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Abstract. The purpose of this article is to address such problem as preservation of the historical heritage objects and more specifically – the historical manor complexes through the prism of the sustainable development principles. The set task is to identify the existing problems in such field as restoration and capitalization of architectural heritage as well as to articulate recommendations on their resolution. The methods of conducting the work: analysis of the legislative base, statistical data, and case studies, as well as juxtaposition of the subject being researched with the sustainable development principles. The study has resulted in the conclusion that preservation of the cultural heritage objects is one of the priority tasks in the paradigm of sustainable development of architecture, residential settlements and the society. Having identified the major problems of the restoration sphere, the author has formulated briefly the methods for their resolution at the macro-, micro-, and mezo-levels.

1. Introduction
Preservation of architectural monuments is an acute issue throughout the world. In Russia, the cultural heritage objects (CHO) are protected officially by the RF Constitution [1], and the Federal Law “On Cultural heritage objects” [2]. For the time being, historical manors and manor complexes are perhaps in the most distressing condition [3]. By A. I. Komech’s data, in the last 100 years Russia has lost 95% of former nobles’ manors, which de facto are the historical and architectural monuments, although de jure they are not included in the CHO Register [4].

Restoration of all historical manors at the expense of budget funds is an unfeasible task for the state. Therefore, the Law on privatization of historical and architectural monuments attributed to the housing stock was passed in 1994 [5]. Besides, since recently the Russian government has been and is in the active search of mechanisms to attract the non-government funds for restoration of monument buildings: from 2012 such programs have been underway as the “Green Corridor”, “One Ruble per a Square Meter”, and “Moscow Countryside Manors”. Such programs imply to sell the CHO or to lease the latter on a long-term basis for a symbolic rent, but the major term for the buyer / renter would be to perform the high-quality scientific restoration of the given facility so that it could be further adapted for the modern use as the protected subject [6]. The idea of capitalizing the heritage has been assessed positively in the academic community since long ago: it was as early as in 1987 that the ICOMOS members referred to the use of monuments as the main guarantee for their preservation. [7], In their articles, A. L. Gelfond and M. V. Doutsev consider the importance of the architecture’s functional...
addressee in the historical-city context [8], I. V. Krasnobayev has drawn the so-called investment cadaster of manors in the Kazan area of the Volga River basin [10], while I. Yu. Yarovoi et al. [11-12] highlight the cases evidencing the successful modern use of CHO in the West.

In Russia, however and regrettably, the current economic laws provoke the rather controversial public attitude to shabby and ruin-like objects - for many people, the need to restore the latter is not evident so far. It should be added that the process of monuments capitalization is being “slowed down” by the existing number of actual problems, such as:

First, the sale of CHO at the overprice value (for instance, the forsaken Grebnevo manor, requiring multi-million investments, was sold in 2017 for 80.1 million Rubles [13]). Such high value of the objects, which need the large-size investments, demotivates the potential investors. Second, the impossibility to calculate the actual value of the manor restoration (dilapidated condition of construction in most cases would give rise to the circumstances that would the restoration much more expensive than it was estimated).

Third, the limited chances to receive a credit in view of the potentially low profitability of the investments [14].

And, fourth, the absence of tax incentives in relation to historical buildings, which do not have the status of federal-level CHO [15].

So, the existing situation does not contribute to the general resolution of the long-standing problem while without taking the urgent measures the rapid destruction of the ownerless heritage will be inevitable. This is confirmed by the analysis of the RF State Statistic Service data of 1990 through to 2016 [16]. In connection with the changes, enacted in the definitions at the juncture of 2013-2014, it is not possible to draw a general chart and only the conclusions on the trends can be made. Besides, it should be noted that the definitions are featured by the absence of specifics. For instance, basing on the data of the Statistic Yearbook as of 2013, we record the increased number of "immovable monuments of history and culture" and at the same time the reduced number of "monuments of town-planning and architecture" (Figure 1). We may assume that reduction in the number of monuments would be possible owing to the entire destruction of some cultural heritage objects. The chart as drawn on the basis of statistics for 2014-2016 shows the reduction in the number of "cultural heritage objects" and, in particular, "monuments" (Figure 2). Considering the deplorable condition of historical manors, we may assume that their rapid disappearance could have an effect on the statistical data.

Figure 1. The chart drawn on the basis of data from the “Monuments of history and culture being protected by the state” section of the Russian Statistic Yearbook for 2017.
Apprehension of such problem as preservation of CHO and, in particular, historical manors in the context of the sustainable development principles would probably change the attitude to this "futureless" (from the commercial point of view) asset.

By the classical definition of sustainable development, “development means” the process of economic and social changes, in the course of which the exploitation of natural resources, vector of investments, orientation of science-tech progress, personality development and the institutional changes are coordinated with one another and would strengthen the current and future potential for satisfaction of human needs and aspirations. As known, the sustainable development concept is based on the tree components – the economic, social, and ecological ones. The principle of sustainability is applicable in any sphere of the mankind's contemporary activities. As far as the town-planning is concerned, sustainable development implies the rational use of all assets, and such use includes adaptation of the buildings, which have lost their former functions. Today, however, the residential-settlement development trend in Russia is diametrically opposite to the sustainability concept. As written by Academician M. V. Shoubenkov, "The contemporary town-planning practice in Russia < …> is similar to medical recommendations for overcoming the agony of the doomed patient. By the doomed patient, I mean a contemporary city developing in the traditional paradigm of the growing consumption of the exterior natural resources. Such traditional city is parasite-like inherently" [17]. Certainly, such parasite-like development of agglomerations would cause the irreparable damage to the unprotected objects of heritage. In this connection E.A. Shevchenko emphasized the need to apply the heritage-object preservation principles in order to preserve identity and uniqueness of settlements in the global space, and makes a statement on the contemporary Russian paradigm for protection of the historical and architectural heritage [18]. Academician G. V. Esaulov, too, makes an emphasis on the point that apart from introduction of the “green construction” and proper correlation between the “stable” and “changeable” elements in architecture, “the future is impossible without the due account of the already available multiple research and design projects – the “past” of the sustainable architecture, history of the entire architecture and the due account of the experience accumulated in the traditional folk art of building” [19].

The principles of sustainable development in the sphere of cultural heritage were always intuitively close to Russian thinkers – in the early 20th century they were being promoted by N. A. Berdyaev [20], and in the end of the same century by D. S. Likhachev [21]. Later on, a weighty contribution to development of the “sustainable heritage” was made by T. N. Mironova, P. M. Shoulgin, and N. M. Mamedov [22-24]. A special value is seen in the works by D. N. Zamyatin and N.Yu. Zamyatin, focused on formation of the so-called “image of the place” on the base of using the historical buildings [25-29]. These applied case studies can be used as the road-map for realization of the sustainability paradigm in the sphere of the CHO restoration and capitalization.
A.R. Gainoutdinova – a member of the ICOMOS and an art historian, addresses in detail the phases of the heritage entry in the sustainable development concept and the followed shift of the emphasis in the governance sphere from the CHO conservation to adaptation and the proper use thereof [30].

However, we may assume that the constructive principles of the sustainable development would be applied first and foremost to the objects included in the urban environment and located in the social gravitation centers. A noteworthy point is that despite all the afore-described equivocation and chaotic nature of the contemporary town-planning policy, the urban historical manors use to be the more or less successfully adapted for the population needs irrespectively of the manors’ age, but the remote rural estates remain quite vulnerable in their ownerless condition and by the time, when “the turn is theirs”, can be lost irretrievably.

Now, let us consider the correspondence between the subject of study and the major components of the sustainable development principle (Figure 3).

**Economic component:**

Introduction of historical manor complexes in the infrastructure of agglomerations can contribute to the economic growth as well as to development of small and medium-size business. If a modern function is selected correctly, the manor can become a center of gravitation and development even notwithstanding its distance from large residential settlements. For example, the manors can be adapted as off-the-city conference centers, hotel complexes, agrarian complexes, farms, etc.

**Social component:**

the forsaken ruined manors for the time being can be the concentration hotbeds for marginal groups and thus dangerous for visiting. Valorization of manors is necessary in view of the citizens’ safety and de-marginalization of the respective social groups by changing the environment.

**Ecological component:**

the ownerless manors also often happen to become the places for unsanctioned garbage dumps, which cause a negative impact on the ecological condition. Adaptation of manors for the modern use will resolve this problem in the natural way.

![Figure 3](image-url) Addressing the problem of HMC preservation through the prism of sustainability principles.

Further on, let us consider the options of imbalance among the components of the sustainability principle in such sphere as preservation of the architectural heritage objects:

**I. Absence of the ecological component = Incompliance with ecological requirements** (for more details, see: GOST R 54964-2012, Date of enactment: 2013-03-01).
Such situation occurs usually in such cases as reconstruction of historical buildings, which are not registered as the CHO. It happens quite often in view of the owner’s interests as well as the incompetence of the organization performing the works.

II. Absence of the economic component = “Volunteer restoration”. This option of imbalance can be observed, for example, in Russia’s remote northern regions, which so far stay beyond the field of the potential investors’ interests. In the case, when funding is not available, the existence of the monument would come to depend on concerned citizens and volunteer teams, whose possibilities are rather limited, because under the order, issued by the RF Ministry of Culture, public volunteers may only perform the counter-breakdown and conservation works at CHO [31]. Such works are neutral in terms of ecology, but are less effective. In the absence of the economic component there will be no financial investments, which are necessary for maintenance of the CHO. It should be noted that this applies not only to financing of restoration works and continuous subsidies, in which case the CHO should have been deemed as economically parasitic objects. However, in case of the knowledge-based selection of the modern function, the heritage object would be capable of generating revenues or at least being self-repayable. In Europe, there are quite many such projects of successful capitalization of heritage objects, and the rare analogue cases can be found as well in contemporary Russia [32].

III. Absence of the economic component = Non-transparency of the restoration sphere. Regrettably, this situation is typical of the restoration sphere in Russia, Interaction between the state and the public organizations in the sphere of architectural monuments protection is disturbed, and this fact quite often causes vandalism on the client part. In the course of examination and work on the Object the public organizations are deprived of access to it. This situation represents a crude violation of the afore-mentioned Article 44 of the RF Constitution: “any person is entitled to have access < … > to cultural values”. The only item, available for the concerned citizens, is the project documentation, submitted to protection bodies for approval. Quite often right at the phase of the CHO examination, the elements of the building, which are unwanted for the client, would be destroyed and then signed-off from the protected Object as lost earlier.

Vesting the public organizations with the supervisory rights, their guaranteed access to CHO at all work performance phases, and the broad discussion of the project-related decisions will provide for the preservation and the proper use of monument buildings. It should be also noted that the widespread vandalism of CHO owners is a result of the social ignorance – i.e., deformation of exactly the social component, which is necessary for sustainable development.

Summing up, let us briefly address the problem of CHO preservation in the sustainable development paradigm at three levels of governance (Figure 4).
All the afore-listed tasks are equally important, but imply the actions to be taken by the government at different levels: the macro-tasks are to be undertaken by the top-level government bodies because they suggest amendment of the legislative base, and enactment of new decisions by the government; the mezo-tasks of the lesser scale may be set for the regional governance bodies, while the micro-tasks may be resolved through the incentive measures to be taken and favorable conditions to be provided by the local governance authorities.

2. Conclusions
Resolution of such complex and grand tasks as preservation of heritage requires a comprehensive approach. However, it is necessary first and foremost to understand that historical buildings are manifestations of the material culture and must be treated as carefully as painting, sculpture, and the like. The knowledge-based integration of architectural monuments into the modern context is a guarantee and imperative for sustainable development of architecture, residential settlements and social sphere. For example, an unregistered asset, represented by historical manor complexes, in case of its relevant adaptation has a huge potential and in case the modern function is selected correctly, the manors can become the centers of social gravitation and development irrespectively of their protection status, preservation condition, and location.
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