

근대역사문화공간의 지속적 관리를 위한 조사·계획 체계 구축 방안

Survey and Planning Framework for
Sustainable Management of "Modern Historic-Cultural District"

임유경 Lim, Yookyung

심경미 Sim, Kyungmi

권영란 Kwon, Youngran

방보람 Bang, Boram

(a u r i

Survey and Planning Framework for Sustainable Management of “Modern Historic-Cultural District”

SUMMARY

Lim, Yookyong

Sim, Kyungmi

Kwon, Youngran

Bang, Boram

Discussions on conserving historical towns and architecture have continued with rapid urban growth and higher demand for urban center development. In academia, research on the area management system for effective conservation of the historical environment has been published since the 1990s, which have culminated in earnest discussions from the late 2000s. In August 2018, the Cultural Heritage Administration introduced a system for registering cultural assets by streets or areas and had pursued the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” in connection with urban revitalization and registering areas where historical and cultural assets of the modern era are agglomerated in streets, towns, and landscapes. Access to historic environments that are both a place of historical value and a place for living needs to be approached individually according to the presence of different cultural properties. This study aims to understand the characteristics and limitations of the “Modern Historic-Cultural District,” analyze domestic and overseas systems regarding historic environments, and propose a survey and planning framework for the sustainable management of “Modern Historic-Cultural Districts.”

In Chapter 2, the study reviewed the concept of historic environments through literature review and extracted the main issues of sustainable management of the historic environment. Reviewing the definitions of urban heritage, historic urban landscape, historic town, historic district, modern historic environment, historic urban area, it was

found that these terms initially referred to the surrounding area of cultural properties both in Korea and abroad. This definition broadened to include temporal and spatial boundaries and became expanded in the direction of areas with unique natural and built environment characteristics. This study defines the historic environment not as the surrounding area of cultural property as outlined in The Venice Charter or the Cultural Heritage Protection Act, but as the broader sense of an area where historic and cultural conservation value is high.

Rather than being preserved as it is, the historic environment should be considered an area to be managed where buildings of different cultural values coexist as well as where people carry out their daily lives. Based on the literature review, the main issues of sustainable management of historic districts were found to be area character, managing change, and sustainability. First, the historic environment has area character that extends beyond the historic and architectural characteristics of individual buildings and so the conservation and utilization of these areas should be in the direction of maintaining and strengthening area character. The survey and evaluation phase which helps understand and evaluate the value of the site is important, and new methodologies that reflect the characteristics of the historic environment should be devised. Second, the conservation and utilization of historic environments need to be managed effectively as it differs from preservation, entailing constant changes depending on social needs. All interventions including new construction, extension, renovation and remodeling, need to be done in conserving and strengthening the area character. Third, in order to conserve the value of the historic environment as well as improve the quality of living of residents, the participation of the local community in the decision-making process must be guaranteed to reach social consensus.

As the purpose of the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” lies in systematically conserving and utilizing the historic environment, it is necessary to have a means to appropriately manage change based on the evaluation of area character in view of sustainability.

In Chapter 3, analysis and interviews were conducted on the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” projects of the Cultural Heritage Administration to examine project status, characteristics, and limitations. The “Modern Historic-Cultural District” project was implemented as a pilot project in 2018 which expanded in 2019, followed by a third year competition-based project in August 2020. The pilot project areas were Jeollabuk-do Gunsan, Jeollanam-do Mokpo, Gyeongsangbuk-do Yeongju while the

expanded areas included Jeollabuk-do Iksan, Gyeongsangbuk-do Yeongdeok, and Gyeongsangnam-do Tongyeong. As of September 2020, five areas excluding Tongyeong are in the process of establishing a comprehensive plan for the “Modern Historic-Cultural District.” Reviewing these projects, the study found the following limitations.

First, area character identification and the system of valuation is insufficient. In the bidding for the competition and establishing a comprehensive plan, the study found that the specific survey methodologies and items for investigation to understand the area character and its value were not systemized. This resulted in a large variation in survey results by region. Hence, a survey system and specific guidelines that can be referred to at each stage of the project are needed.

Second, the institutional base is weak. To achieve sustainable management of the “Modern Historic-Cultural District,” a system that provides adequate support for residents who want to conserve and utilize local historic cultural assets, as opposed to regulation-based preservation management, is needed. Property prices may rise due to growing expectations of residents and gentrification may entail.

Third, the consideration for street and area-level registered cultural property characteristics are insufficient. The most prominent feature of the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” is the designation of a district in terms of street and areas, and therefore, its conservation, maintenance, and utilization need to differ from a property-based approach. In addition, the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” is a registered area as well as a part of the existing urban environment, and therefore, requires consideration toward the living areas of local residents as well as the conservation and management of cultural properties.

Last, resident participation is lacking. Active participation of residents is required to ensure the longevity of the “Modern Historic-Cultural District” project and urban regeneration. Through continued education to strengthen residents’ competency, ways of promoting change in resident perception regarding the conservation and utilization of cultural properties, as well as encouraging higher participation should be pursued.

Chapter 4 drew implications from analyzing the system of survey and planning to conserve and utilize historic environments in Korea and overseas. With regards to the domestic system the architecture and urban, cultural properties, and tourism aspects were studied separately, and for overseas systems, the Conservation Area of the UK, the

Historic District of the U.S., and the Heritage Conservation Area of Canada were examined. The evaluation system, conservation and management system, participation and cooperation system were compared and analyzed.

Based on the comparative analysis, the study found that the majority of domestic systems designated areas based on the survey of individual properties and conducted surveys to establish implementation plans in the absence of survey guidelines and forms. In overseas cases, specific guidelines were provided based on the development of area-specific survey methods and evaluation tools, and local provisions were made to prevent changes during the survey period (Canada's Heritage Conservation Area).

In terms of conservation and management, the majority of systems in Korea did not establish a management plan and were concentrated in either preserving and managing the physical environment or managing the non-physical aspects. For architecture and urban projects, the management plan specialized in regulations and special provisions with regards to the physical environment, while others such as cultural properties or tourism-related systems showed an emphasis on non-physical aspects such as manpower training and cooperation systems. In overseas cases, establishing a management plan for historic districts separate from the conservation plan of cultural properties were mandated. Guidelines tailored to the local area were provided, and various institutional mechanisms, such as an agreement system for conservation and management, and finances and incentives, were in place.

In regards to the participation and cooperation system, the central government leads operation in Korea, while local governments take a leading role in overseas cases with the central government supporting the local government. Most domestic systems stipulate the procedure for listening to local residents' opinions during the area designation and planning process. Recently, the role of residents has gained more importance and systems have come to include the formation of resident councils and resident support projects. In overseas cases, it was found that resident participation was recognized to be important not only in the area designation and planning process but also in the survey and evaluation phase. In addition, it was found that the active participation of local residents was promoted throughout the different phases, including the development of design guidelines.

In Chapter 5, based on the analysis of the limitations of the "Modern Historic-Cultural District" and the domestic and overseas case studies, the survey and planning framework

for the sustainable management of these projects was proposed as well as the direction for system improvement.

The “Modern Historic–Cultural District” is where diverse types and styles of modern architecture are agglomerated in large quantities. It is located in the old city center or in the periphery, which is often in decline. There is a demand for change and much discussion of urban regeneration around the area. These areas are part of the urban ecosystem where registered cultural properties, architectural assets that are potential cultural properties, and individual buildings are mixed. Considering these attributes, the basic direction of the survey and management system has been set as follows: first, strengthen the survey to identify area characters; second, establish a management planning system for sustainable management; and third, create an implementation system. In short, the value of the district needs to be properly surveyed through research, and based on this, the cultural properties and districts need to be registered which should be systematically managed.

The survey system for the “Modern Historic–Cultural District” was proposed in three stages: the preliminary survey, basic survey, and an in–depth survey. The preliminary survey is the stage where districts of historical value are identified based on an understanding of the historic urban changes and its current status. The basic survey is where district characteristics and the value of cultural properties are examined. The in–depth survey is the stage of conducting in–depth investigations, surveying architectural assets that could potentially be registered as cultural properties, drawing cultural property conservation and management plan, and district management plan based on the humanities, social and economic considerations of the site. Survey items, in view of the survey stages and the spatial boundary of the project area, have been categorized as ‘surrounding context and area outline,’ ‘district history and current status,’ ‘project area,’ and ‘detailed status.’ The method of survey included literature review, historical material review, maps and aerial photo mapping, spatial information, and site investigations. The research suggested appropriate research methods and data for each survey item.

The survey results serve as the basis for drawing area character and evaluating the value of the site. Area character can be divided into the humanities, social and economic aspects, physical aspects, and urban and periodic aspects. In order to register cultural properties, the value of the local area is evaluated. However, as the existing cultural

property registering criteria has limitations to properly assessing the “Modern Historic–Cultural District,” the research presented additional spatial, landscape, place–making, and conservation standards.

In order to continuously manage “Modern Historic–Cultural Districts,” the study suggested that district–level management is needed separate from the comprehensive maintenance plan established for the project area. Currently, in the majority of cases, the boundary of the “Modern Historic–Cultural District” is drawn as the minimum area connecting individual registered cultural properties, and thus a broader area needs to be managed to maintain the characteristics and values of the area. Means for management include existing district–level plans such as land–use plan, district unit plan, architectural asset value enhancement management plan, cultural district management plan, and special streetside district. The “Modern cultural heritage district utilization plan’ outlined in the draft of the “Modern Cultural Heritage Conservation and Utilization Act” initiated in the 20th National Assembly, is also applicable, but the current provisions (draft) mainly consist of the use of individual properties, and hence, future adjustments are needed. The contents of the management plan should include regulatory matters, special cases, and deregulation, financial and technical support, similar to the historic district unit plan and architectural asset value enhancement district management plan, but also include selective planning elements that consider area character.

It is of utmost importance that an implementation system is set for the survey and planning framework of “Modern Historic–Cultural Districts.” The proportion of parcels where individual registered cultural properties are located in the “Modern Historic–Cultural District” are less than 5%, and therefore, construction activities on private parcels are a prime factor that determines the character of the district. In order to conserve the value of the districts, individual projects must conform to the direction of conserving the area character. For this purpose, financial support for individual construction activities, education and promotion programs to induce the participation of residents, and a monitoring system that ensures the sustainability of place as a key area and lived space is required.

In order to implement the suggested survey and planning framework, it is necessary to define the modern historic cultural district conceptually and institutionalize the survey and planning framework in laws related to cultural properties. Also, for district–level management, ways to connect with urban and architectural laws need to be sought, and

detailed guidelines for survey and planning need to be in place.

This study established the main issues of sustainable management of historic environments, defined the characteristics of the “Modern Historic–Cultural District” and proposed the survey and planning framework for sustained management. The results of the study can be used as a reference for understanding the “Modern historic cultural district” projects and establishing project plans by local governments that are conducting a survey or establishing management plans in the selected project areas or are preparing for a new bid. In particular, the pilot survey conducted in the area of Hyanggyo-ro in Paldal-gu, Suwon City may be used in setting the direction of the survey for future modern historic cultural areas.

This study conducted a pilot survey limited to a single site. In particular, Suwon City is an area where much historical research of the urban area has accumulated. While this study suggested the basic survey framework and method considering data availability, and have specified data that can be obtained nationally, the design of survey items and methods may vary depending on the large discrepancies in the amount of data and data quality by region. Research on modern urban formation classification and in-depth investigations of various areas with potential for “Modern Historic–Cultural Districts” designation should follow. The value evaluating method of “Modern Historic–Cultural District” briefly mentioned in the study should also be followed up through further research.

Although the survey and planning framework for the “Modern Historic–Cultural District” has been suggested, the study has limitations in that specific system improvement plan that applies to the current system was not derived. Hence, follow-up studies that tackle the amendments to the law and establishing a survey and planning framework guidelines are needed.

Keywords :

historic environment, sustainable management, Modern Historic–Cultural District, survey and planning framework, management plan