovenian problems and measures for rehabilitation of the built environment

Today many of the people (companies) beginning to get interested in rehabilitation or wanting to plan or execute particular acts, unfortunately don't know some of the basic principles. The truth is in the finding, that rehabilitation as a possibility of profit for builders or even planners (designers) has suddenly become extremely attractive, although until recently it was considered unattractive by many or was purposely presented as costly, thus limiting its real possibilities. Builders in general, because of their technical and organisational incompetence raised the cost of rehabilitation and created the false impression about cheap new development as compared to costly renewal etc. of existing buildings and urban structures. Despite proof about diametrically different experiences around Europe, it was impossible to train builders or designers or even the industry, to become capable of correct renewal (rehabilitation) work.

Tenders from abroad\* suddenly sweeping across Slovenia (mainly from Italy, Austria and Germany) bringing not only cheaper, but also better possibilities for high quality execution of renewal, caused confusion and rehabilitation (renewal) became the »hit of the season«. Even a superficial glance over the list of companies presently offering renewal in Slovenia, either as designers or builders, shows that something is wrong. Amongst them are companies that have until recently been exclusively involved with building new buildings or even roads and designers known to have claimed that older housing stock and urban structures were useless etc. Listing all the names would be fruitless, but diverse documentation proving the point has been collected!

To promote rehabilitation of the built-up space in Slovenia, seasoned by domestic and foreign experiences and to prevent possible disorientation, some of the specifics of the Slovenian circumstances have to be recognised.

The basic goals of the spatial role of comprehensive rehabilitation of buildings and settlement values evolve from the conclusion, that they are special qualities and undoubtable high quality components of Slovenian and European space. After all, planning of spatial development in the modern World is today incomplete, if it doesn't unconditionally contain these qualities as the basis of rational, spatial, ecological and culturally conscious and comprehensive (sustainable) planning of the living environment.

The primary finding, that can be applied even in Slovenia is, that the future is possible only with the most thought out use of given space and inherited human changes to the environment. It is true whether directed towards the protection of natural or cultural heritage of the highest rank, comprehensive rehabilitation with simultaneous protection of particular areas with typical architecture or settlement identity or sensible »recycling« of already spent human endeavour, energy and resources. Especially in cities they represent a large part of the available space and possibilities for future use.

To achieve such a method it is necessary to assess the rank of value, preservation, issues and opportunities of the (whole) existing building and settlement heritage. Also ties to the place and people in it have to be assessed, in comparison to corresponding domestic and foreign experiences and findings. Similarly such expert guidelines and methods should be established that would ensure direct integration into other spatial documents.

From the expert point of view, Slovenian experiences are sufficiently diverse and rich to support such direct elaboration, however problems are becoming more and more acute and without the use of foreign experiences, solutions will be hard to find.

The term »rehabilitation« of building and settlement qualities in spatial development applies to the following parts of existing building and settlement heritage:

- those that have the qualities of significant cultural heritage (specially formalised by law),
- those that represent significant components of identity and creativity of cultural, as well as architectural landscapes and regions or particular settlements and their complementary parts,
- those that are comprehensively of high quality and important parts of the living environment.

Simultaneously the enhanced protection approach to highest quality spatial components has to integrate the rehabilitation of degraded (dilapidated) places. In this way the necessary spatial condition for correct understanding and rational spatial use of existing qualities would be enabled. Such a rationale facilitates the introduction of one of the most rational and even basic economic and environmental components of sustainable, comprehensive and sensible development planning of urbanised spaces in Slovenia.

Until recently the planning practice and building industry didn't consider the activity seriously, except in the sense of formal protection, as stated in by-laws, ordinances etc. concerning listed cultural and natural monuments. In view of the new state of affairs in the last decade and new relations that have emerged, the following circumstances dealing with the activity are crucial:

- Special building and settlement values have to be argued for - not only as particular listed units of cultural heritage,

but also as parts of the comprehensive quality of spatial identity.

- Compulsory and specific methods have to be developed of joining presently narrowly oriented planning of partial protection of cultural heritage with development plans for settlements, regions and the national level, as well as crossborder areas. Such a planning range provides best results both in the protection and development aspects, as can be proven by examples from numerous parts of the developed world.
- In comprehensive rehabilitation of building and settlement values economics has to be built in as an important component besides cultural and symbolic meanings. Rehabilitation (»recycling«, facilitating new use) of well built and designed structures and carefully controlled »marketing« of established settlement and architectural values, as well as cultural heritage, will transform the present short-term planning decisions into mid- and long-term ones.
- Unadapted and inharmonious legislature has to be adjusted with comparable European experiences, and intersector co-operation achieved (e.g. the law on protection of cultural heritage has to be partially harmonised with the law on spatial planning and other laws with pertaining sectorial proscriptions). Possibilities of using the system of stimulants and destimulants, renowned worldwide that could replace the present »ordinances« are completely ignored, although they could facilitate rational and active use, as well as comprehensive protection of existing building and settlement values.
- Badly understood and too often over-exaggerated problems of new property owners have diminished possibilities for rational long-term planning and gradually achieving comprehensive protection of the existing values. Introduction of civil initiatives or other organised forms (Agency for rehabilitation ...) even in the field of finance and with respect to a necessary transitory period of training the new owners and investors for better joint decision making can redirect the issue into a new quality. However simultaneous expert recommendations have to be given due attention about environmental, culturological, economic and other recommendations for sustainable development.
- Systems of recommendations and licensing for the execution of specific tasks have to be enforced and suitable professional training on all levels ensured.

#### 4. Methodological basis and criteria for determining suitability for rehabilitation

The methodology stands because of the demand, that rehabilitation should enable the acquisition of at least as many surfaces (space) or if possible even more than the existing ones. The cost should not exceed or at least be equal to, the cost of new development increased by the simultaneous cost of necessary demolishing of (dilapidated, outdated) buildings to gain new building sites.

To obtain an overview of the state of all building heritage from the viewpoint of »rational rehabilitation«, two essential goals demanded comparison between rehabilitation and new development of the same category. This was the basis of formulating evaluation criteria:

- estimate of advantages of protection and improvements to the living environment (empirically checked by various

surveys - the estimate is a special recommendation for additional checking if the numerical estimate doesn't allow objective judgement),

- economic considerations of the development and usage of existing resources (actually can be checked by special calculation).

The starting criteria for calculation in Slovenia was the construction cost of a new building with a footprint equal to the existing building that can also reach valid standards from the construction and infrastructure viewpoints. To achieve uniformity investment demands were recalculated according to average site prices (in this way we tried to prevent discrepancies between the cases). The calculation of necessary investment needed to achieve the goals in the framework of rehabilitation provided comparative categories of rationality of rehabilitation (index 1= construction of a new building). The calculation didn't include savings on reuse of existing infrastructure, added value of land and costs of removing (demolition) of existing buildings. These elements were dealt with separately and would of course additionally lower the costs of rehabilitation as compared to new development.

Since expectations and demands differ because of the buildings age and special content (cultural heritage), final estimates had to be additionally tied to the following criteria. These were divided into three main categories:

- investment is lesser than new development (1 category = rehabilitation has the advantage)
- investment is equal to new development (2 category = rehabilitation is recommended)
- investment is higher than new development (3 category = rehabilitation is sensible only after additional checking of other influences or demands: architectural heritage)
- investment is higher than new development, but is insignificant because of special demands in heritage protection conditions (particular exceptional architectural monuments outside any category!).

The results seen from the viewpoint of rational management with space and the existing building stock should condition comprehensive and strategic directions in development decisions, as well as stimulate special considerations concerning investment by the private and especially public sector. They should also cause the specialisation of some builders, the reason why issues concerning quality of renewal were included amongst the criteria.

The research was on cases (samples) conducted according to strict construction and technical criteria by the Institute for researching materials. Particular cases were chosen in Ljubljana, while comprehensive assessment of all buildings was carried out in Škofija Loka and its wider hinterland. The results can be seen in the research paper »Expert guidelines and criteria for establishing rationality of rehabilitation on the levels of settlements, parts of settlements and particular buildings« (P. Fister et al.).

The findings of the research were that in the mid nineties, after a short standstill, a significant change in the ratio between renewal and new development occurred very much in favour of renewal, especially of the housing stock. On one hand it was the consequence of poor strategy (or even policy) for public investment in building homes. On the other it was the marked lack of competent investors in the private sector that would invest in housing construction for the market, competent banks providing adequate loan policies, but above all it

was a consequence of new property circumstances (denationalisation, property as a prime target for investment etc.).

Unfortunately such change of events wasn't always based on real content and market goals of rehabilitation since most of the »renewal« was carried out for unimportant goals: prestige, fashion, momentary placement of capital, even bad market supply of prefabricated homes, roofing, facade materials challenged by experts, but also simple economy. Misuse of the concept »substitute building« presented as renewal (!?) only to obtain site permits, is still rampant. In this way buildings are often executed in completely unacceptable manner, different from the existing or permitted new ones. Moreover the building that should have been demolished usually remains intact and functioning - after all they do possess some quality, especially after minimal investment in their renewal.

The positive change, despite the stated negative occurrences, is growing recognition of the fact that renewal supervised by experts can in reality prove to be efficient and diminish costs. It doesn't necessarily represent only sensible recycling of space or (most often) formal protection of special values of buildings and settlement heritage. All the noted phenomena caused the shift of many builders into renewal (rehabilitation) activities, expert training reintroduced some specialist courses, needed for the activity, loans can be obtained for renewal etc.

The estimate included buildings older than 30 years (some office buildings) and 50 years (residential buildings). 50 years is a short period for a residential building, but certain demands show that it is a period when ideas about possible or even necessary changes become articulate, even because of generation changes, ownership, as well as changes in living or day-to-day standard.

The first estimate from the late eighties of the share of the building stock, seen from different viewpoints as having quality legitimising renewal as the most sensible and recommended type of development or protection was 25 %. Included were all registered and listed monuments. By year 2000 the quantity dropped by 2 %. We can still speak about more than 150.000 homes and almost 30 % of all public buildings, where renewal would have priority in their modernisation or even obtaining new building land.

Industrial and other large production, warehousing or retail buildings weren't included in these figures. By their inherent nature they are not built to last very long (except for buildings built in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and listed monuments of technical heritage). The largest share of buildings where renewal is the most rational future land use lie in urban and village centres, that are simultaneously those parts of settlements where rehabilitation is the prime policy.

In a special analysis dealing with the more important settlements in Slovenia, the need for placing rehabilitation amongst the basic goals of planning development and rational land use was established in more than 700 settlements. In this way the need for preserving continuity of all features giving each settlement their distinct value and uniqueness (by preserving cultural heritage and symbolic, as well as semantic values) was further proven. The analysis was integrated in a research dealing with comprehensive protection of settlement and building values, within the framework of preparations for the new Slovenian spatial plan.

## 5. Rehabilitation methodology, specific to Slovenian conditions

For rehabilitation to be introduced into present practice, three screenplays were played: spontaneous, technological and combined. The first two had numerous drawbacks and since the emergence and competition of both (coupled with additional weakening of either) cannot be expected without adequate measures, the combined screenplay was proposed.

The first condition that has to be met for the combined screenplay, is the strategic conclusion about the rationality, necessity or even essentiality of enforcing the basic goals. These should be proscribed in initial (=national) programmes, that deal both spatial development from the aspects of sustainability, improved quality of the living environment, ecological consciousness and cultural identity.

The combined screenplay is also called »optimal«, because it joins the advantages of the first two, partially known and used screenplays while simultaneously enforcing special measures of comprehensive protection of building and settlement values, as well as cultural heritage in spatial development. The rationale is founded in the special (assessable) value of »architectural identity«, the criterion for establishing basic relationships between natural and created resources on one side and development goals of use and spatial design on the other.

The components of architectural and settlement identity used to evaluate existing buildings, settlement layouts or architectural complexes, or more precisely, components used to present general criteria for future building, have to become an important part of spatial management policies. Their goals are the preservation or establishment of such a living environment, which comprehensively joins the protection of natural and cultural heritage with rational use of all existing spatial values in the present, as well as future.

Certain spatial characteristics of all kinds of buildings or settlement layouts marking their legibility and proving their continuous development, together with particularities, complementing general architectural values in given environments with additional values, are the criteria for assessing the existing state and suitability of the planned.

These aren't catalogues of proscribed shapes or contents, but facilitators of quality development of any environment where preservation of established values is expected, especially those environments where significant architectural identity hasn't been preserved. Since these criteria contain numerous characteristics, values and conditions, ranging from natural to cultural, and their relationships differ in different environments, even in the framework of these particularities separate typical groups of elements can be determined.

Expected possibilities are as follows:

- Rehabilitation of high quality spaces (landscape) and settlement or building heritage will alongside the generally known goals also enforce careful protection of spatial, settlement, building and natural values of all categories as qualitative, environmental, cultural and symbolic criteria for planned spatial management;
- »Rehabilitation of new built structures« will allow rational, environmental, energy efficient, qualitative recycling of the existing stock (settlements, buildings, infrastructure...).

A high level of humanity in scale of design and preservation of the built environment will be established with all its symbolic, artistic and other (unmeasurable) qualities and content of specific environments, besides the basic economic, ecological and technological goals;

- The expected savings are around 20-25 % of the whole needed annual investments to be put in construction (according to experiences from certain European countries and checked with detailed analysis), that could be redirected into higher quality living environments and other investment targets;
- »Rehabilitation of the rehabilitated« with thought-out and constant maintenance and increase in quality of the built and designed space of settlements and buildings, will become a part of development strategy of land use. Instead of giving exclusive advantage to new development it will establish compulsory assessment of rationality of both preserving existing parts of the built-up structure and building new capacities;
- Long-term beneficial effects can be expected, the first checking showed that the time period is tied to the life span of guarantees issued by builders (in Slovenia less than 10 years on average!). Numerically expressed calculations weren't carried out, because future relations to stimulated maintenance are impossible to predict especially concerning ambiguous property relations, undeveloped banking or other types of subsidies;
- In conclusion, the joined screenplays with emphasis on rehabilitation as a planning method for establishing comprehensive protection of building, settlement and spatial values will have a significant effect on rational use of natural and manmade resources. It will also ensure protection of space and all its high quality components and also the diminishment of planning costs needed to accomplish the tasks. We would simultaneously create stimulating and de-stimulating conditions for a significant part of the sustainably oriented spatial use, create certain new possibilities for production and employment and help in harmonising Slovenian with European spatial management.

## 6. Necessary conditions for enforcing rehabilitation as the primary method for settlements with preserved building and settlement values

Rehabilitation has the advantage over new development under the following conditions:

- In settlements with protected areas of cultural heritage planning of protection should be built into the broad task of planning and managing the settlements development with the procedure of protection-development rehabilitation. Thus high quality future development of the settlement can be assured and cultural heritage preserved by either preserving the existing high quality buildings or urban structures or by modernising dilapidated buildings or urban structures.
- If the settlement has older (existing) parts that are dilapidated, of poor quality, wastefully placed etc., rehabilitation can have the advantage over new development in their planned development. It is manifested as reuse of already settled places, built infrastructure, still useful building structure - all with the goal of development of sett-

lement complexes that is rational, economic and even pertaining to the landscape features;

- If the settlement or its constitutive parts that don't have the character of protected heritage, are built in such a way, that their present state cannot allow new, changed, improved uses, rehabilitation has the advantage because of rationalising use and recycling existing capacities. The latter applies to financial savings, savings in energy consumption, established knowledge on the specifics of particular sites;
- To use rehabilitation as rationally as possible as a special method within the framework of planning settlement development, all the previously mentioned criteria have to be checked in (comparable) other environments. The following particularly applies to areas where the concept of rehabilitation has become an undeniable part of spatial development policy. Positive and negative experience has to be respected. New findings or methods, to be used in Slovenia have to be adapted to domestic possibilities, specifics and needs, but also enforced as necessary for comprehensive and rational settlement development (similar experiences can be seen in other environments).

To establish specific methods of planning and executing rehabilitation the experiment must stand in relation to existing practice and legislature, although the later has to be amended with legitimate proposals for new, better criteria.

The following specific types of rehabilitation have to be integrated in the methodology of planned settlement development:

- Rehabilitation, led by conservation experts, is the activity within the framework of conservation, restoration, reconstruction, clearing and revitalisation that is responsible for the preservation of architectural and settlement heritage. Integral protection and corresponding integral rehabilitation imply the future establishment of professionally monitored development of architectural and settlement heritage, that should in a more comprehensive and real manner that present pure conservation, maintain the complex value of heritage.
- Rehabilitation of the landscape emerges from respect for the landscape. It is seen as part of the settled space, important component (extension) of urban settlements, protected space adding to the comprehensive quality of the living environment, as well as a high quality (even economic) starting point for special activities, such as tourism, recreation etc.
- Rehabilitation of new structures, implies the recycling of the existing, already built high quality monument, but not (yet) listed or part of the protected stock, to achieve goals of »sustainable« urban development, gain new contents, new qualities with economically advantageous solutions for urban development.
- Rehabilitation of dilapidated parts of cities (also J. Koželj in: DUA = degraded urban areas), is conducted to rationally use poorly used urban space to improve the content, quantity and ecology by clearing, to complement degraded parts of the settlement with economically beneficial solutions for obtaining new capacities.
- Rehabilitation of the rehabilitated, implies »maintenance rehabilitation«, that simultaneously enables long-term economic benefits and rationality of invested funds into rehabilitation. Its goals are improvements in living standard, an important consideration in »sustainable« planning of urban development.

Reasons enforced as goals in decisions concerning rehabilitation procedures:

- Sensibility of land use and already built capacities, is the main goal in rehabilitation development of settlements. It should be based on real estimates of possible uses, additions or supplements to the existing building stock and infrastructure.
- Cost of acts upon the building stock and elsewhere should be monitored over a longer period and the content determined according to the specifics-of the place. They should be argued for, before the acts ensue, according to a check-list with the following hierarchical scale:
  - Preservation of architectural, settlement, landscape and natural heritage and protection of the harmonious image of settlements and cultural (architectural) landscape are in all cases, where these qualities are recognised as public goods, also the basic definition for establishing economic feasibility of rehabilitation.
  - Economic maintenance has to encompass the scope and expected results in the sense of savings as compared to new development and contents with special goals.
  - Necessity/possibility of rehabilitation or adaptation of the existing stock or infrastructure is legitimate if we achieve savings on space, time, energy, and investment and maintain the special values; comparison applies to the same criteria in substitute building or new development to achieve the same goals.
  - Possibilities/needs for extensions as a principle of rational land use are legitimate, if we can meet expected demands and by doing so do not destroy the high value of protected heritage, deny the qualities of architectural identity or the settlement pattern.
  - Possibilities and limitations for new development was the last level of checking within the framework of rehabilitation and the procurement of new, renewed, adapted or supplemented already built-up spaces.

Prof. dr. Peter Fister, architect, Faculty of architecture, University in Ljubljana E-mail: peter.fister@arh.uni-lj.si

*For sources and literature turn to page 13*