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Abstract

Built environment is the history of the life of man in the past, the present of value and the directions for the future. Building conservation is a part of human value. However in some cases the value of heritage has been absent in the community. This paper postulates that the conceptual idea on the emergence of facility management strategy as a basis in dealing with building conservation. Facility Management (FM) is recognized as human or people centered approach that appreciates users in dealing with the organizational process. It is anticipated that common understanding of the stakeholders can lead to a better framework of heritage building conservation. There are several points where facility management strategy will contribute in conserving heritage. It will focus on the approach of analysing and assessing the social perception of both cultural and natural of heritage conservation.
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1.0 Introduction

Community and government play a major role on the conservation of heritage places. It is imperative since preserving the heritage building is not only about the building but also other values that originated within it. Pereira Roders and van Oers (2011) discovered that cultural heritage has become a driver for development in which it will enhance the livability of the surrounding areas and sustain the productivity of the community in a changing environment.

The research incorporate heritage and facilities management is not up-to-date. A number of studies have been conducted with a discrepancy of issues various perspectives. Hasbullah and Baldry (2002), clearly stated the attributes of heritage conversation from FM perspective. This paper proposes the conceptual framework of the role of social perception as integrating element for heritage conservation.

2.0 Heritage Conservation

In general, conservation of heritage is imperative. It is regarded as a source of memory and inspiration, while it contributes to national and local community identity, which is fundamental for a sense of place and social cohesion (Communities and Local Government, 2009). Tangible cultural heritage includes monuments, groups of buildings, sites and cultural landscapes [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 1972], while intangible cultural heritage includes the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills of communities and groups, and sometimes individuals, as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith (UNESCO, 2003). In principle cultural heritage is as broad and diverse as the human population groups that have roamed, and still roaming the Earth.

The New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand 1992: Section 1) states that heritage places:

- Have lasting values and can be appreciated in their own right
- Teach us about the past and the culture of those who came before us
- Provide the context for community identity, whereby people relate to the land and to those who have gone before
- Provide variety and contrast in the modern world, and a measure against which we can compare the achievements of today
- Provide visible evidence of the continuity between past, present and future

Furthermore, Pearson and Sullivan (1995, p. 11) summarize the aims of conservation management as the elucidation of all the values of heritage places, the development of long-term preservation and the implementation of management practices that conserve the essence and physical form of the place.
Documents from government heritage agencies and regional councils indicated that historic heritage is important for a range of reasons, including its contribution to identity and wellbeing at both individual and collective levels. In addition, heritage helps to form individual identity and provide a sense of place, as well as enriching quality of life. In an Australian study on the value of historic heritage, 79% of participants agreed that their life was better for having the opportunity to see or visit heritage sites or places (Allen Consulting Group 2005). At a community level, historic heritage can be seen as contributing to collective identities and to social cohesion. Historic heritage is also important for economic wellbeing, for instance through cultural tourism (Colmar Brunton 2003).

Besides, historical buildings and historical areas can be developed and promoted as tourism products to generate foreign exchange. Putnam et al. (1993) pointed to the fact that the resources of social capital are dependent upon long-term historical development processes. The historic buildings usually demonstrate interesting aspects of country’s history and its evolving culture.

A recent study undertaken by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (hereinafter referred to as “ICOMOS”) on “Threats to World Heritage Sites 1994-2004” analyzed 1,570 threats reported for 641 properties in the State of Conservation (SoC) reports and other ICOMOS mission reports (ICOMOS, 2005). This analysis identified that the majority of threats to cultural WH properties were related to management deficiencies and aggressive development. When discussing cultural heritage management in relation to sustainable development, arguably the single-most important instrument in this field is the 1972 World Heritage Convention. It has been instrumental in the formulation of aims and goals, the setting of international standards, the elaboration of approaches, and the building up of a coherent system of evaluation, monitoring and periodic reporting, in the field of cultural heritage management.

In Australia, the duty of care for heritage places has been clearly spelt out in the development of the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 1999) to guide the experts (conservation practitioners) and the community in the development of an appropriate response to conserving a heritage place. The Burra Charter provides guidelines for understanding the five heritage values (aesthetic/architectural, historic, scientific, social and spiritual) and for the development of conservation policy and strategy for implementing strategy. Besides, there is a useful guide for preparing plans is The Conservation Plan by Kerr Semple (1996). This plan acts as the management plan, which is a practical document dealing with the political, resources, economic and community issue surrounding the conservation of the heritage place.

3.0 Prevailing the Scenario of Heritage Conservation in Malaysia

People and tourists, in particular are often attracted to buildings that have high historical value and architectural outstanding. Some historical buildings in Malaysia have been converted into new uses including hotels, museums, restaurants, entertainment centers, art galleries and cafes to promote local tourism and to generate income (Ahmad and Badrulzaman, 2001). Though the heritage conservation
places had taken place previously but perceptions towards the conservation are still low especially in Malaysia.

Communities speculate that the conservation activity is a waste of money and nothing can be achieved in return. One of the reasons is because in Malaysia, the remains of British colonial buildings is being preserved and conserved. There is no relation and connection can be linked between the people of Malaysia and the former colonialists other than keeping historical record and retaining evidence of the development of the country. Whether those buildings are important to be conserved is always a question asked by many. Is Malaysian aware on the withstanding of those buildings at present, and is it important to them? As the result, a research on perception of roles of facilities manager (FM) in monitoring and evaluating the social perceptions of heritage building conservation as derived.

4.0 Social Perceptions on Heritage Conservation Strategy

Individual perceptions are described by the Allen Consulting Group (2005) in the context of economic value. However, the authors also note that there is an increasing acceptance that the traditional distinctions made between different claimed forms of value (e.g. economic value, heritage value, social value, environmental value, cultural value) can be measured in both financial and broader social terms, and it is not useful to take each form of value in isolation. In terms of individual value, heritage values can be assessed according to an individual’s willingness to pay to protect heritage or to accept compensation for its loss. The authors suggested that historic heritage sites should not be seen as providing a good or service in isolation, but rather be seen as providing the attributes for a number of goods; for example, a site may be used for various purposes, such as for work, recreation and socializing. Moreover, they suggested that in order to gain satisfaction from a heritage site, individuals do not necessarily have to visit or access a site; benefits from heritage can be gained from knowledge of its presence in terms of providing a sense of place or the possibility of future opportunities to visit.

The Allen Consulting Group (2005) report describes different individual perspectives on value as ‘categories of value’. This model separates values into use and non-use values. Use values are further separated into direct values (e.g. valuing as a source of income, residence and/or recreation) and indirect values (e.g. valuing for aesthetic qualities, community image and/or social interaction). Non-use values are divided into option (preserving as an option for future use), existence (e.g. contribution to identity and uniqueness) and bequest (providing a historical legacy for future generations).

The Australian report builds on this definition by referring to institutions, relationships, attitudes and values as governing the interaction among people, which ultimately contributes to a collection of individuals forming a society. Using community as a reference point, the authors suggested that dimensions of social and cultural values in relation to historic heritage include:
The responsibility for protection of the heritage building is not just played by government but it involves all parts of the community in order to conserve and preserve for present and future generations. A success heritage building conservation come with good management. Good management comprises of have a clear strategies and effective methods for planning, designing, executing and managing this facility in order to optimize their production and consumption (Pereira Roders and van Oers, 2011).

ICOMOS highlights the importance of stakeholder consultation and recommends that it should be implemented as soon as possible. “Early consultation with relevant parties, including any affected community, is important. The heritage impact assessment (HIA) may also collecting information about World Heritage properties not otherwise easily accessible. HIA is a useful cooperative tool for all stakeholders” (ICOMOS, 2011, p. 5). This recommendation would help verify if in fact earlier consultations bring benefits to the HIA process. Yet, ICOMOS is convinced that HIA would greatly benefit from methodology which would “include organizations or people to be consulted, determining, for example, who are stakeholders and who is part of a heritage community related to the site, details of the baseline information to be collected including methods and appropriate study areas, likely sensitive heritage receptors and proposed survey and assessment methodology” (ICOMOS, 2011, p. 5). An adequate training on HIA of the stakeholders involved will ensure that the commissioning process for HIA is appropriate and that full and effective use is made of the output (ICOMOS, 2011, p. 3).

5.0 Proposed Facilities Management Strategy Of Heritage Conservation

In general FM is understood to be a property based discipline. FM can be considered to have emerged from the integration of three main strands of activities which comprises of property management, property operations and maintenance and office administration. More significantly it establishes a focus on the management and delivery of the business “outputs” of both of these entities; namely the productive use of building assets as workplaces. According to Williams (1996) facilities management means one thing or another depending on where in the management process is located or in practice, whether you are managing a task, organizing and directing the whole range of activities or sponsoring the provision. It addresses the operations and functions associated and concerned with the management of constructed premises within the built environment and the assets within them (Edum-Fotwe et al., 2003).

According to Alexander (1996) the function of facilities management is really a bridge between the changing workplaces and users. There was awareness about the contribution of the user-customer experience in
the development of facilities strategy. Understanding customer or user experience is viewed as an integral part of information system in facilities management. User were being acknowledged as a customer and as stakeholder should have their views considered in identifying building performance requirement (Szigeti et al., 1997, Pinder et al., 2003, William, 1995). In this regards, it’s an avenue to postulate the important of community as a function of creating the environment of conservation. As a social elements, community should react to prevent their on cultural and the nature of the environment. This cognizance will lead to better strategy of heritage conservation.

The strategy place the values that the conservation of heritage places is not about the building itself but beyond. Managing the perception of community toward conservation of heritage building is a basic requirement without being affected by the deterioration of the physical condition. World Heritage for example is a joint task for the whole local community rather than only an administrational issue that can be dealt with by a top-down approach. Information, public participation, shared objectives and responsibilities are the main strategies toward achieving a sustainable level of identification among local stakeholders and sometimes even among different departments from the local administration. In planning processes, stakeholders have to make decisions about their abilities to act and to commit to future actions that will satisfy their interests (Forester, 2006).

Pereira Rodgers (2011) reveals that facilities management should integrate the complex processes of management of heritage conservation because it deals with change of use, changes in the surroundings, various of stakeholders and competing demands as regards environmental, economic, social and cultural requirements.

5.0 Conclusion

This conceptual paper brings up the importance of heritage building culture and the roles of FM in managing the perceptions of people towards the conservation activity. On most of the heritage sites, the focused have been given to building and left is to the community perception. Usually, conservation activity is handled by government or organizations that can serve more sites permanently. In fact, it needs full commitment of all stakeholders that have direct connection to this process. Facilities management integrates people, process and places. The approach considers the human attributes as factors of success which are part of heritage conservation strategy. It seems that the postulated framework creates commitment between the authority and the community. Heritage conservation not only deals with concrete plans and agreement on costs, benefits, risk but it considers the social perceptions on the community. Hence, in such projects, strategy formation should not only create plans, but in corporate social perceptions.
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