



Studies of Immovable Cultural Heritage Changes in Regional Parks of Lithuania

Aušra Mlinkauskienė

Land Management Center, Department of Architecture and Land Management, Kaunas University of Technology

(received in May, 2010, accepted in June, 2010)

Results of both the legislative analysis and research into the heritage status indicate that the existing heritage protection measures can no longer stop negative changes springing up in this sphere. Real cultural heritage of historical memory and cultural assets, as well as tourism resources and component changes of true identity of cultural landscape, appliance and conservation have never been complexly studied either theoretically or practically not only in Lithuania, but in neighboring states too. Protected areas (Smart 1990, Fairclough 1999, Thomas 2003) have a special status in most countries, if they want to solve this problem. Although theoretical and practical basis establishing protected territories and their network was formed from environmental provisions in Lithuania, however, juridical documents of protected territories evidence that the function of complex protected territories i.e. their conservation, restoration and the use of culturally valuable landscapes and cultural objects is not being performed. After the Restoration of Independence, Lithuania has started to focus more on real cultural heritage in protected territories, especially in regional parks, but the threat of losing the heritage has not disappeared. Neglect of heritage regulation and transformations of juridical basis of protected territories system have a strong impact on the changes in conditions of real cultural heritage in Lithuanian complex protected territories – regional parks. Study results of real cultural heritage in Lithuanian regional parks, their quantitative and qualitative changes educed from test results obtained in the heritage evaluation of proposed sites with reference to a paradigm of real cultural heritage suggested by the author are being discussed in the article.

Keywords: real cultural heritage, monitoring of real cultural heritage, the paradigm of analyzed changes in real cultural heritage, regional park.

1. Introduction

After the Restoration of Independence of our state 30 new regional parks were established in Lithuania. Regional parks occupy 54% (446 thousand ha) of all protected territories and they cover the cultivated landscape areas. According to the International Nature and Natural Resources Conservation Union (IUCN) guidelines national parks are planted due to environmental interests to protect large natural areas, while regional parks – to protect exceptional areas of cultivated landscape, giving priority to the usage and management of landscape values for cognitive recreational needs (Parks 1994).

The use of real cultural heritage under new conditions encourages renovation and even conversion of regional parks. However, innovative

processes are difficult to be combined with the reservation of authenticity, whereas systematic and constant mechanism of monitoring qualitative and quantitative changes of heritage has not been developed yet. Cultural heritage policies and heritage monitoring are still unkept, although the main goal of cultural heritage in protected territories is to preserve the heritage of all detected values and to maintain regional cultural identities, while the main objective in development of protected areas is to protect Lithuanian natural and cultural property and to reach the level of other European countries, also adapting the management of heritage to new economic and social conditions (Valstybinės 2007).

The aim of the article is to discuss protection and usage issues (which would help securing valuable property preservation of real cultural heritage) of real cultural heritage in Lithuanian regional parks, to consider their quantitative and qualitative changes, to rate methodological provisions for heritage changes evaluation based on the monitoring principles.

2. Paradigm of research into real changes of cultural heritage

Conception of real cultural heritage and tendencies to change it. Changes in real cultural heritage can be defined as a fixed physical heritage change with valuable character transformation, deterioration/amelioration of object condition, the change of structure and complexity over time.

A *change* is understood as incidental change being influenced by external and internal factors in tenor. In current Lithuanian language glossary a *change* is defined as a special mutation and recognized in a more linguistic meaning (Dabartinis 2002). Meanwhile, scientific literature usually includes not a concept of change, but actually refers to the interface change in any particular area or subject, for example: climate change, demographic change, social and environmental change, etc. It is noted that the concept of change is often used and well examined in the fields of economy and management, discussing companies' organizational management and their changes being in process (Stoškus 2005). Usually the conception of a term *change* denotes the process of change or action, while *changeover* is *transformation* of specific object characteristics. Changes can be contingent or implemented to improve or even radically to amend one or the other elements, according to the physiognomy of change (Quinn 1980, Magnusen 1981).

Concepts of both *change* and *changeover* are rarely found in heritage conservation, because heritage conservation is based on preservation of its valuable characteristics and its physical state, and the whole cultural heritage in an exterior is treated as a static and unchanging valuable object. Thus, changes in the concept of heritage assume a negative sense, because they are used only when it comes to the loss of authenticity or other valuable features. However, real changes in the cultural heritage are a complex phenomenon that can have both negative and positive consequences of change, where the negative changes of heritage are supported by the destructive intervention, and positive – by the essential interventions (Ashwort 2008).

Changes in real cultural heritage were affected by many factors in Lithuania: economic, social, juridical, and many others, which can be divided into *internal* and *external* effect factors. *External* factors have an effect on *indirect* impact of heritage items, and a general effect, influencing all groups of heritage values. The characteristics of *external* effects are characterized in more *material or physical* object

changes. *Internal* factors have an effect on both *material and physical* heritage object feature changes, *ideological or spiritual* change of significance giving a sense to the object. The *spiritual / ideological* significance of change includes: giving a sense to historical memory; phylotopic value changes; traditional leveling; the flout of ethical elements, the loss of communication with nature and cultural background (Minkevičius 2005), etc.

The analysis of heritage protection system before and after the Restoration of Independence in Lithuania shows the following main provisions:

- Both political and heritage protection activities were ambivalent in Soviet times. The biggest transformations of sacred objects, old seats of manor houses, ethnographic values were sustained during that period.
- Main factors, which influenced heritage changes after the Restoration of Independence, were: noneffective facilities privatization, social-economic conditions, inopportune management, lack of information and education activities, etc.

Analysis of the system of Lithuanian protected areas has revealed that the change of complex protected areas into the heritage status change has been most affected by the processes related to the return of the forest and land to former owners, by intensification of forest exploitation, construction, intervention, flagging administrative procedures and responsibilities, lack of information after the Restoration of Independence. These processes are often taking place in regional and national parks, as well as in under-controlled protected areas of conservational use – reserves.

Source analysis or theoretical studies have shown that the most important *varying elements* of the objects in real cultural heritage are: the object environment, the object and object details, and *variable characteristics* of these elements: authenticity, relevancy, aesthetic appeal and physical condition. Transformation characteristics of variables determine the changes and the importance of cultural heritage as a value (Fig. 1).

There is an essential need of constant change processes evaluation of real cultural heritage and juridical mechanism regulating the processes of a change in an ongoing heritage change processes of various directions. Meanwhile, real heritage change evaluation is neither regulated in Lithuania nor on the international law basis, i.e. there is no definition of cultural *heritage changes* and *change* regulation tools in Lithuanian and international juridical documents concerning the heritage protection sphere. The following factors influencing the changes are being mentioned in the international juridical documents: social, economic, political, and the others, while the national law basis, which should mainly rely on the international documents, has change regulation and change security policies described very vaguely or not mentioned at all. For example: the Immovable Cultural Heritage Protection Act of the Republic of Lithuania defines the management and recovery

(rehabilitation) measures, which could serve the heritage implications of changes in the eradication, environmental monitoring of the Republic of Lithuania, there the Law on Amending the law regulates only the natural elements of change, a part of the landscape (as a whole), but the real culture Heritage as an integral part of the cultural landscape is not covered.

Thus, it can be assumed that in the absence of a real change in the regulatory mechanism of cultural heritage, without realizing the importance of heritage changes, without ensuring the cultural heritage succession of evolution, the objectionable processes concerning the cultural heritage objects will continuously take place in Lithuania.




Fig. 1. Principal model of immovable cultural heritage changes in regional parks (presented by A. Mlinkauskienė)

Evaluation of real changes in cultural heritage.

Landscape changes are identified and evaluated through monitoring. Similarly, fixation of the real cultural heritage changes as an integral part of landscape may be based on the observation (monitoring) principles. Thus, the objective of the key change detection – monitoring is observation of systematic changes, analysis and theory, by studying the environment, evaluating changes of natural conditions and anthropogenic impact changes (Valstybinė 1998).

Real cultural heritage monitoring system can be reasonably attributed to the international activities in Europe – the DEMOTEC (Development of a Monitoring System for Cultural Heritage) program run by the European Union countries. It formally had its start in Norway in 2003 and currently involves many European countries: Norway, Finland, Sweden, Great Britain, Italy, Estonia, Germany and Lithuania. Mentoring powers of this project were given to the NIKU (Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research). The following key components of monitoring, according to this project, were identified by analyzing real cultural heritage:

- *Retrospective monitoring*, when the initial physical condition of an object or area, environmental risk and protective preliminary recommendations are being declared examining archival data;

- *Diagnostic monitoring*, when the objects' "testing" is performed, as well as comparing irregularities of physical condition, environmental impact risk and protection recommendations are being declared;
- *Systematic monitoring*, when the reports with recommendations to heritage protection for five years are being prepared (EU-Project DEMOTEC-A. 2004).

The system of real cultural heritage monitoring has been developed since 1998 in the *Russian Federation*. These on-going investigations and projects are mainly related to the ecological monitoring of real cultural heritage.

A wide variety of documents related to heritage monitoring studies dominate *in the law basis of the Russian Federation: an order: „Об утверждении порядка проведения общероссийского мониторинга состояния и использования памятников истории и культуры“; an order: „Об объектах культурного наследия (памятниках истории и культуры) народов Российской Федерации“*. The latter mentioned with a different name exists in our country, however, article 39 of the Russian act states that regular information updates about the state of the object, periodically monitoring object change must be done during 5-year cycle (Приказ 2002; Федеральный 2002).

Taking the Russian Federation as a model, the object monitoring uses the following analysis mode:

- *Data collection.* In collaboration with the other databases, the information about immovable cultural heritage object that is required for object preservation is being collected (data about the technical condition of the object, protection zones, photo-capture, etc.). The request for information from the other databases is sent, if the supplied data is not sufficient.
- *Data analysis and processing.* Once monitoring assessment value has been added, the project offers on protection regulation are declared;
- *Results report.* In accordance with the monitoring results the corrections are introduced to the information basis.

Meanwhile, the monitoring *information system* of the Russian Federation is based on these information databases:

- National cultural heritage registry;
- Documents selection database;
- Historical-cultural maintenance plan.

Ecological monitoring studies are implemented in all the territory of Russia, clarifying an impact of environmental factors on immovable cultural heritage. The research work „Экологический мониторинг культурного наследия“ was carried out in this way. It was important in methodological basis and practical work which was focused on natural environmental heritage identification and capture (Веденин 1998, Веденин 2004).

Real cultural heritage monitoring was defined in the Lithuanian Real Cultural Heritage Protection Act, which singled out the concept of *observation (monitoring)*, defining it as periodic monitoring, capture of cultural heritage objects and their condition, and *evaluation, generalization* and *prediction* of the destruction/spoliation effects on their valuable characteristics in Lithuania.

Real cultural heritage object monitoring regulations approved in 2005 include cultural heritage object condition assessment of a five-point scale, where the course evaluation status is: *valuable characteristics change, physical conditions change, environmental change* (Lietuvos 2005, Kultūros 2007). However, the detailed evaluation of the methodology does not exist, therefore, it is recognized as subjective, because the evaluation depends on assessor's understanding of valuable heritage objects characteristics and their change as well as physical condition changes.

The initial assessment of real cultural heritage changes in Lithuania was performed in compliance with the UNESCO requirements for heritage objects monitoring. This research is based on the expert's evaluation by filling it in the questionnaire prepared by the committee (Ataskaita 2005) and by implementing fixation of urbanized environments changes. Meanwhile, an assessment of the real cultural heritage changes is not being implemented in the country or in some urbanized territories, there is

no solid monitoring program and no research methodology approved.

The base of the paradigm prepared and proposed in this article for real cultural heritage studies consists of the following parts (Fig. 2):

- preparatory studies – territory selection for the study;
- retrospective monitoring – object selection for the study and analysis of heritage objects archived data;
- diagnostic monitoring:
 - quantitative changes analysis;
 - qualitative changes analysis;
- systemic monitoring:
 - generalization of the results;
 - formulation of conclusions and changes forecast.

Preparatory studies are necessary for the selection of evaluation assessment of real cultural heritage changes territory (territorial research edification). The aim of such studies is to clarify favorable territories for real cultural heritage development, utilization and preservation with reference to the spread of protected complex territories.

The selection of study territorial edificators, depending on the study extent, can be performed in two ways:

- selection of regional park as a territorial study edificator;
- selection of an area in a regional park, as a territorial study edificator.

My intention is to offer to carry on research on real cultural heritage monitoring in those regional parks that match with Lithuanian territories possessing recreational potential; registered real cultural heritage territories and heritage valuables hoard stations. The selection of some area in a regional park, as a territorial study edificator, is based on the local territory which is characterized by a number of registered real cultural heritage and its variety, fixation (based on functional zones separated in a regional park) and selection (based on functional zones separated in a regional park) of the territory in which most heritage objects changes have been recorded.

Retrospective monitoring is based on identification of research objects, on historical data collected on studied heritage objects and on description of their primary physical condition and cultural value.

The research object selection is based on the selection and filing of the heritage objects that are within the national, local (municipal) and regional park.

Diagnostic monitoring is one of the most important stages of real cultural heritage turnover assessment that help establishing quantitative and qualitative heritage changes.

Quantitative changes analysis is based on the fixation of heritage object changes in quantity in the fixed territory. The basis of these studies is:

- data about the heritage object quantity in the studied territory gained during the analysis of archived data;
- revision of heritage objects quantity in the concerned territory.

Qualitative changes analysis is based on the assessment of valuable characteristics and physical condition of the real cultural heritage object in the concerned location and also on the social survey. The changes of heritage object valuable characteristics are being identified by fixation of value changes, whereas the assessment of physical condition is based on identification of the object, its components and its environment physical characteristics.

Systematic monitoring is based on the summary of results and presentation of research data. The summary of results is based on the filing and data-processing methods depending on the type of the research:

- summary of quantitative changes analysis is based on quantitative indicators which are the figures obtained using a mathematical method;
- results of qualitative changes analysis are being processed on the basis of comparative and qualimetric analysis by evaluating qualitative changes quantitatively (Kavaliauskas 1992). Research data are presented in the form of a written report.

Research results on real cultural heritage changes are recommended to record on a digital database.

Systematic supervision and fixation of real cultural heritage objects would prevent a rapid heritage objects decline, and test results would be beneficial for establishment of heritage objects changes, for fixation of valuable characteristics in objects that are on the decline, for identification of objects that are experiencing the biggest quantitative and qualitative transformations, for forecasting heritage objects changes.




Fig. 2. Paradigm of the research into the changes in real cultural heritage in regional parks (presented by A. Mlinkauskienė)

3. Results of heritage changes research

Dynamics of real cultural heritage regulation in regional parks based on their formation stages. The regional park formation after the Restoration of Independence can be divided into the following key stages:

- *1st stage – 1990-1992* – the period of formation and establishment of regional parks. Over this period, when the regional parts were formed, the administrative institutions responsible for protection of regional parks were established, juridical basis was prepared. Division of offices and juridical basis were silhouetted, utilization possibilities of the real cultural heritage were restricted;
- *2nd stage – 1992-2000* – validation of planning schemes, park boundaries and zones developed over the first stage. The focus was on the regional parks planning schemes, determination and validation of the park boundaries and functional zones. During that period the heritage situated in the territory of the regional park was inventoried, its physical and cultural value was fixed. Changes of real cultural heritage objects were not separately recorded, however, during that period the reasons of heritage decline became silhouetted: inopportune management of heritage objects because main attention was given to the specification of its vestigial objects and heritage accountings but not to practical protective activities;
- *3rd stage – 2001-2009* – the approval of regional parks planning schemes, park boundaries and zones corrections. At that stage the main attention was given to the specification of the planning schemes. It is related with the heritage protection peculiarities in the regional parks. During that period on the initiative of the Department of Cultural Heritage discussions were started about the monitoring research of the real cultural heritage objects situated not only in the urban but in rural areas as well.

Research results. After preparatory studies the research territories i.e. regional parks were determined. These protected territories were meant for the development of recreational activities, due to which the heritage objects in these territories are more applicable for today's needs (tourism and recreation). Research into qualitative heritage changes was carried out in the regional parks that correspond with the territories designated on the Lithuanian general plan as territories with recreational potential and cultural heritage collections, i.e. – regional parks of Neris, Varniai, Panemunės, Meteliai, Veisiejai, Salantai and Pagramantis. In the meantime, research into qualitative real cultural heritage changes was done in the regional parks typical of a great amount of constructional heritage, i.e. Dieveniškės historical, Varniai, Salantai and Panemunės regional parks.

Quantitative research into the real cultural heritage objects changes is based on the *analysis of*

archival data and objects revision in the areas. The quantity of real cultural heritage objects that are protected or should be protected and their territorial spread was determined after making archival studies. It has been noticed that the quantity of the real cultural heritage objects included in the national records reduced by 27% after the Restoration of the Independence. Main reasons for these quantitative changes in the regional parks were: prolonged objects inventory, lack of financial support, inopportune objects supervision, inappropriate privatization, the problem of objects utilization.

Quantitative research carried out on the real cultural heritages in the regional parks has shown that most of the registered real cultural heritage consists of archeological valuables. Historical and archeological valuables make less than a quarter of protected objects in the studied parks. The largest part of the protected heritage in these territories consists of “non vital” valuables whose utilization and adaptation is no longer applicable.

The percentage of the heritage objects found in the analyzed regional parks according to the structural components of the real cultural heritage (Fig. 3) are: archaeological – 67% (105 objects); event locations – 2% (3 objects); mythological – 6% (9 objects); burial grounds – 3% (5 objects); constructions – 6% (9 objects); construction belongings – 13, 5% (21 object); building complexes – 2.5% (4 objects).




Fig. 3. Percentage of distribution of registered real cultural heritage in Meteliai, Neris, Panemunės, Salantai, Varniai and Veisiejai regional parks (presented by A. Mlinkauskienė)

There are sixteen thousands objects registered in the Real Cultural Heritage register of the Republic of Lithuania, 7428 (the bias is possible) of which have granted status of nationally protected object. The biggest part – 27% is the archeological objects, and 22.5% - burial grounds. The smallest part of the registered real cultural heritage in the territory of Lithuanian Republic is monuments – 2%.

The registered real cultural heritage situated in the regional parks is not evenly distributed according to the fixed structural components of the cultural

heritage (Fig. 4). It is observed that most of the real cultural heritage registered in the National Register is outside the regional parks areas.




Fig. 4. Quantity of objects listed in Lithuanian SSR monuments list and registered in the Real Cultural Heritage Register of the Republic of Lithuania situated in the studied regional parks (presented by A. Mlinkauskienė)

Qualitative studies about the changes of heritage are based on the objects fixation in the areas. The quantitative evaluation of real cultural heritage was carried out by evaluating changes in valuable features and physical condition of its objects. In addition to these characteristics, the type of property, current utilization, tourism infrastructure and park functional priority area in which the analyzed object was situated were assessed. There was a quality standard set with standard features evaluated by points for determining the result for a qualitative study.

Qualitative (valuable) characteristics of changes of heritage objects were fixed with reference to the comparative analysis: taking into comparison the results of the state study performed in 2002-2004 with the records obtained during the study of the period of 2008-2009. Changes in valuable characteristics were evaluated in points interval from “-4” to “+4”, depending on the nature of the change, i.e. if the condition of the valuable characteristics improved or became worse. Variation of the physical condition of the object was evaluated in points interval from “-3” to “+3”, assessing its positive and negative variations.

It is determined that utilization of the object has a direct influence on the variation of valuable conditions – the greatest changes are recorded in the objects that are not utilized and are vestigial. Then, having applied to the objects a new function for utilization, their valuable features start changing partly. Valuable features of the objects persist best when these objects are being utilized according to their initial utilization function. Tourism infrastructure in the regional parks is valued considering availability of the object, layout of informative stands, object marking and references. It has been noticed that the objects utilized for tourism, recreation and cognitive purposes have better

infrastructure. The possibility of heritage object utilization is also guaranteed in the functional priority zones for its recreational priority or residential purpose. However, most of the valued heritage objects are in conservative priority zones (recreational priority zones make about 10% of all the studied parks area, conservative – over 60%) where their utilization is limited. Physical condition of the heritage objects in the regional parks is mostly moderate, but it is improving when the object is adjusted to any function (not necessarily to the initial one). The physical condition of unused objects is rapidly getting worse. The following relation between the authentic characteristics of the object and its physical condition has been noticed: when physical condition is improving, the condition of authentic characteristics is partly getting worse (as well as the cultural value).

Reasons for real cultural heritage changes.

Following from the studies carried on at the areas, it is established that heritage quantitative and qualitative variations appear due to physiological, i.e. natural and anthropogenic factors. There can be distinguished two ways to make an impact on changing cultural heritage – *direct* and *indirect*, and two groups of factors that influence heritage variation – *external* and *internal*. Heritage objects adjustment for recreation, tourism and cognitive purposes and for meeting and assuring society demands results in the following *positive variation consequences* for the heritage objects situated in regional parks:

- maintenance of the optimal ratio between valuable characteristics and physical condition;
- assurance of the initial or similar to the initial utilization (maintenance of the object viability);
- preservation of historical memory or phytotopic features.

In the meantime in national parks, keeping the heritage object unused, frequent changes of heritage managers, failure to comply with the juridical basis result in *negative variations consequences*:


- loss of valuable characteristics;
- degradation of physical condition;
- loss of psychic sense.

The factors of an internal impact and their influence on the changes of these objects have been

assessed while analyzing qualitative variations of real cultural heritage in the regional parks. It is established that in regional parks the main reasons of qualitative variations of heritage objects are:

- *utilization nature* of the real cultural heritage (Table 1);
- *development of tourism infrastructure*;
- *protection* of the object with reference to the *functional priority zone* of the regional park.

Table 1. Real cultural heritage changes and utilization nature (presented by A. Mlinkauskienė)

Real cultural heritage changes and utilization function		
Object utilization for initial function	Object utilization for the other function	Object is unutilized
<p>Qualitative heritage development (i.e.):</p>  <p>1. Žižmai, Dieveniškės historical regional park, photo by A. Mlinkauskienė, 2004. Granary, object is utilized for the initial purpose (stocks stored).</p>  <p>2. Poškonys, Dieveniškės historical regional park, view to the village from the west side, photo by A. Mlinkauskienė, 2004. Authentic residential function prevails.</p>	<p>Qualitative heritage development (i.e.):</p>  <p>1. Mosėdžio watermill, Salantai regional park, 2009. After restoration the object is adjusted to meet social function – stone museum administrative facilities.</p>  <p>2. Pravydžiai, Anykščiai regional park, photo by A. Mlinkauskienė, 2006. Former school currently applicable for accommodation function.</p>	<p>Heritage object's degradation (i.e.):</p>  <p>1. Bradeliškės watermill, Neris regional park, photo by A. Mlinkauskienė, 2004. Object is not utilized.</p>  <p>2. Former Veisiejai manor homestead, Veisiejai regional park, photo by A. Mlinkauskienė, 2004. A part of the object is not utilized.</p>

4. Conclusions

1. Evaluation of real cultural heritage *variations* in regional parks is an important part of the heritage protection process of today, which helps determine the relation between the *nature of heritage variation, its changing characteristics and its protection and utilization*. The chief means used to identify changes of real cultural heritage in Lithuanian regional parks is quantitative and qualitative analysis of heritage variations based on monitoring, evaluating heritage objects changes in the fixed territory during the span of time..
2. The paradigm has been prepared for the analysis of real cultural heritage changes, and on the

basis of it the evaluation of heritage changes has been performed in eight regional parks. The results have resulted in identification of quantitative and qualitative changes of heritage objects in the periods before and after the Restoration of Independence:

- *quantitative* analysis of real cultural heritage changes in regional parks has shown that the quantity of real cultural heritage objects in national records decreased by 27% after the Restoration of Independence. It is noted that the changing quantity of valuable objects in the landscape changes the visual quality of the cultural landscape.

- assessment of qualitative changes of real cultural heritage in regional parks has determined: within the period of Lithuania's Independence the cultural value of architectural and ethno-cultural heritage objects (manors and "palivarko" homesteads, old rural settlements, granges, single dwellings and farm buildings) has decreased. The mentioned objects have lost their landscape importance and are in danger to decay. The constructions, construction belongings and small architectural objects have changed a lot as to their physical condition.
3. Having completed the analysis of quantitative and qualitative changes of real cultural heritage in regional parks, it is found that the appropriate heritage status changes are caused by the following fundamental factors:
- utilization function of the object,
 - tourism infrastructure,
 - nature of protection of heritage objects in different park functional purpose zones.
4. It is established that heritage utilization vouchsafes the possibility of functioning and quantitative development of these objects. The proposed trends of real cultural heritage utilization are:
- reinstatement of authentic or initial functional purpose;
 - adjustment of the heritage object to the social-commercial function.

It has been also determined that the areas with recreational purposes which nowadays make up only 10% on the average of the whole park area, are more favorable to heritage preservation in regional parks. In this way, it is proposed to increase the areas with recreational purposes in regional parks, the areas where fixed real cultural heritage can be adapted to the needs of today.

References

- Ashwort G., Howard P. Europos paveldas. Planavimas ir valdymas (2008). Vilnius, Versus Aureus.
- Ataskaita apie dalyvavimą UNESCO Pasaulio paveldo ir gamtos paveldo konvencijos antrosios periodinės ataskaitos Europos šalių susitikime. „Ataskaita už Pasaulio paveldą Europoje rengiant veiksmų planui. 2005 m. lapkričio mėn. 8-9 d., Berlynas, Vokietija.
- Bučas J. Kraštovarkos pagrindai (2001). Kaunas, Technologija.
- Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas. IV leidimas (2000). Vilnius, Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- EU-Project DEMOTEC-A (2004). Monitoring and risk assessment of monuments and archeological sites in the Nemi basin, Colli Albani, Italy. Volume 1, Report.
- Fairclough G. Protecting the Cultural Landscape: national designation and Local character // Managing the Historic Rural Landscape, edited by Grenville J. (1999), London, Routledge.

Kavaliauskas P. Metodologiniai kraštovarkos pagrindai. Vilnius: VU, 1992.

Kultūrologinių tyrimų praktikos ataskaita, Salantų RP nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo tyrimai (2003), vadovė A. Mlinkauskienė.

Kultūrologinių tyrimų praktikos ataskaita, Varnių RP nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo tyrimai (2003), vadovė A. Mlinkauskienė.

Kultūrologinių tyrimų praktikos ataskaita, Veisiejų RP nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo tyrimai (2004), vadovė A. Mlinkauskienė.

Kultūros paveldo departamento metinė ataskaita, VII skyrius: nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo saugojimas, 2007 m.

Lietuvos Respublikos Kultūros ministro įsakymas „Dėl nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo objektų stebėsenos taisyklių patvirtinimo“ (2005), Valst.žin., Nr. 86-3242.

Magnusen K. Organization design Development and Behavior (1981). New York.

Minkevičius J. Lietuvos kraštovaizdis kaip tautos dvasios formantas (2005). Konferencija: Lietuvos kraštovaizdžio vizija. Kaunas, Technologija.

Parks for Life. Action of protected areas in Europe (1994), IUCN.

Quinn J. B. Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism (1980). Irwin.

Smart G., Anderson M. Planning and Management of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (1990). Cheltenham, Countryside Commission.

Stoškus S., Beržinskienė D. Pokyčių valdymas (2005). Šiauliai, VšĮ Šiaulių universiteto leidykla.

Thomas L., Middleton J. Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas (2003). Gland, Cambridge, IUCN.

Valstybinė aplinkos monitoringo programa (1998). Lietuvos Respublikos Aplinkos ministerija, Vilnius.

Valstybinės saugomų teritorijų tarnybos prie aplinkos ministerijos nuostatai, [interactive], reviewed 2007, May 14 at www.vstt.lt

Веденин Ю. А. Экологический мониторинг культурного наследия (1998). Москва, Институт наследия.

Веденин Ю. А., Кулешова М. Е. Культурные ландшафты как категории наследия // Культурный ландшафт как объект наследия (2004). Москва-С.Петербург.

Приказ „Об утверждении порядка проведения общероссийского мониторинга состояния и использования памятников истории и культуры“ (2002), Российская Федерация, Федеральный закон, Российская Федерация.

Федеральный закон от 25 июля 2002 года № 73-ФЗ „Об объектах культурного наследия (памятниках истории и культуры) народов российской федерации“, Российская Федерация.

<p>Researcher Aušra Mlinkauskienė, Land Management Center, Department of Architecture and Land Management, Kaunas University of Technology.</p> <p>Main research areas: the analysis of protected territories, evaluation of real cultural heritage changes in protected territories, cultural heritage monitoring.</p> <p>Address: Studentų Str. 48, LT-51367, Kaunas, Lithuania.</p> <p>Tel./Fax: +370 37 451546;</p> <p>E-mail: ausra.mlinkauskiene@ktu.lt</p>
--

Nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo pokyčių tyrimai Lietuvos regioniniuose parkuose

Aušra Mlinkauskienė

KTU Kraštovarkos centras, Architektūros ir kraštovarkos katedra

(gauta 2010 m. gegužės mėn.; atiduota spaudai 2010 m. birželio mėn.)

Teisės aktų analizės ir paveldo objektų būklės tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad esamomis paveldosaugos priemonėmis nebegalima sustabdyti kultūros paveldo negatyvių pokyčių. Teorine ir praktine prasme nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo kaip istorinės atminties ir kultūros turto, taip pat kaip turizmo ištekliaus ir kultūrinio kraštovaizdžio savasties komponento kaitos, panaudos ir išsaugojimo problema nėra kompleksiskai tirta tiek Lietuvoje, tiek ir kaimyninėse šalyse. Sprendžiant šią problemą, daugelyje pasaulio šalių išskirtinis vaidmuo tenka saugomoms teritorijoms (Smart 1990, Fairclough 1999, Thomas 2003). Nors Lietuvos saugomų teritorijų steigimo ir jų tinklo kūrimo teorinį ir praktinį pagrindą sudarė gamtosauginės nuostatos, tačiau saugomų teritorijų teisės dokumentuose nurodoma, kad kompleksinių saugomų teritorijų paskirtis – išsaugoti, atkurti ir panaudoti kultūriniu požiūriu vertingiausių kraštovaizdžio kompleksus bei kultūros objektus. Po Nepriklausomybės atkūrimo Lietuvoje pradėtas skirti didesnis dėmesys nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo išsaugojimui saugomose teritorijose, ypač regioniniuose parkuose, tačiau paveldo nykimo grėsmė neišnyko. Paveldosaugos nuostatų nepaisymas ir saugomų teritorijų sistemos teisinės bazės transformacijos daro stiprų poveikį nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo būklės pasikeitimams Lietuvos kompleksinėse saugomose teritorijose – regioniniuose parkuose. Straipsnyje aptariami nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo kiekybinių ir kokybinių pokyčių regioniniuose parkuose tyrimų rezultatai, kurie gauti atlikus paveldo vertinimą vietose remiantis autorės siūloma nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo pokyčių tyrimo paradigma.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.erep.52.2.71