

digital cultural heritage: FUTURE VISIONS

Edited by Kelly Greenop and Chris Landorf

Papers presented at the *digital cultural heritage: FUTURE VISIONS* Conference
19–20 April 2017 in Brisbane, Australia
<http://digitalculturalheritageconference.com/>

Cimadomo, G (2018)
**Heritage as an asset. How to involve local communities
in the protection of cultural heritage.**

In K Greenop and C Landorf (eds) *Proceedings of digital cultural heritage:
FUTURE VISIONS*. Brisbane:
Architecture Theory Criticism History Research Centre,
School of Architecture, The University of Queensland,
pp 111.

The following is published as an abstract only. The full paper is currently being developed
for submission to an academic journal for a special edition on digital cultural heritage.

ISBN 978-0-646-98233-5

© 2017 *digital cultural heritage: FUTURE VISIONS Conference*, Brisbane, Australia

Copyright for the proceedings belongs to the Architecture Theory Criticism and History Research Centre at The University of Queensland. Copyright for the abstracts and papers contained in these proceedings remains the property of the authors. Copyright of images in these proceedings belongs to the authors, or the images appear with permissions granted to those authors. Individual authors were responsible for obtaining the appropriate permission to reproduce any or all image published in the proceedings. The editors and the publisher accept no responsibility if any author has not obtained the appropriate permissions.

Other than fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of these proceedings may be reproduced by any process without prior permission from the publishers and authors.

The convenors of the *digital cultural heritage: FUTURE VISIONS Conference* acknowledge the generous support and sponsorship of the Architecture Theory Criticism and History Research Centre at The University of Queensland and the Ian Potter Foundation. Thank you also to the peer reviewers who gave their time and expertise to the refereeing of papers, the State Library of Queensland who hosted the event, and Carmen Armstrong who provided invaluable project management support.

The papers published in these proceedings are a record of the conference mentioned on the title page. They reflect the authors' opinions and, in the interests of timely dissemination, are published as submitted in their final form without change. Their inclusion in this publication does not necessarily constitute endorsement by the editors.

Editors: Kelly Greenop and Chris Landorf

Design and Production: Mark Fletcher

Publisher: Architecture Theory Criticism and History, The University of Queensland

The Conference Convenors received a total of 44 abstracts. Abstracts underwent a double-blind peer review by two members of the Conference Organising Committee. Authors of accepted abstracts (32) were invited to submit a full paper. All submitted full papers (18) were again double-blind peer reviewed by two reviewers. Papers were matched as closely as possible to referees in a related field and with similar interests to the authors. Sixteen full papers were accepted for presentation at the conference and a further 6 papers were invited to present based on submitted abstracts and work-in-progress. Revised papers underwent a final post-conference review before notification of acceptance for publication in these conference proceedings.

Please note that papers displayed as abstracts only in the proceedings are currently being developed for submission to a digital cultural heritage special edition of an academic journal.

Guido Cimadomo

Departamento Arte y Arquitectura. Universidad

Heritage as an
asset. How to
involve local
communities in
the protection of
cultural heritage

Abstract

The 'Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society' can be considered a turning point in the role of communities in the protection of Cultural Heritage. It emphasises the value of cultural heritage and its potential for wide use as a resource for sustainable development and quality of life in a permanently evolving society; and it also reinforces social cohesion by fostering a sense of shared responsibility for the places in which people live. Technologies have improved citizens' networks and mobility and offered the possibility of actively engaging communities in public policies from the beginning. Anyway, their use in Cultural Heritage processes has not been widely explored. The paper, built on a handful of critical observations and literature reviews, first looks at several rehabilitation experiences in Spain where community participation has not been taken into account. Another group of international experiences where community participation has been promoted through the use of digital tools based on social networks, suggests that new imaginative solutions can be found. They demonstrate not only how easy it could be to engage communities in safeguarding cultural heritage at risk, but also how disruptive lack of involvement could be. Heritage is definitely more than the sum of recognised objects and has to be approached as a territorial system where the relationship between the physical heritage and human actions constitutes an integral whole. The use of digital tools such as social networks in the case studies presented, made it possible for these projects to obtain wide participation of individuals not active in heritage conservation and not always related with the stakeholders involved. When it is given the opportunity, community engagement is fast and proactive with important payback towards an increased sense of place and a strong sense of belonging, which rebounds on built heritage. Finally these latter experiences offer several key points worth taking into account for similar implementations in other contexts.

Keywords: Cultural heritage; common; community participation; digital heritage



THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

**school of
architecture**

a | t | c | h

Architecture
Theory
Criticism
History