Research Repository UCD

Title	Defining 'Official' Built Heritage Discourses within the Irish Planning Framework: Insights from Conservation Planning as Social Practice
Authors(s)	Parkinson, Arthur, Scott, Mark J., Redmond, Declan
Publication date	2015
Publication information	Parkinson, Arthur, Mark J. Scott, and Declan Redmond. "Defining 'Official' Built Heritage Discourses within the Irish Planning Framework: Insights from Conservation Planning as Social Practice" 24, no. 2 (2015).
Publisher	Taylor and Francis
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/8678
Publisher's statement	This is an electronic version of an article published in European Planning Studies 24(2): 277-296 (2015). European Planning Studies is available online at: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09654313.2015.1077782 .
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1080/09654313.2015.1077782

Downloaded 2023-04-07T10:52:29Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information

Defining ‘official’ built heritage discourses within the Irish planning framework: insights from conservation planning as social practice

Arthur Parkinson*, Mark Scott, Declan Redmond

School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy, University College Dublin, Ireland

*Author for correspondence, email: arthur.parkinson@ucd.ie

This is the Accepted Version of this manuscript. The Version of Record has been published and is available in *European Planning Studies*, 2015. <http://www.tandfonline.com/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1077782>

Abstract

Conservation of built heritage is a key planning process and goal which shapes urban development outcomes across European cities. In Ireland, conservation of the built heritage is a key part of the planning framework, albeit one that is, in comparative terms, only recently established. While it is widely recognised that the underlying rationale for conservation of built heritage varies considerably (from cultural priorities to place marketing), the literature suggests that heritage and conservation professionals perform a key role in controlling decision making through an official or ‘authorised’ heritage discourse, emphasising expert values and knowledge and based around selective heritage storylines often reflecting elite tastes. Drawing on policy and practice in Ireland, in this paper we contribute to these debates by further unpacking the ‘authorised’ heritage discourse, exploring tensions within the heritage policy elite through examination of competing views and representations relating to the purpose of built heritage protection. Based on a discourse analysis following interviews with key national actors, we identify two key narratives – a ‘museum-curatorial’ discourse and an ‘inclusive heritage’ discourse – which in turn frame conservation practices. We argue that subtle variations of heritage meanings have the potential to either reproduce (museum-curatorial discourse) or challenge (inclusive heritage discourse) conventional modes of practice, particularly relating to the relationship between built heritage and identity and the role of public engagement.

Key words: built heritage; conservation; discourse; conservation planning; Ireland

Introduction

Conservation of built heritage has become firmly established as a central planning goal within the management of contemporary urban space. As While (2007, p. 646) observes, although there increasingly appears to be a societal consensus surrounding the value of preserving buildings of recognised significance for the wider public good and for future generations, “questions about what precisely should be protected, why, and in what form, are much less clear cut”. While the literature acknowledges competing rationalities and narratives framing conservation policy, such as preservation based on cultural values (While, 2007) or nostalgia (Carmona, 2014), conservation to foster place identity (Graham and Howard, 2008), or conservation as a tool for urban regeneration (Pendlebury, 2002), it is often assumed that a so-called heritage policy elite can be identified with an agreed discourse and policy priorities. In this context, Smith (2006) suggests that heritage professionals are able to control decision-making through an ‘authorised’ heritage discourse, whereby groups of policy actors group around specific and often selective storylines of cultural built heritage, with an emphasis on expert/technical language and knowledge.

The aim of this paper is to contribute to debates surrounding the role of authorised heritage discourses in shaping urban planning and development outcomes. The focus is on built heritage conservation policy in Ireland, which provides an interesting and complex case due to: its rich built environment heritage as a legacy of colonialism; an often uncritical pro-development and anti-planning ethos; and a relatively recent establishment of built heritage policy, with specific planning legislation for architectural protection only introduced in 1999. While Ireland’s postcolonial context plays an important part in built environment representations, this is not explicitly addressed in this paper as we focus on this theme elsewhere (*reference to be inserted after peer review*). In this paper we provide a top-down perspective of national-level policy makers and actors and the extent to which an official heritage discourse exists and the role this performs in shaping how actors engage with conservation as social practice within the spatial planning arena. Therefore, we focus on

tensions *within* the heritage policy elite through examining competing views and representations relating to the purpose of built heritage protection, which in turn frames professional actors' attitude towards the role of the public in planning for built heritage and to the wider role of conservation within place-making strategies.

We identify two key narratives that view built heritage in fundamentally different ways: firstly, the preservationist or 'museum-curatorial' building-specific approach; and secondly a more embrative – but equally legitimate – approach, which sees the heritage object as subject to a wider set of concerns, encouraging a democratisation of built heritage. We seek to reveal, analyse and understand the implications of the competing discourses that can underpin planning conflicts in managing the built environment and heritage. To achieve this, a series of in-depth semi-structured interviews have been conducted with key national policy actors, with critical discourse analysis employed to reveal the role of discourse in maintaining patterns of power and inequality. Accordingly, the remainder of the paper is structured as follows: firstly, we locate the discussion within the literature on discourse analysis and its usefulness in understanding planning for built heritage. Secondly, we provide a brief overview of conservation planning, policy and practice in Ireland. Then, we outline our research methodology and structure our results under the following headings: (1) heritage professionals and 'museum-curatorialism'; (2) experts and non-experts: narratives of exclusion; and (3) an inclusive shift in the authorised heritage discourse? Finally, we develop conclusions with wider significance for built heritage conservation within urban planning and place-making strategies.

Understanding discourse and built heritage

This paper draws on discourse or interpretive analysis to examine the extent to which an 'official' built heritage discourse can be identified in Ireland and to explore how this frames or shapes built heritage conservation as policy and practice as discourses become institutionalised within the planning arena. Discourse analysis suggests that the basis on

which people make sense of the world is social and linguistic in nature, and recognises the importance of the way in which policy problems are constructed and related to the rest of the policy process, particularly to the nature of the solutions proposed (Hastings, 1999). Jacobs (1999) contends that interpretive and discursive approaches to policy analysis emphasise that policy decisions constitute a setting where different groups compete to establish a particular version of ‘reality’ in order to pursue their objectives. Therefore, the methodological assumption is that these conflicts are revealed in texts and speech as well as in the actions of individuals, interest groups and government agencies. In relation to built heritage conservation, discourse analysis potentially enables the research to ‘reveal’ how policy actors and agencies have constructed and interpreted various meanings of heritage and therefore ‘frame’ both analysis of heritage problems, the identification of priorities and proposed policies. Furthermore, as Hastings (1999, p. 91) argues, discourse analysis of language used by individuals is useful in “identifying instances of the exercise of power”, and particularly “ways in which power is being exercised which may not be apparent to or acknowledged by those involved”.

Discourse analysis, therefore, provides a means of delving beneath the more superficial values and meanings of what is said or written. Building on this, and Foucauldian concepts of power, knowledge and discourse, Fairclough (1989, 2010) has posited the theory of a dialectical relationship between discourse and ‘social practices’ as the framework for what he calls ‘critical’ discourse analysis (CDA). The relationship is dialectical because discourse is shaped by social practices and – more significantly in the context of this paper – discourse can contribute to the shaping of social practices, and the reinforcement and transformation of power relations. More specifically, Fairclough argues that discourse/language plays a part in social practices in three broad inter-dependent ways, as illustrated in table 1 and developed in relation to built heritage debates.

<Insert table 1 about here>

Together, these three dialectically-related elements form an ‘order of discourse’ (see Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 71-73 after Fairclough, 1995), e.g. an authorised heritage discourse (Smith, 2006). This is the discursive (semiotic) dimension of social practices, through which a discourse coalition exercises power to create or consolidate a policy network. Parallel analysis of text/language, discursive practices (the three elements of discourse in table 1), and their relationship with social practice can therefore provide insights into the role that the discourse of different actors plays in shaping conservation planning. In other words, the analysis derives interpretations from the interview material by considering how each of the three elements of discourse in table 1 figure in conservation planning. In this paper, we employ a CDA to examine the extent to which built heritage policy actors group around discursive claims, ‘storylines’, or ‘narratives’, to create or consolidate a policy network, termed by Hajer (1993) as a discourse coalition. A narrative is a particular construction of text or language within the interviews, potentially containing the three elements of discourse in table 1, which hold the potential to shape conservation planning as social practice.

At this point, it is important to set out a number of key limitations that must be borne in mind when conducting research through CDA. Firstly, CDA cannot reveal all of the forces that shape conservation planning. In particular, Fairclough (2010) argues that while economic forces and socio-political institutions are partly semiotic (discursive) in nature, they are also partly non-semiotic. So, while the approach can reveal useful insights in relation to the discursive elements of these, it cannot reveal the role of the non-discursive forces they also exert on conservation planning outcomes. Pendlebury (2013) makes the similar observation that a discursive perspective tends to ignore other forces that can shape conservation planning, such as broader social movements, or other external pressures unrelated to discourse. For example, the tourism market, or micro- or macro-economic forces may shape both the authorised heritage discourse, and conservation planning outcomes, but CDA cannot reveal their full effect. The second key limitation of CDA is that it cannot disentangle what

different, potentially multiple, motivations lie behind particular utterances. Related to this, CDA also cannot definitively determine whether the effect of a particular utterance is inadvertent or intentional. However, the power-enforcing action of the discourse is the same regardless of the specific motivations and/or intentionality. Therefore, despite these limitations, but bearing each of them in mind, CDA is still useful, specifically to identify the role of discourse in shaping conservation planning.

The authorised heritage discourse

Heritage is a key aspect of policy regulating the built environment, with conservation practitioners enjoying a longstanding overarching technical remit and privileged knowledge within built heritage decision-making within the planning arena, with various examples in the literature of ‘experts’ able to control decision-making through an authorised heritage discourse – the expert account of the heritage story (Smith, 2006; Waterton et al., 2006). In this context, Waterton and Smith (2010) argue that dominant political, professional and academic practice in heritage have adopted particular narratives and meanings related to heritage, underpinned by the assumptions of these expert groups. Moreover, these expert narratives of built heritage often reflect dominant elite interests in society, leading to a prioritisation within conservation planning that reflects elite tastes and values, for example the interests of a small group of enthusiasts in 19th-century Britain (Pendlebury et al., 2004), or the dominance of middle-class interests in contemporary Britain (Waterton and Smith, 2010).

Graham (2002) therefore argues that built heritage decisions are value judgements, made on the basis of one set of subjective and contestable values. However, subordinate groups in society do not possess the specialist knowledge to meaningfully participate in heritage discourse or, put another way, they have insufficient social and cultural capital to engage substantively or to influence those who define official notions of heritage. In this unequal context, Waterton et al. (2006) contend that heritage experts use their expert-knowledge to maintain their position of power through an authorised heritage discourse,

which becomes routinized and institutionalised in policy and practice. Though heritage experts may use their expert knowledge to reinforce their own power-position deliberately, Waterton et al. further argue that this also happens inadvertently. Even with the best of intentions, the *expert* nature of the authorised heritage discourse – and therefore *exclusionary* nature – prevents parity of engagement between experts and non-experts. So, in situations where state or professional representations of heritage are different from those of other groups in society, and where alternative values and priorities are not understood, these may not be properly represented in policy.

While much of the literature suggests that heritage decisions are framed by an ‘official’ discourse that is contested and power-laden (Smith, 2006), it would be wrong to uncritically assume that the heritage community operates within only *one* authorised discourse, rather than to varying degrees being influenced by, and participating in multiple discourses. Similarly, to assume that the heritage community is entirely and exclusively coincident with one authorised heritage discourse would be a mistake: the discursive territory is complex. Nevertheless, the above discussion has implications for social justice and the democratic credentials of heritage policy and practice within the wider spatial planning system. In this paper we argue that, drawing on the Irish experience, while national policy actors share expertise and values, there are subtle variations of heritage meanings that have the potential to reproduce or challenge conventional modes of planning practice, particularly relating to the relationship between built heritage and identity and the role of public engagement.

Built heritage and the Irish planning system

There are two principal sets of legislation concerned with the protection of built heritage in Ireland: the National Monuments Acts 1930-2004 (DAHG, 2014), a long established legislative framework that deals with archaeological heritage independently of the planning system, and the more recently established Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)

(Government of Ireland, 2000; DECLG, 2014), dealing with architectural heritage. The National Monuments Acts 1930-2004 apply solely to the protection of archaeological heritage, or *monuments*, the definition of which is extremely broad, and is not confined to a specific time period, but have customarily tended to date to before 1700.

In contrast to many European states, the system for architectural heritage protection in Ireland is relatively new, with specific protection policies established as late as 2000. While the Irish planning system was established in the 1960s, an absence of conservation measures perhaps reflected a perceived lack of development pressures in an underperforming economy (at least until the so-called Celtic Tiger era from the mid-1990s) and a wider political prioritisation of development and the pursuit of economic goals through the planning system. In relation to the contemporary protection and management of architectural heritage, the system is administered by local planning authorities through the development control system. The operation of the planning system is legislated for in the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) – a consolidation of the Local Government (Planning and Development) Acts 1963-1999 (DECLG, 2014). The 1999 Act, was seminal in making architectural heritage protection mandatory for the first time. It owes its existence to the 1985 Granada Convention (Council of Europe, 1985), to which Ireland was a signatory, and which Ireland ratified in 1997 (Council of Europe, 2014). Stemming from the Granada Convention, the report entitled *Strengthening the Protection of the Architectural Heritage* (DACG, 1996) formed the basis for the broader framework for architectural heritage protection, notably recommending: (1) a centralised heritage advisory service; (2) recording of a nationwide inventory of architectural heritage and, most notably, (3) mandatory listing of buildings by planning authorities.

Arising from the above report, the Heritage Act 1995 (Government of Ireland, 1995), established a centralised heritage advisory service whose principal built heritage responsibilities have now been split into the National Monuments Service (DAHG), and the Built Heritage and Architectural Policy Section of the present DAHG. The Heritage Act,

1995, also established the Heritage Council, a new body concerned with both built and natural heritage, with a mission is “to engage, educate and advocate to develop a wider understanding of the vital contribution that our heritage makes to our social, environmental and economic well-being” (Heritage Council, 2014). The National Inventory of Architectural Heritage was established on a statutory basis in 1999 (Government of Ireland, 1999), now under the Built Heritage and Architectural Policy Section of the DAHG, and is nearing the completion of a programme of County Surveys.

In addition to the above measures, mandatory protection of architectural heritage was implemented through Part IV of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. This is achieved through designation of Protected Structures in local authority Development Plans, defined as “any building, structure, excavation, or other thing constructed or made on, in or under any land, or any part of a structure so defined” (Government of Ireland, 2000, PT.I, S.2(1)), adjudged to be worthy of protection according to eight categories of “special interest”: Architectural; Archaeological; Artistic; Cultural; Historical; Scientific; Social; and Technical. (DAHG, 2011, p. 24). Notably, structures included on a Record of Protected Structures (RPS) are not graded according to varying levels of significance, as in the UK. The 2000 Act also makes provision for a local authority to designate Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) under its Development Plan where it is deemed necessary to “preserve the character of a place, area, group of structures or townscape” (Government of Ireland, 2000, PT.IV, S.81(1)). The Development Plan (including the proposed RPS and any proposed ACAs) must be adopted through a vote by local elected representatives in order to come into force.

Under Part IV of the 2000 Act, any alterations deemed by the local authority to affect the character of a Protected Structure, or any alterations to the exterior of a structure deemed to affect the character of the ACA, require planning permission unless the local authority has determined otherwise via procedures set out in legislation. Part IV of the 2000 Act also confers a duty of care on “owners and occupiers to protect structures from endangerment” (Government of Ireland, 2000, PT.IV, S.58), and grants local authorities extensive powers of

enforcement. As with the initial implementation of a wider development control system in the 1963 Act, mandatory architectural heritage protection once again created a new tension between the perceived public good and the individual private property right. However, building owners are not generally entitled to compensation for refusal of planning permission due to heritage interest, except in very limited specified circumstances. Nevertheless, the Act includes provision for grants to assist owners of Protected Structures with the cost of compliance. A review of Part IV of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 is currently ongoing, examining “the effective operation of the existing code”, and is not intended to be “a fundamental review” (Deenihan, 2011).

Research approach

Semi-structured qualitative interviews were chosen to allow in-depth exploration of specific research questions with national conservation policy actors. The interviews were based around a series of inter-related themes to investigate how policy actors negotiate and operate within a built heritage policy terrain within the overarching planning policy framework, particularly focusing on (competing) representations and narratives of built heritage deployed by policy actors in the pursuit of particular interests, to frame action, practice and policy. Key interview themes included: heritage perceptions of elite actors; self-view of the heritage establishment; heritage conflicts; competing narratives of heritage; rationale for heritage policy; and the public’s role. Informants were chosen from the group of elite actors involved in defining built heritage discourse at a national level. This group included government departments and bodies (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Heritage Council, *An Bord Pleanála* – the national planning appeals board, Office of Public Works); statutory and professional planning, architectural and heritage bodies (Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland, Irish Planning Institute, Third-level education, Private Practice, ICOMOS – International Council for Monuments and Sites); and voluntary campaigning organisations (Irish Georgian Society, *An Taisce* - The National Trust for Ireland, Irish Heritage Trust). In

total, twenty-eight potential participants were contacted and eighteen interviews were undertaken.

The research also made use of the visual sociological technique of photo-elicitation. When used alongside traditional semi-structured interview questions, photo elicitation can more effectively reveal informants' views on the intangible qualities of place (Tweed et al., 2002; Tweed and Sutherland, 2007; Stewart et al., 2004; Van Auken et al., 2010). The photographs also help to break down differences in power, class and knowledge between the interviewer and the informant. Van Auken *et al.* point out that, where photographs are selected by the researcher, results may be less accurate than those which would be obtained from informant-selected (or taken) photographs. However, informant-selection of photographs has not been attempted here due to resource limitations. Nevertheless, despite this, the technique is still of considerable utility in eliciting discussion that would not have arisen in the absence of photographs. In this paper, the technique is particularly useful with respect to heritage values in general – and especially when discussing those of the wider public – which not everyone, even amongst the so-called 'expert' group, may have the knowledge, understanding and competence to elucidate. Semi-structured interviews were complemented by a series of twenty-two photographs aimed at eliciting information relevant to the research themes outlined above. Some verbal prompts were included alongside these photographs, but without at first explicitly stating the topic concerned, so as to provide some structure, but to leave interpretation as open as possible to the informant. Table 2 contains an example of the photographs used in interviews, an explanation of what this photo intends to elicit, and the prompts that were used when necessary.

Coding of the interview material did not seek to identify specific words or phrases that related to the key research themes, but how informants shaped particular interactions, how they represented the social and physical environment, and how their discursive style/identity tended to shape conservation planning outcomes. In practice, this means that the underlying meaning and resultant effect of the language is examined, rather than enumerating

particular words or phrases. Coding was therefore carried out through a manual iterative process of reading through the transcripts. Though codes were applied to utterances that related to the above research themes, these were grouped into informant-generated categories. Therefore, where codes reappeared frequently, this can begin to indicate that a particular category is in some way shared, and conclusions can begin to be drawn. However, the discussion in this paper does not only relate to the categories most frequently evidenced in the interviews, but also to conflicts and dissenting voices, which may be fewer in number, but which also relate directly to the key research themes above. The discussion below is broken down according to the informant-generated categories that arose from the process of analysis. Within each section, sub-themes are analysed and discussed in relation to the hypothesis that competing representations of heritage can underpin disagreement in planning for the historic built environment. Each informant is referred to by a codename (e.g. N2) to protect his or her identity.

<Insert table 2 about here>

Heritage professionals and ‘museum-curatorialism’

It is significant though not surprising that, in ten cases, professional architectural values were the focus of informants concerns and, most notably, authenticity of material fabric and physical architectural details. For example, informant N4’s rhetoric repeatedly emphasised architectural design significance, and contempt for competing priorities. In relation to an unprotected 19th-century house in Dublin, altered beyond recognition, informant N4 said,

I think that’s a monstrosity. [laughs] And I think the person who did it should be taken out and shot! And these windows as well [points to modern aluminium windows]. (N4)

Informant N4 was also enthusiastic about the ‘eating parlour’ in the 18th-century Headfort House, Co. Meath, ‘what really is one of the very greatest rooms in the country.’ In both comments, the heritage interest stems from specialist qualities that non-experts may have difficulty relating to fully. Specifically, the plasterwork in Headfort House is unique and of interest to heritage experts internationally. In contrast, informant N12 was strongly critical of a policy emphasis on architectural details, and suggested that some are obsessed with minor details, on which only the expert group places a high value. This reflects a variety of opinion, and informant N12’s own professional background (as neither an architect nor heritage campaigner).

There was also explicit prejudice expressed by four informants against consideration of reasons for ascribing heritage protection other than architectural – even where those reasons are already enshrined in legislation. For example, informants were shown a photograph of the house at 16 Moore Street, Dublin – a national monument and protected structure most notably of historical importance (though also of some less well-known architectural interest internally). The historical interest arises because the leaders of the 1916 Easter Rising (an armed republican insurrection against British rule) surrendered to British forces from 16 Moore Street (Townshend, 2006). Informant N16 was particularly outspoken about the notion of protecting the building at 16 Moore Street:

N16: Yea, well, that’s always been a funny one, in my view.

INT: Should the building be protected?

N16: From what, like? ... There’s nothing else to be done with it, other than just leave it there. So it’s a waste of resources. ... I’m not somebody who necessarily believes that everything that has had a significant past has to be retained. And, eh, so, if somebody says, ‘oh! It was a place where the 1916 people were hanging out, or did this, and that, and the other.’ I say well, right, ok. Now, what does that mean in terms of this floor and this wall [said in tongue in cheek manner]? You know? I’m not so sure. I’d like to hear that argument made.

The discourse here is strongly focused on architectural matters and the dismissive tone downplays the opposing view, which sees the building as being of value due to the significant historical events that took place there. However, this is indicative of the views of at least ten (a majority) of the group. Though there is variation in opinion and approach amongst the entire group, the dominant influence of a relatively narrow set of professional values in heritage decision-making is evident. In some cases, this may result in a lower likelihood that competing, non-expert priorities will be taken into account in heritage decision-making.

In contrast to this focus on material fabric and physical architectural details, eleven informants very specifically contended that conservation planning and practice in Ireland is too narrowly focused, and needs to be more holistic, as encapsulated by informant N11:

... there's a move away from specialisms and towards looking at heritage holistically, ... so not just about conserving an old building and how you think about places, as opposed to just buildings. (N11)

Specifically in relation to built fabric, the narrative of informant N2 portrays conservation as having two conflicting 'traditions' – two discourses – each of which sees heritage in fundamentally different ways: the preservationist (perhaps 'museum-curatorial') building-specific approach, and an inclusive approach to heritage and conservation, which sees the heritage object as subject to a wider set of concerns:

[Conservation] was too legalistic; it was – probably to some extent – was not embracing enough of the context of conservation. ...the idea of urban fabric and so on, it's become too object-specific; too building-specific. ... And, somehow, this drew a line between that tradition of [architectural] practice – which, in my view would have included, like, Carlo Scarpa, and many others – to the idea of something that was closer to preservationist culture. ... I think it's...our cultural immaturity and lack of, em, realisation of the systemic and inter-related nature of all elements of our heritage. ... What, to me, is hugely important that we have a much more embrative concept of, of conservation.

These two discourses are a key thread that has emerged from the interviews. Their contrasting characteristics are summarised in table 3. It is important to note, however, that these two discourses are not mutually exclusive, but can be drawn upon by particular actors, depending on the context and/or purpose of an interaction or a text. In relation to the dividing lines between different categories of discourse, Jones cautions that these “should be considered as fuzzy rather than sharp in distinction”, but “they have content and consequences that are separable” (Jones, 1995, p.38).

<Insert table 3 about here>

Experts and non-experts: narratives of exclusion

The interview material revealed a narrative portraying non-experts essentially as a problem that needs to be overcome in built heritage practice. In this section we examine two sub-themes: (1) national cultural norms relating to built heritage and regulation more generally; and (2) the value of public engagement and participation.

Cultural norms

Five informants explicitly asserted that the cultural norms of Irish people are a significant difficulty in effective heritage practice. For example, informant contended that the Irish public do not place importance upon a collective sense of custodianship, of heritage for example, for the greater good: “This country is bad as community, [...] we look after our own things”. In this regard, informant N2 argues:

I think it has perhaps to do with, with our heritage and, I suppose, the primacy of private property, which I'm not going to change, or anyone else is going to change, but it's very much part of our culture.

In other words, this characteristic is an aspect of the intangible cultural heritage of the Irish people – conflicting directly with conservation experts’ prioritisation of the protection of tangible heritage for the greater good, and purportedly on behalf of the Irish people. However, these were not the only national attributes raised by informants. Informants N2 and N10 further specifically argue that Irish culture has contempt for law and authority: “There is a culture here of, if you can find a way around doing something you do it.” (N10) and, “there’s the law and...there’s wriggle room...and wriggle room is very important in Irish culture. But we’ve paid a huge price for wriggle room” (N2). It is also possible that this perception of cultural norms within Irish society may lead experts to hold more inflexible, ‘black-and-white’ views in an attempt to compensate.

The value of public engagement

There is considerable appreciation of the value of public input, but some of the interviews revealed power struggles rather than consensus. Eight informants described public involvement as either important or essential. Within this group, six informants specifically argued that public participation is vital in order that heritage is managed democratically, and to ensure that the public have a sense of ownership of built heritage. Informant N10 highlights recent shifts in international policy in this direction, relates heritage to identity, and emphasises their view of the importance of public involvement in defining group or national identity. Notably, this is in direct contrast to the views expressed by informant N11 and discussed in relation to non-expert representations of heritage, above.

... if you look at the Florence one [charter] and if you look at the really interesting Faro [convention], it talks about heritage as almost as kind of a common human right, something for society as a means of expressing themselves, forging identity. ... I suppose what I’m getting at is that if you look at only that new emergent thinking from that kind of European thing, it’s about empowering people. (N10)

Just two informants made critical comment on Ireland's performance in participating with the public regarding heritage. However, the comments of informant N3 in particular were scathing:

I mean, there's a whole 'tell 'em nothing'. There's a whole centrist control thing; if you don't conform, you don't get money. If you speak out, you get cut. You know, there's a real power and control thing within the state, as an institution.

Making direct comparisons with the UK, informant N3 suggests that there is very little public accountability in heritage management and a much more top-down approach in Ireland, where divergence of views is not tolerated by those who hold power.

In contrast, eight informants either expressed a negative opinion on the effectiveness or usefulness of public involvement relating to planning processes for heritage management. In this context, where the heritage policy elite holds divergent views on what heritage is and who should define it, the likelihood of alternative non-expert heritage discourses being represented in policy is minimal. Rather, there is a greater likelihood of conflict either amongst the policy elite, or with non-experts. Informant N13 describes such a scenario:

A mass-walkout took place at one meeting. The atmosphere was scary. There was a lot of bad feeling about designation. People feel that the designation has been imposed by central government. A man from the IFA [Irish Farmers' Association] talked about the 'sterilisation of the landscape' and walked out, followed by others.

The lack of consensus on a lot of these issues also leaves individual experts with considerable freedom to wield power through heritage decision-making, and eight informants specifically highlighted a perceived tendency for individuals to dominate and lead heritage decisions.

An inclusive shift in the authorised heritage discourse?

There was no consensus on whether alternative or non-expert representations of heritage are valid *per se*, and particularly on their use as a basis for heritage and planning decision-

making. Interviews revealed a flexible attitude amongst ten informants to this theme. For example, informant N11 discusses the possibility of viewing a very simple concrete structure – the handball alley – as a form of heritage due to the meaning of these alleys for a section of society, but also due to the historical significance of the sport in Ireland. Gaelic handball, known in Ireland simply as handball, or *liathróid láimhe*, is a traditional sport that has been played in Ireland since the 18th century, if not earlier:

There's a really interesting study ... which is to document handball alleys...

That's not something that you would think about, and yet it's a valid subject for consideration in the heritage gaze, if you want to call it that.

In a context where some see heritage primarily at a national level, and others focus equally or predominantly on the local level, informant N11 attempts to reconcile the dichotomy between expert and non-expert representations of heritage – or, even, ‘polychotomy’ between multiple groups’ representations.

“A familiar and cherished thing”, so it's something that people are used to, part of their daily experience, part of their mental map, part of their identity...

Despite informant N11 referring to the relationship between an individual, a place and their sense of identity in the context of an attempt to define heritage, informant N11 later explicitly warned against relating heritage to *identity*:

When you start relating heritage to personal identity or group identity, it acquires power ... but it also acquires the capacity to be divisive. So, my identity, your identity, whose heritage, and so on. ... So it's a trap – associating heritage and identity is a way of turning it into something controversial and dissonant, or a cause of dissonance, or it becomes the nub of the conflict ...

Though heritage and group or national identity are intimately related, and this relationship is well-established in the literature (see Pendlebury et al., 2004; Waterton, 2005; Moore and Whelan, 2007; Graham and Howard, 2008; Waterton and Smith 2010, amongst others), informant N11 here rejects this relationship and frames it in strongly negative rhetoric. So

while, on the one hand informant N11 portrays themselves as open and inclusive, informant N11 simultaneously shuts the door to what Pendlebury et al. argue is a key representation of built heritage, and which they also argue runs counter to that of the elite.

Whose heritage?

There was a perception amongst seven informants that the wider public do not appreciate built heritage, with implications for the outcomes of planning processes. Informant N9 is clear about the reasons for this:

This is about ownership of the heritage. It's the question of ownership. Patrimoine – French, meaning patrimony – is a bi-lingual working group. This is an alternative name for heritage. It's a much stronger term, meaning 'you get from your father'. It's a much better word, emphasising the property of the people. But here, the question arises "is this part of our cultural patrimony?" "What does the Duke of Leinster have to do with me?" In fact he was a patriot. The question is whether there is a buy-in there. The local craftsmen built them, e.g. 'big houses', so this is how people in Ireland now have come to buy into this heritage. Now the house is in public ownership and is accessible. [Emphasis as spoken]

Informant N9 here touches on the way in which buildings and people associated with the ruling elite Ascendancy, or with imperial British rule, were traditionally seen as foreign and not part of the heritage of the Irish people. The individual mentioned – the Duke of Leinster – was a member of the elite Irish Ascendancy, and therefore fell into this category. In the example, informant N9 implies that the lack of a sense of ownership is a problem which needs to be corrected, and was one of four informants who argued that the purported 'ignorance' of non-experts lies at the core of the problem. Implicit in this narrative is *de facto* acceptance of expert discourse and the buildings it values. They neither explicitly nor implicitly give credence to non-expert values and priorities.

Informants were also asked for their own opinion on a wide range of different ages and styles of buildings. This was again aimed at examining their heritage priorities and prejudices. Although there was consensus that modernist buildings are of architectural significance and, given the importance assigned to modernist buildings in official discourse, it was perhaps surprising that five informants expressed some level of prejudice against these buildings. Also surprising is the attitude of the expert group towards vernacular buildings, which are generally regarded as being of inadequate significance to warrant protection, except in specific cases, such as a building having an intact thatched roof, or being of mud wall construction. Eight informants argued that some mechanism should be found to protect vernacular buildings generally, as they consider them to be of substantial heritage significance. While this is a minority, only four other informants argued that vernacular buildings are not worthy of protection at all. Both of these groups of informants are out of step with current policy, which tends to protect only special cases under the categories in the Planning and Development Act 2000, rather than vernacular buildings more generally. Within the expert group, the sense of heritage ‘ownership’ – or lack thereof – of vernacular buildings is hit and miss. These inconsistencies point to the existence of competing narratives within the expert group around who heritage should be for and what it should reflect, and they highlight the nature of heritage decisions as value judgements (Negussie, 2004). This is recognised by informant N10, who also argues in favour of a broader and more democratic approach to ascribing heritage value within the planning process. Also significantly, the interviews clearly reveal that the authorised heritage discourse is not monolithic; it is the dominant discourse amongst the heritage policy elite, guided by the most powerful voices, reflected and reified in heritage policy. However, there are both subtly varying and starkly dissenting narratives amongst the expert group and, as argued by Smith (2006), the discourse, *per se*, is not fixed, but evolving.

Exclusive heritage: the flip-side of the heritage dichotomy

Despite the significant numbers of informants whose narratives might be characterised as inclusive, as already seen in the comments of informant N11, above, many informants were reluctant to be too inclusive – or cited examples of others who disapprove of an inclusive approach. This results in an uneasy dichotomy between the elite origins of heritage protection and a seemingly recent democratic shift that is poorly represented in policy. A total of six informants downplayed the relevance of alternative non-expert representations of heritage – or had experience of others doing so. Informant N11 gave the example of how the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland (RIAI) had dismissed the validity of investment in built heritage not easily classifiable under the categories of special interest in legislation:

The RIAI were writing to us saying ‘what on earth is this about? There’s protected structures and then there’s everything else, and we can do whatever we like with everything else!’ That’s the mindset that they were coming from. They didn’t know why we would be concerned with non-protected heritage.

Similarly, informants N4 and N8 both suggest that a multiplicity of public views is good reason not to allow the public any role in defining heritage:

I certainly have gone through consultation on issues relating to heritage, but whether the public should have actually defined... I think that might be; it could be dangerous, because you’re going to get so many different views, and different interpretations. (N8)

The National Inventory of Architectural Heritage is presenting a professional [view] on what is considered to be of heritage interest. And if you veer from that, then perhaps you’re compromising that professional view. (N4)

Five informants also cautioned against the involvement of non-experts because they can use representations of built heritage to further vested interests within urban development processes. While this may be a real problem, informants recognised the difficulties inherent in

any argument against non-expert involvement purely on this basis, which runs counter to the notion of heritage as something representative of wider society.

There was also discussion around the extent to which heritage is an intrinsic or a cultural phenomenon. Specifically, seven informants argued that certain heritage ‘objects’ have intrinsic qualities that make their heritage value objective and universal: “You have to acknowledge that something like *Brú na Bóinne*...Newgrange, Tara, Dublin Castle, this building, they’re objectively heritage” (N18). However, although heritage value as a cultural phenomenon is recognised in international charters and in certain national contexts through the concept of ‘intangible’ heritage (see UNESCO, 2003; ICOMOS, 1999), its recognition in Irish policy is relatively limited. Contrasting narratives around tangible and intangible heritage are discussed by Ahmad (2006), Turnpenny (2004) and others. These contrasts are evident for example in informant N5’s claim that Germany and Italy primarily value authenticity of fabric, whereas Japan and Australia both arguably place a comparatively stronger emphasis on intangible qualities. Given the relationship between heritage and identity, and Ireland’s postcolonial context (which frames certain aspects of heritage meaning and place-making processes in Ireland), international debates on intangible heritage have as much relevance to designation and management in Ireland as in Australia or Japan.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the discourse of key actors involved in built heritage decision-making at a national level in Ireland to reveal and understand the dominant and competing narratives of the expert group, patterns of power and inequality, and implications for the wider urban planning arena, where it is hypothesised that competing representations of place can underpin conflict. The discourses of these actors, and the way in which they shape conservation values and practice, are also framed by broader narratives about the past. For example, in different societies, this leads to subtly contrasting meanings associated with terms such as ‘heritage’ and ‘patrimony’. In Ireland, these broader narratives have traditionally

tended to relate to the memory of past oppression under colonial power, nation-building, and the meaning of modernity and its relationship with both a colonial past and with tradition. These, in turn, have tended to shape conservation debates and decision-making. As also discussed in the opening sections of this paper, power can be wielded in heritage decision-making by economic forces and market demand, as well as through discourse. Indeed, discourse, itself, is shaped by the wider market for heritage, which tends to shift over time. In Ireland, the 'heritage market' has evolved from the promotion of a rural idyll, appealing to the diaspora, towards a more recent broader emphasis on Ireland's cities as tourist destinations. The discursive picture is therefore complex, comprising a series of shifting, overlapping and competing views both between and within specific discourse 'communities'. However, according to Fairclough's framework, critical discourse analysis of the interview material suggests that the professional style/identity of dominant heritage actors allows them to control built heritage representations that become integral to conservation planning as social practice in Ireland. It follows that the competing representations of non-expert groups are overlooked, leading to conflict where the role of conservation is contested, or where alternative meanings are dismissed in planning processes, both within the heritage policy elite, and between this group and the wider public.

A key theme revealed in our interviews was the tendency for non-expert priorities to be inadequately considered is of particular interest given, (a) the notion that built heritage is an expression of the diversity of society, owned by and for the benefit of all (DAHG, 2011, p. 13), (b) the important role that identity plays in heritage, particularly for those not part of the conservation elite (Pendlebury et al., 2004, p. 17), and (c) Ireland's post-colonial context, where competing narratives of identity has underpinned vigorous debates within the spatial planning arena.

A second key theme related to a lack of consensus *within* the expert group (even if a shared vocabulary existed) leading to subtle variations within the authorised heritage discourse, but also on occasion overt dissent where dominant representations are challenged

by some within the expert group. In the interview material as a whole, it is striking that some informants' discourse is presented *de facto*, with little or no room for debate, while others are careful to critically frame everything they say as opinion rather than fact. In this context, the unresolved dichotomy has emerged over time between two 'sub-discourses' that see the heritage value of the historic built environment in fundamentally different ways, resulting in two competing notions of conservation as social practice: conservation as 'museum-curatorialism' and conservation as 'inclusive heritage'.

On one hand, a 'museum-curatorial' authorised heritage discourse is focused on authenticity and the conservation of material fabric, which is firmly institutionalised in planning policy. On the other hand, an emergent 'inclusive heritage discourse' sees conservation planning from the perspective of its practice. This 'inclusive' discourse views the historic built environment as subject to a wider set of concerns, emphasises non-expert values, and sees heritage as comprising multiple international, national, local, or even individual patrimonies. The description of the competing discourse as 'emergent' is appropriate given, for example, the relatively recent and increasing emphasis placed on public involvement and values in international charters and conventions (see for example ICOMOS, 1999; Council of Europe, 2000; UNESCO, 2003).

These 'inclusive' and 'museum-curatorial' discourses are not mutually exclusive, however, but can be drawn upon by particular heritage policy actors, albeit perhaps to varying degrees, depending on the context or purpose of the interaction taking place (or text). More specifically, the fragmented nature of individuals' discourse can be seen through the three discourse elements in table 1. Firstly, though the principal research material (interviews) remained consistent, informants framed their discourse differently depending on the nature of the various interactions they discussed (e.g. public meetings, dealings with other professionals, etc.). Secondly, informants applied different representations to the historic built environment, varying according to context. Thirdly, though the majority of informants attempted to adopt an inclusive 'way of being', a professional (and more exclusive) discursive

style/identity tended to surface, again depending on the nature and wider context of the subject being discussed.

In general terms, the conclusions in this paper relating to the nature of the relationship between expert and lay conservation values reflect the conclusions of others internationally, and particularly in the UK, around heritage broadly (Watson and Waterton, 2010; Schofield, 2014), and conservation specifically (Hobson, 2001, 2004; Pendlebury, 2013). In particular, the way in which actors' discourse varies in response to its context mirrors Pendlebury's observation of the way in which *Conservation Principles* and *Constructive Conservation* respond to different factors external to the AHD. However, while Pendlebury specifically examined the relationship between what he terms the conservation-planning assemblage and other elite discourses, this paper places a different emphasis, instead focusing on the way in which the official authorised heritage discourse relates to, apprehends, or ignores, non-expert conservation values and priorities.

The dichotomy described above is reinforced by the continued dominance of expert/elite values in contemporary planning processes for built heritage, institutions and practices. It is further compounded by a continued lack of understanding and awareness of non-expert heritage values amongst much of the policy elite, and their varying (in)ability to articulate these alternative values in their interactions. Dominance of elite/expert values is maintained despite (albeit limited) efforts to be inclusive, such as through recognition of social and cultural categories of interest/value in heritage legislation and guidelines. Heritage experts are as much subject to the tendency of an authorised discourse to exclude alternative representations and non-expert groups in decision-making – seemingly often unintentionally – arguably leading to a delusion of objectivity in built heritage assessment. Given this tendency, this raises questions over the appropriateness, representativeness and even legitimacy of aspects of conservation and built heritage policy in Ireland today.

References

- Ahmad, Y. (2006) The Scope and Definitions of Heritage: From Tangible to Intangible. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(3), pp. 292-300.
- Carmona, M. (2014) 'The Place-shaping Continuum: A Theory of Urban Design Process' *Journal of Urban Design*, 19(1), pp. 2-36.
- Council of Europe (1985) *Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention)*. Available at <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/121.htm> (accessed 14 April 2011).
- Council of Europe (2000) *European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention)*. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Council of Europe (2014) *Chart of signatures and ratifications*. Available at <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=121&CM=8&DF=23/06/2014&CL=ENG> (accessed 23 June 2014).
- DACG (Department of Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht) (1996) *Strengthening the Protection of the Architectural Heritage* (Dublin: Stationery Office).
- DAHG (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht) (2011) *Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities*, 3rd ed. (Dublin: Stationery Office).
- DAHG (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht) (2014) *Legislation*. Available at <http://www.archaeology.ie/PublicationsFormsLegislation/Legislation/> (accessed 23 June 2014).
- DECLG (Department of Environment, Community and Local Government) (2014) *Planning Acts/Bills*. Available at <http://www.environ.ie/en/DevelopmentHousing/PlanningDevelopment/Planning/PlanningLegislation-Overview/PlanningActs/> (accessed 23 June 2014).
- Deenihan, J. (2011) *Dáil debates*, 14 September 2011, Vol.740, No.1, Question 468.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power* (London: Longman).
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media discourse* (London, E. Arnold).
- Fairclough, N. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis the Critical Study of Language* (London: Taylor and Francis).
- Government of Ireland (1995) *Heritage Act, 1995* (Dublin: Stationery Office).
- Government of Ireland (1999) *Architectural Heritage (National Inventory) and Historic Monuments (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1999* (Dublin: Stationery Office).
- Government of Ireland (2000) *Planning and Development Act, 2000* (Dublin, Stationery Office).
- Graham, B. (2002) 'Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture?' *Urban Studies* 39(5-6), pp. 1003-1017.

- Graham, B. J. & Howard, P. (2008) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Hajer, M. A. (1993) 'Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain the Great Britain', in: F. Fischer & J. Forester (Eds) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, pp.43-76 (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press).
- Hastings, A. (1999) 'Analysing Power Relations in Partnerships: Is There a Role for Discourse Analysis?' *Urban Studies* 36(1), pp. 91-106.
- Heritage Council (2014) *Home*. Available at <http://www.heritagecouncil.ie/home/> (accessed 23 June 2014).
- Hobson, E. (2000) 'Value and control: perceptions of conserving the built environment in local planning authority practice' *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*. 28, pp. 461-474.
- Hobson, E. (2004) *Conservation and Planning: Changing values in policy and practice*. (London: Spon Press).
- Jacobs, K. (1999) 'Key Themes and Future Prospects: Conclusion to the Special Issue' *Urban Studies*, 36(1), pp. 203-213.
- Jones, O. (1995) 'Lay Discourses of the Rural: Developments and Implications for Rural Studies' *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11, pp. 35-49.
- Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London, Sage Publications).
- Moore, N. & Whelan, Y. (2007) *Heritage, memory and the politics of identity new perspectives on the cultural landscape* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Negussie, E. (2004) 'What is worth conserving in the urban environment? Temporal shifts in cultural attitudes towards the built heritage in Ireland' *Irish Geography*, 37(2), pp. 202-222.
- Pendlebury, J. (2002) 'Conservation and regeneration: Complementary or conflicting processes? The case of Grainger town, Newcastle upon Tyne'. *Planning Practice and Research*, 17(2), pp. 145-158.
- Pendlebury, J. (2013) Conservation values, the authorised heritage discourse and the conservation-planning assemblage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 19(7), pp. 709-727.
- Pendlebury, J., Townshend, T., and Gilroy, R. (2004) 'The Conservation of English Cultural Built Heritage: A Force for Social Inclusion?' *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(1), pp. 11-31.
- Schofield, J. (2014) *Who Needs Experts? Counter-mapping Cultural Heritage* (Farnham: Ashgate).
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage* (London, Routledge).
- Stewart, W. P., Liebert, D. & Larkin, K. (2004) 'Community identities as visions for landscape change' *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 69(2-3), pp. 315-334.

- Townshend, C. (2006) *Easter 1916: the Irish rebellion* (London: Penguin).
- Turnpenny, M. (2004) 'Cultural Heritage, an Ill-defined Concept? A Call for Joined-up Policy'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(3), pp. 295-307.
- Tweed, C. & Sutherland, M. (2007) 'Built cultural heritage and sustainable urban development' *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 83(1), pp. 62–69.
- Tweed, C., Sutherland, M. & Teller, J. (2002) Identifying the relations between historical areas and perceived values: introduction to issues and indicators. SUIT project report on Task 2.1a. Available at http://www.lema.ulg.ac.be/research/suit/Reports/members/SUIT2.1b_Report.pdf (accessed 01 May 2013).
- UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Paris: UNESCO).
- Van Auken, P. M., Frisvoll, S. J. & Stewart, S. I. (2010) 'Visualising community: using participant-driven photo-elicitation for research and application' *Local Environment*, 15(4), pp. 373–388.
- Waterton, E. (2005) 'Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(4), pp. 309-325.
- Waterton, E. & Smith, L. (2010) 'The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1), pp. 4-15.
- Waterton, E., Smith, L. & Campbell, G. (2006) 'The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(4), pp. 339-355.
- Watson, S., and Waterton, E. (2010) 'Heritage and community engagement'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1), pp. 1-3.
- While, A. (2007) The state and the controversial demands of cultural built heritage: modernism, dirty concrete, and postwar listing in England. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 34(4), pp. 645-663.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009) *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (Los Angeles: Sage).

Table 1. The ways in which discourse/language plays a part in social practices (after Fairclough, 2010: 230-231)

Discourse elements		Example
a)	Discourse as a way of interacting.	Policy or guidance text; Everyday conversation (e.g. with actors or stakeholders).
b)	Discourse as a way of representing A social representation is a shared understanding of the social and physical environment (Wodak, and Meyer, 2009).	The built environment is represented in contrasting ways through the use of language/discourse in different social practices: for example in environmental planning, built heritage management, politics, or property development. Further, the built environment is represented differently <i>within</i> each social practice, according to the different positions of different social actors
c)	Discourse as a way of being. A style that creates a unique identity through what Fairclough refers to as 'signs' in language (semiosis).	The distinctive discursive/semiotic style of built heritage professionals today, which creates the heritage expert 'identity'. Similarly, the distinctive semiotic style of non-experts, which creates their lay 'identity'.

Table 2. Example of interview photographs

<p>Early 20th-century housing/townscape in inner-city Dublin (not included on RPS or designated an ACA)</p>	
<p>Aim Assess attitude to intact early 20th-century streetscape (not currently considered to be of sufficient heritage value to warrant protection)</p>	<p>Prompts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This street is not protected (RPS or ACA) • What are your thoughts on the value of this street? • Should it be protected?
<p><i>I wouldn't be overly precious about it. Eh, I'd say there are things of quality in it – obviously – and you would try and retain lots of quality. But, eh, if you're talking about special significance, I would say, well eh, [whispers] nah. (N16)</i></p>	
<p>The representation applied to the buildings is characteristic of the 'museum-curatorial' discourse. The informant frames discussion of the buildings' value around 'special significance' and 'quality', thereby emphasising architectural, rather than historical cultural or social significance, about which no mention is made.</p>

Busáras (Central Bus Station), Dublin

Aim

Assess attitude to the heritage value and protection of Modernist buildings

Prompts

- Is the building of value?
- Do people appreciate this building?

Now, Busáras... Call me philistine [smiling], but I do not consider Busáras has any beauty [laughs]. But I appreciate that it was built to the very highest of standards, and the materials used in it are possibly without parallel in buildings of its type in the country. But it's a building which needs to be celebrated, as much for its rarity in the Irish – in the, the spectrum of buildings in C20th in Ireland, but also in the materials and the standard of craftsmanship. But I still don't think it's a beautiful building [laughs]. (N4)

The speaker here creates a discursive style for themselves as someone with an expert knowledge and understanding of built heritage conservation, and the capacity to adjudicate on – and thereby control – heritage and conservation decision-making. Within the context of this expert discursive style, but also despite it, and in more informal language, the utterance also implies a personal prejudice against modernist architecture, with the effect of somewhat downplaying its value. This reveals the relatively higher priority they personally place on the aesthetics arising from traditional craftsmanship – often emphasised within architectural conservation guidance (see, for example, DAHG, 2011, pp.114-183)

Unprotected 19th-century terraced houses in Dublin

I think that's a monstrosity. [laughs] And I think the person who did it should be taken out and shot! And these windows as well [points to modern aluminium windows]. (N4)

In stark and simple terms, the utterance represents the alterations as wholly unacceptable, thereby setting out the primacy of professional values. While the language is not technical, a clear discursive style/identity is established – that of a defender of architectural value and the practice of conservation.

Aim

Assess attitude to alteration of late 19th century streetscape (not currently considered to be of sufficient heritage value to warrant protection), and to loss of original built fabric and architectural details

Prompts

- This street is not protected (RPS or ACA)
- What are your thoughts on the alterations, and the loss of original features in these buildings?
- What are your thoughts on the value of this street?
- Should these buildings be protected?

Table 3 Characteristics of the two competing heritage discourses

Characteristics of ‘museum-curatorial’ discourse	Characteristics of ‘inclusive heritage’ discourse
<p>Preservationist</p> <p>Focus on material fabric</p> <p>Focus on authenticity</p> <p>Building-specific</p> <p>Legalistic</p> <p>Introverted</p>	<p>Cognisance of the wider context of conservation</p> <p>Sees built heritage conservation as one of a wider system of inter-related heritage concerns</p> <p>Representativeness of heritage of society</p> <p>Legitimacy</p>