

ICOMOS NORWAY



RØROS

WORLD HERITAGE SITE
NORWAY

BERGSTADEN RØROS

PERIODIC REPORTING ON APPLICATION OF
THE 1972 WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

OSLO MAY 2003

CONTENTS

II.1	Introduction	page	3
II.2	Statement of Significance		4
	On values		4
II.3	Statement of Authenticity/Integrity		5
	Changes to authenticity and integrity		6
	Foreseeable changes to the authenticity and integrity		6
II.4	Management		7
	Legal status		7
	Management status		8
	Need to revise administrative/management arrangements		8
	Information on cases where changes have occurred		9
II.5	Factors Affecting the Property		11
II.6	Monitoring		12
II.7	Recommendations		16
	Appendix		18
	Contract		
	ICOMOS Norway Working Group		
	Documentation Attached		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II.1 INTRODUCTION

State Party: Norway

World Heritage property: Bergstaden Røros - Mining town of Røros

Geographical co-ordinates to the nearest second:

Bergstaden's Old Town area is located on 11⁰ 23' east longitude and 62⁰ 35' north latitude, and about 650m above sea level.

Date of WH List inscription: 1980

Organisation or entity responsible for the preparation of this report:

ICOMOS Norway has carried out the periodic reporting for the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Riksantikvaren) Norway. Coordinator for the ICOMOS Norway working group is Amund Sinding-Larsen, with Siri Myrvoll, Christopher Pound and Flemming Aalund taking part, supported by Bjarte Gullachen and Dag Nilsen.

The Report:

This report addresses the WH site as inscribed in 1980 that is also regarded for practical terms to constitute the protection area. Please refer to the contract between Riksantikvaren and ICOMOS Norway dated 09 Aug 2002.

We note the current discussion on extending the WH site boundary to include "*Circumferencen*", within which are located very significant cultural heritage and natural resources.

Date of the report: Oslo 29. May 2003

Signature on behalf of the State Party

Signature: -----

Name: -----

Function: -----

II.2 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Røros WH site was inscribed in 1980 under cultural Criterion (iii), Criterion (iv) and Criterion (v).

The nomination document dated May 1980 confines itself to basic identification information, a statement of historical justification, with a following short statement on integrity, authenticity and the state of conservation.

The advisory body made no special or additional observations, and no exploration of values was made at the time by ICOMOS or by the World Heritage Committee.

No new criterion has been added later. The boundary of the WH-site is not clearly defined.

The State Party at present considering a proposal to extend the WH site boundaries to include the "Circumference" - *Circumferencen* - and cultural landscape between Røros and the national border with Sweden. The Circumference is an area of 40 km radius around Røros within which the mining company was given autonomy to extract available resources.

Røros is a significant surviving ensemble of buildings in traditional timber construction of 18th Century rural and urban Norway, with some elements from the 17th C. The structure of the early town survives with domestic properties and urban farmyard buildings and integrated into a loose urban grid that is relatively undisturbed by modern (20th C) development - this in part surrounding but not diminishing the integrity of the original townscape. This today all gives Røros a rare, if not unique quality compared to 'similar' environments in the Nordic region.

Structured around an activity, and as a function of that activity, Røros existed for 333 years as an economic centre for closely related activities in the sub-region involving mining, forestry, charcoal burning, transport, farming and husbandry – all interdependent and inter-supporting activities within the large geographical area of the Circumference. Compared to this vast area, the WH-designated site is very small.

Røros still includes a significant amount of fabric of an 18th - 19th C industrial complex of smelting works, industrial buildings and slag heaps, that bring together an extended cultural site, a large cultural environment and natural landscape.

An extension of the present WH-site boundary must consider the relation of Røros to the whole of the Circumference, with selected mining sites and related transport system.

A statement of significance was not made at the time of inscription of the property on the WH List or later. This is recommended carried out, in accordance with the recommendations of the WH Committee meeting of 1998.

On values

The WH criteria under which the site is inscribed, are clear. The 1994 ICOMOS Norway Periodic Reporting refers to Røros as a "characteristic example of technological

and industrial development". It is not clear what is meant by this. No evidence has been proffered from industrial archaeologists or industrial historians that Røros 'developed' the technology or arts of copper smelting, or did they in actual fact learn from others? Does Røros represent a 'snapshot' of a wider development of smelting technology at a point in time or did indeed new smelting techniques emerge from Røros? Røros pumping technology was, however, known as a new development, 'exported' to other mining settlements, such as at Løkken.

The above raises some interesting questions on values.

The criteria in 1978 under which Røros was inscribed on the WH-list did not address technological development.

Criterion (iv) has further changed since the 1994 ICOMOS Periodic Reporting. It now reads: the site *"be an outstanding example of a building or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history."*

Is Røros an outstanding example of a technological ensemble or is it outstanding as types of building or architectural ensemble? No material supports the supposition that Røros is outstanding in the manner of being 'better' than other relevant WH-sites. However, Røros as a place must be defined as a rare survivor and to be of remarkable interest. It is worthy of being on the WH List but the State Party should be clear on the values and criteria that support this.

Should for instance the technology and industry be 'separated' from the merits and values of Røros as a town of Nordic Renaissance, or be regarded as an implant in the fairly desolate ore-rich region by continental mining experts that also brought other expertise to Norway? At this point, it should be noted there is no supporting evidence of this or of the larger site being formally planned. Did a court official set it out, or was Røros the work of a well-read mining surveyor who set out a new town in a contemporary and convenient grid?

Criterion (ii) is interesting in stating that the property should: *"Exhibit an important interchange in values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town planning or landscape design...."*

This criterion addresses development in technology and may be a criterion more appropriate for industrial sites such as Røros. It relies on importance rather than being outstanding. No material has been offered by the authorities to judge whether we should assess the site under Criterion (ii). However, in light of the current criteria, the question is raised whether our recommendations should ask for the merits of the site to be considered as industrial or technological? It is recommended that the authorities consider whether the criterion is appropriate in response to the values of the smelting works. If the mines and transportation system are also considered to be important independently or as part of a whole ensemble then the WH-site is recommended extended under Criterion (ii).

II.3 STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY

Original aspects of authenticity are in overall terms still considered well maintained. The 1978 Nomination Form is addressing the question of authenticity quite briefly.

Subsequent conceptual changes and extensions of relevant vocabulary during the intermediate years require special attention.

The problems of maintaining authenticity may be related to

1. Røros townscape and its relationship to the surrounding landscape
2. Industrial heritage
3. Røros settlement structure and building patterns

Changes to authenticity and integrity

A number of changes are carried out since inscription. A majority of buildings within the protected area of the mining settlement originate from the 18th C and represent a traditional timber log construction. Buildings of the 20th C are made in a mixture of traditional-modern construction.

Røros Museum is currently contributing to reshaping part of *Sleggveien* as an example of an 'original' streetscape with gravel-roads and building elevations constructed in timber logs. Most of the buildings are in private ownership. The 'restoration' can be seen as a comprehensive overhaul to check overdue maintenance needs. Over a period of about 200 years since the construction of the buildings, external panelling as well as doors and window formats and detailing represent external influences and changes in fashion. Today this presents a quite unique and highly interesting variety of details.

The current Røros *authenticity of place* is a happy consequence of continuous maintenance and repairs with traditional materials and techniques. Its harmony was seen as threatened in the 1970s and 1980s by new buildings in non-traditional formats and using new materials - as seen generally in the introduction of plastic paints, thermo window panes inserted with glazing beads instead of putty, and ill-designed eaves that are modelled on national standard building manuals, examples of new materials and constructions not relevant to Røros.

It is, however, the general impression that the most unsightly changes to the historic environment are now under control, with balance achieved between protection of cultural resources and adaptive reuse.

Further foreseeable changes to the authenticity and integrity since the inscription

The "Outbuildings-Project" – *Uthusprosjektet* - is successful in bringing attention to unused or deteriorating outbuildings through providing public funding for their repair and/or adaptive reuse. The project is seen to impact positively on Røros, with acceptable adaptive reuse to some former outbuildings, but in has most cases a focus on repairs to the building fabric, as the majority of the buildings are not inhabited. The amount of original timber taken out and replaced as a result of the repairs varies with each building, and seems generally well controlled. At the start of the project proper documentation was lacking of buildings and work carried out. Today halfway through the project, well considered routines are adopted for continuous documentation during the repair work, the documentation mainly being carried out by the craftsmen.

The programme has, however, provided focus in only one direction. Credit or funding support is not available for private house-owners unless they are owners of protected or

listed buildings. The project should be monitored also beyond the end of its formal program period.

New development is addressed and controlled through the Planning- and Building Act. One of the political aims of the project – strongly supported by the DOE - was “new use” or adaptive reuse of outbuildings. As many outbuildings could accommodate new living- or guest-facilities - for instance as extensions to the main house - this became a “natural” choice for the owners. Despite its success in turning round a largely defunct and dilapidating stock of culturally very valuable outbuildings, the project, seen in retrospect, should probably have been followed by some restrictions on “new use”.

The 'Building Materials Bank' – *Materialbanken* - is important in spreading knowledge of traditional building methods and use of materials, and has been of great importance to the Outhouse-Project at Røros.

Most of the dwelling houses are still used for their original function. Adapting them to modern standards of living is in general carried out with due respect to the historic fabric. When a property is taken over by the next generation, it often changes into a holiday home for family members living elsewhere. This change in use should be monitored to ensure that a commercial purpose gradually does not take over for residential and conservation needs. Some statistics are needed as a reference and to establish a future bench mark for this. Positive consequences of such 'change' are also noted, in that a holiday home status is likely to guarantee adequate repair and maintenance also in the future – ensuring authenticity.

West of the *Slagghaugen* and south of *Småsetran*, a large area has been developed for commerce and industry. The construction is of ordinary to low architectural quality, indeed not adding to Røros in terms of visual quality. The area is located adjacent to the historical area, and may in terms of potential impact have been considered of only limited consequence to the historical area when development started around 1960. Since then, however, the area has grown much in size and visual dominance.

The development of the area needs to be followed closely. Careful and sympathetic control and management is needed. When a larger buffer zone is considered, the importance of this area must be taken into account.

II.4 MANAGEMENT

Legal status

The Røros Master plan of 1978, revised in 1982, shows the central area designated as a Protection Area, under The Planning and Building Act § 25.6.

In all 51 single buildings and sites are listed as protected, under § 15 of The Cultural Heritage Act.

The Protection Area designated as such in the Master Plan is under local jurisdiction (The Planning and Building Act). The 51 listed buildings are handled separately under federal legislation (The Cultural Heritage Act), with authority delegated by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage, *Riksantikvaren*, to Sør-Trøndelag County. In practical

terms, however, Røros Municipality has the intention to treat all traditional buildings within the protection area as listed buildings.

The legislative basis for the Røros Protection Area is considered sufficient to ensure satisfactory protection of the World Heritage site.

Management status

The management responsibility of the property is split between four legal institutions:

1. Acting for the Department of Environment, DOE, the Directorate for Cultural Heritage has overall responsibility through the Cultural Heritage Act, a federal legislation. This responsibility includes the heritage management of the Røros church, and main responsibility for the Outbuildings Project.
2. Sør-Trøndelag County has authority of the Røros Protection Area through the Cultural Heritage Act, as delegated by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage. This is exercised through their monthly visit to Røros. Open and continuous dialogue between the Municipality and County officers ensures satisfactory site management.
3. Røros Municipality has overall responsibility for the Røros Protection Area and all matters affecting it as relevant under the Planning and Building Act, including all matters of urban development and building activity. A “cultural heritage officer”, CHO, who functions as an advisor to the Røros Urban Development Office handles the municipal responsibility, but has no legal authority.
4. Røros Museum is an independent foundation, the owner of a number of listed buildings, and is responsible for the management of the State-owned industrial properties of the earlier Røros Copper Works. In this capacity, the Museum receives its instructions on heritage management directly from the Directorate for Cultural Heritage without reference to the municipality.

The institutions involved in the management of the World Heritage site are all represented in the Røros World Heritage Site Co-ordinating Committee, *Samarbeidsgruppen for verdenskulturminnet Røros*. The committee is chaired by the Mayor of Røros, with the municipal CHO as secretary.

The preparation for a revised Plan for Røros Central Area shows a sympathetic approach to bridging from needs of urban development to preservation/conservation concerns. The overall analysis does, however, appear somewhat meagre, and it is recommended that the proposal be considered in more depth and detail.

Need to revise the present administrative and management arrangements

Management responsibility is today spread across four levels, and the administrative-management structure is considered to require revision.

- Management responsibilities are found somewhat unclear at both institutional and individual levels. The direct involvement of the Directorate on some matters is

considered unsatisfactory for efficient management of the WH site, particularly as it can reduce Municipality opportunity to enforce legislation. The split responsibility reduces operational responsibility and blunts the legal instruments available – in sum, considered not optimal for the needs and potential of Røros.

- Røros Museum is understood as a partly autonomous institution with some responsibilities granted by the Directorate. Some of these are considered as operational responsibilities that could be handled by the Municipality, depending on developing relevant control and management mechanisms.
- The World Heritage designation sets some requirements for cultural heritage management at Røros. The role of the municipal Cultural Heritage Officer (CHO) acting merely as advisor to the Municipal Planning Coordinator/ Plans Coordinator is inadequate in terms of the WH responsibility. Terms of reference for the CHO position need to be reconsidered, and relevant tasks delegated it from the County. Arrangements in other counties, as in maybe Aust-Agder and Vestfold, could be relevant for Røros. The issue is a complex one, and needs to be considered at overall and detail levels, beyond the scope of this report. A constructive approach could be that the municipality is given an extended mandate for operative management. The municipality should closely follow the current national discussion on this. An extended mandate would require increased capacity at Røros Municipality.
- Røros Municipality is understood to be requesting full operational responsibility for the WH site. This should be looked into. The DOE pilot project on management procedures now to be tried could, on condition of available in-house capacity, prove relevant also to Røros Municipality.
- No management plan is established for the property, but should be regarded as a high priority. Work with building documentation and developing a GIS database should be brought forward as part of this.

In sum, operational responsibility for the Røros world heritage seems partly hidden inside a complex superstructure created through established practice that is accepted by the involved parties. The complexity of the management structure may be illustrated by the large operational distances that seem to exist between the institutions for the purpose of daily management.

Information on cases where changes have occurred

Infill and development

A few negative cases of infill from the 1970s - 80s are noted, relevant examples being Røros Municipal Music School and the nearby Milano Pizzeria. A few traditional courtyards are radically changed - glazed in - as semiprotected internal courtyards, such as *Schankegården* in Kirkegaten. The increase in domestic buildings turning into holiday-homes at Røros is mentioned above. The authorities need to pay close attention to this development, as a factor likely to affect the demography, economy and use-patterns of Røros more than most others in the next 10-20 years. The Municipality should consider using special regulations for the township to ensure a permanent resident population in 'historic Røros' in the future. The Outbuildings-Project with its mixture of adaptive reuse and repair of building has reactivated the traditional building stock and its use in various ways – and hence also the township.

New development is addressed and controlled through the Planning- and Building Act. Despite continuous efforts a few recent cases set a most negative trend. Ironically the two major hotels at Røros, both benefiting from the Røros status as a World Heritage

Site, have demonstrated that short-sighted economic interests again takes precedence of conservation and cultural heritage values. The recent extension of Bergstaden Hotel is not sympathetic to the general character of Røros, and has contributed to degrading the overall appearance of the town providing a real eyesore at the southern front and main entrance to the historic town, also affecting the view down one of the two main streets of the historic town, *Bergmannsgata*. The structure is out of scale with the historic townscape, considerably reducing the authentic character in this part of Røros. Røros Hotel is seen to oppose the extension of the conservation buffer zone towards *Kvitsand* to the west, having established a golf course in that area.

Adapting traditional dwelling houses to a modern standard has in general been carried out with due respect to the historic fabric.

The recently opened medical Rehabilitation Centre in the *Småsetran* area, reflects negatively on the planning and development management of Røros - notwithstanding the relative architectural merits of the project.

Townscape

The previously unpaved roads bordered by large flagstones along the houses are now changed in favour of tarmac. Former front gardens facing the main streets, and then enclosed with white painted wooden fences, have disappeared, all front gardens now included in the streetscape. The larger shopwindows are believed to have been introduced along the main streets already before WW II. The efforts by the municipality to develop asphalt to 'match' the historic environment are applauded.

Climate and buildings

The harsh winter climate at Røros calls for special thermal insulation to the buildings. A few unfortunate examples of external isolation are noted. These leave the window frames with a setback from the facades, changing radically the character of the buildings. The need for improved thermal insulation is understood, and the wish to replace old windows poses a special problem to the management authority. Repair and maintenance of the original fabric need to come into focus and guidelines be worked out to explain means to improve thermal properties of traditional buildings without changing external appearance and original or genuine character.

Vegetation

Before the copper-works were started at Røros, this mountainous area was largely wooded. The pine forests were quickly consumed as firewood needed in the mining and processing of ore. When dynamite was introduced and other fuels used for the processing, the vegetation was still held down by the grazing cattle of urban farms and those of the 'Småsetran'-area. Accordingly, for many generations Røros has had a visual character of a quite naked or exposed settlement set in a windswept and closely cropped mountainous environment of high altitude sweeping fields. From around 1970, changes in milk production meant an end to free-roaming cattle. So, birch, juniper and other vegetation found very favourable growing conditions. Today only one farm is seen to maintain animal production – and this achieved only by means of considerable public sector subsidy.

Residents appreciate the new 'lush' Røros environment, the green landscape is seen to positively affect the local climate – giving less wind for a start. There is no doubt, however, that in other respects the growing vegetation is negatively affecting Røros. As a clear example of this, a number of buildings are being 'undermined', creating damage through differential settlements. Other structures such as the churchyard stonewalls are

in a process of being broken up, most likely due to the same problem. Also for reasons of Røros central area ground-conditions, this situation should be closely monitored.

With the end of agriculture and husbandry in Røros, the larger landscape is already in a state of disuse - the agricultural land uncultivated. Setting up a public program to maintain some of these areas for aesthetical reasons is of course possible, but not regarded as feasible in the long term. Finding relevant and contributing new use for these areas may prove difficult.

WH-site staffing

An earlier section refers to property management. With a strengthening of municipal cultural heritage management, an increase in local and trained staffing will be needed. The matter of training staff should be considered in this context and is not dealt with in this report.

WH-site funding

Røros Municipality is encouraged to plan the work necessary and relevant to its world heritage status, and submit its Action-Plan as an application for funding to the authorities.

Visitor facilities

The Røros Tourist Office located close to the bus- and train stations provides a range of normal services, for which it seems well equipped. However, it is today not set up to provide information and services profiling Røros as a World Heritage Site.

The other information facility at Røros is Røros Museum, usually perceived as 'merely' a Mining Museum, and located inside the WH site.

The only identification that can be found of the formal WH-designation at Røros is an obscure bronzed plaque fixed to an old and all-brown timber façade located up from Røros Museum. Its World Heritage status is thus stated here, but even for the well-informed visitor, it remains a fairly well kept secret – considered as important information clearly not to be squandered on the incidental visitor?

An information- and visitors centre is badly needed at Røros WH-site. The need for it is regarded as very significant, and its potential in terms of providing information, knowledge, community-visitor awareness and interaction must be regarded as huge – so, still today a real missed opportunity. It should be remembered that under the Convention, the State Party has an obligation to ensure that the WH site is adequately presented.

II.5 FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

Røros has a stable population and well established infrastructure. No radical growth is promoted or expected, but incremental and internal change is assumed due to modern demands and the municipal policy to develop opportunities for employment and housing. These processes are likely to expose Røros to important changes relative to

- current retailing structure
- existing housing, with demand for incremental change and additional space
- physical and social/cultural environments through increasing modernisation
- urban landscape and streetscape – with increasing vegetation
- traffic management
- tourism

- risk preparedness, particularly with regard to the threats of fire

Some pollutants are as a consequence of the mining activity believed to be present in quite large quantities at Røros. It is not known how this may affect the town and its environment in the future, or which procedures may be adopted for their removal.

Recent action by Røros Municipality has brought forward initiative concerning

- development control
- fire threat protection
- traffic management

At present, no risk-preparedness plan exists for the WH-designated area, or for Røros town. A fire protection plan is now under preparation and funding allocated for this.

A change in retailing patterns may result in

- a loss of local need-shops becoming caterers mainly to the tourist trade, providing a surplus of art and crafts shops, and/or
- new major shopping facilities located outside the historical centre.

A cause for concern at Røros is its increasing vegetation, discussed above - the lack of vegetation having been such a characteristic feature of Røros' identity in the past.

New development is at present addressed and controlled through the Planning- and Building Act, and despite continuous efforts a few recent cases set a most negative trend, as described earlier under ...

Traffic pressure is at present contained through a parking strategy and a traffic management plan. As part of this effort, the Municipality has clearly managed to keep the number of intrusive traffic signs to a minimum, and also introduce sympathetic and custom designed parking meters.

The management of tourism seems in overall terms to be under control. However, events such as the largest annual 'crowd-puller' the Winter Market "Martnan" each year seems to produce regular near-critical situations, with smaller fire outbreaks occurring among the very crowded market stalls. The situation are here termed as 'near-critical' because of the density of people – more than 50.000 persons may be thronged together in the narrow main street on these market days. The safety of the crowding people in the event of a real fire should be a major concern, not to speak of the substantial risk to the historical buildings.

II.6 MONITORING

As a commission from the Directorate, ICOMOS Norway in 1994 presented an evaluation report (dated 24.02.1994), with recommendations as set out here

1. Provide definition of the Heritage Site boundaries and buffer zone
2. Establish a site commission and strengthen the position of the cultural heritage officer
3. Compile baseline information for the WH-site
4. Build up documentation archives

5. Initiate regular monitoring and device a maintenance strategy
6. Establish guidelines for planning, protection and urban design
7. Establish building repairs and conservation guidelines
8. Show special regard to protecting the historic urban qualities of the WH- site

The WH-site boundary is yet to be confirmed. No monitoring system has been established, and none is yet planned. The submission of a Management Plan became a prerequisite for inscription as a World Heritage Site in 1997. There is as yet no Management Plan for Røros.

Although Røros also since the previous evaluation seems concerned to maintain and develop its unique values, the ICOMOS Norway 1994 recommendations are given only incidental attention.

A future monitoring system should address the following three issues:

- A review of protection plans and policies
- An assessment of projects and initiatives
- A formal response to the ICOMOS Norway Evaluation of 1994

The WH site boundary needs to reflect the values and qualities of the features of the historic town – also related to *Småsetran*. Monitoring needs to relate directly to such qualities and values.

Regular monitoring should involve

- Røros Municipality
- Sør-Trøndelag County
- Riksantikvaren
- Røros World Heritage Site Co-ordinating Committee

The heritage management team of Røros municipal administration should provide the secretariat organising a regular monitoring regime through the Co-ordinating Committee of the Røros World Heritage site.

An Impact Assessment Study of the new transport centre and other major infrastructure developments is needed that analyses likely impacts of alternative locations on the historic core area. The aim is particularly to maintain stretches of open land connecting 'historic Røros' with the surrounding landscape. Such protected landscape zones should include *Småsetran* to the north-east and *Kvitsanden* to the south-west.

The Area Plan for Røros Centre needs to be revised to address the coordination of heritage preservation and urban development strategies.

Numerous articles and reports about the history of Røros allow a general and rich appreciation of the historic environment. A systematic recording or documentation of individual buildings is much needed. This would help each owner to understand and appreciate the special historic values and architectural qualities of his own property and related to the larger historical townscape. The work should be developed with digital tools into a GIS relational database.

A tourist arriving in Røros without previous knowledge of the mining settlement would appear to receive little assistance today from the Tourist Information Office. It could be

expected that such information includes as a minimum a basic introduction to the WH Site and related attractions.

Smelthytta and related industrial structures including the slag mounds provide Røros with its true identity as a mining settlement. The reconstruction of the building with the establishment of *Smelthytta Museum* was a major achievement in the 1980's, but this remarkable initiative seems not to have been followed up after this. The role of the museum in the contemporary society needs to be clarified as regards research, documentation, interpretation and presentation of the industrial heritage of Røros as a mining settlement with a presentation of all related activities within the Circumference. Developing the museum to become interactive with a proactive role towards the local community would need a significant investment of funds and human resources, and cannot be solved alone by the present resources available to the museum. The social and economic history of the mining settlement and the people who came to work, live and trade here over some centuries has yet to be told.

The Iron Bridge Museum in the United Kingdoms may serve as a possible inspiration for developing a series of interrelated visitor sites at Røros, encompassing all the early industrial sites pertaining to the provision of energy, mining, ore-smelting and transportation.

The cultural identity of the mining settlement is closely linked to the surrounding landscape. This intimate interdependence seems not emphasised or acknowledged by the 1978 WH-site Nomination. Today, the industrial development immediately to the east of the slag mounds is encroaching on the fields traditionally used for summer pasture. Thereby the visitor experience and understanding of the socio-economic background of Røros based on a mixed economy relying on wages from seasonal employment at the Copper Works and farming is greatly diminished.

Riksantikvaren has made arrangements with some property owners to ensure continuous hay harvest at *Småsetran*, but no formal management plan has been made public. This open cultural landscape including its outbuildings should be incorporated as an integral part of the World Heritage Site. Inclusion of this area will secure a wedge-shaped field of open land right into the core of the town. Such protected planning zones may also incorporate the open landscape surrounding the airport and beyond, with *Kvitsanden*.

The derelict land and eyesores that dominate the south-western outskirts of Røros town need careful consideration and subsequent planning initiatives in order to create a valid completion of the historic townscape and an agreeable transition zone between new and historic townscape. To design new infill that matches the historic townscape without creating a pastiche-environment constitutes a major architectural challenge.

A Visual Impact Study and a Survey of the Architectural Values are needed for Røros. The church and the church tower are of the utmost importance to the skyline and its visual identity from afar. This unique monument and symbol of the mining settlement must remain as the prime landmark of Røros.

Likewise, a strategic Environmental Assessment of the new transport centre and related road connections is required to determine their impact on the conditions of the WH site. With a view to assess possible adverse future impacts it would assist in preparing alternative development scenarios before a final decision is taken.

The present 'Site Committee' should prepare an Annual Report with a statement of performance, future intentions, and a concrete work plan including a clear distribution of responsibility for actual implementation.

Advice on painting and colour schemes is provided by Røros CHO in consultations with *NIKU, the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research*. Appropriate paints are provided free of charge to the house owners on their request. This system of advisory assistance seems to work well, but there is a need of general information and guidelines to create appreciation of the inherent architectural qualities of the individual buildings and the urban settings.

There is a need and a potential for urban archaeological research at Røros. Little if any relevant archaeological research is carried out in or near the WH site, despite numerous excavation and construction activities at Røros during the last 20 years.

An information- and visitors centre is badly needed at Røros WH-site. The need for it is regarded as very significant, and the potential of such is seen as huge – so, this still constitutes a real missed opportunity.

The Final Report for the project "Extension and management of Røros WH site" (*Avgrensing, vern og forvaltning av verdensarv Røros*), prepared by Sør-Trøndelag County, Røros Municipality and Riksantikvaren (2002), lists about 40 individual sites within an area of 6000 km². It embraces 6 municipal areas that would constitute an extended Røros WH site if proposed and approved. Efforts to define the real extent of the mining activities in and around Røros and a future proposal thus to extend the original WH site area is supported by ICOMOS Norway. The involved sites within the Circumference need to be ranged in terms of their relative importance, based on a detailed description of each site. A priority list should be part of an Action Plan prepared in cooperation with all stakeholders, to include neighbouring municipalities.

The State represented by the Public Construction and Property Board, *Statsbygg*, is today the largest single property owner of buildings formerly belonging to the Røros Copper Works. The Society for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, *Fortidsminneforeningen*, owns another few. This shared responsibility will hopefully materialise in the formulation of a management plan pertaining to facilities management and conservation of these properties.

In view of the original 'lack' of values definition and the change in concepts and values/ WH criteria since the inscription of Røros in 1980, the State Party is asked to be clear on the values and criteria that today support this, also as regards the possible extension of the WH site.

A distinction is needed between legislation and management of the cultural heritage values. There are examples of recent developments with adverse effects on the integrity of the site as referred to under the Statement of Authenticity.

II.7 RECOMMENDATIONS

Having studied all relevant documents provided, visited the Røros WH site, and discussed various issues with the institutions responsible, we have an overall impression that the cultural heritage management of Røros is quite positive. ICOMOS Norway is, however, concerned that the main recommendations of our 1994 evaluation do not seem to be followed up, and await a response from the authorities on this issue.

With reference to the problems brought to the attention of the ICOMOS Norway current Working Group, in addition to referring to the previous report, we make the following specific recommendations:

1. **Definition of the site.** The issue of the WH site boundary and buffer zone definitions must be brought to an early conclusion. Independent of any future Circumference-proposal, a practical proposal should be prepared immediately to include *Småsetran* and the open land to the West of the present WH-Site in the operational management of the WH site.
2. **Statement of significance.** A statement of significance should be drawn up as part of the requested Baseline information, in accordance with statements by the World Heritage Committee Meeting of 1998.
3. **Management Plan.** A management plan must be established for the WH site as a priority.
4. **Impact study.** An Impact Assessment Study should be made of major infrastructure developments, with appropriate analyses of the landscape both surrounding and 'entering' Røros.
5. **Urban archaeology.** Urban archaeology must be given attention, with an obligation to document whatever remains of the town's early history that could appear in the urban foundations.
6. **Visitors Centre.** A Visitors Centre presenting the Røros WH site is needed. Its organising, mandate and administration need careful analysis - whether it be established in its own right, with documentation centre, or combined with Røros Museum.
7. **Vegetation.** The growth of vegetation foreign to the windswept and exposed settlement typical of Røros gives cause for concern and need to be monitored.
8. **Values.** Knowledge of the qualities and values of Røros WH site is important. The Statement of Significance should be published and distributed to the residents of Røros and its neighbouring municipalities. The Internet should also be used more actively.
9. **Management.** The management structure and division of responsibilities need to be reviewed. The position of the Røros CHO needs to be strengthened, and number of appropriately trained municipal staff increased.

10. **Outbuildings-Project.** The Outbuildings-Project should be continued as a permanent public funding arrangement to assist individual owners maintain their property independent of a status as a listed building or not, and be extended to include outbuildings in *Småsetran*.
11. **Communication.** Education, information and awareness building is a major obligation of the State Party's to the Convention in order to strengthen appreciation and respect of the heritage values and to keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening their heritage.

The World Heritage Convention has introduced concepts of *a common world heritage of outstanding universal value* and of *a duty for the international community to cooperate to ensure its protection and transmission to future generations*.

The Convention also emphasises the interdependence of cultural and natural heritage. The World Heritage emblem clearly symbolises this. The above are of particular relevance to Røros as a mining town depending on a surrounding landscape - an extended cultural site being part of a large cultural environment and natural landscape.

APPENDIX

Correspondence and contract

- Letter from Riksantikvaren to ICOMOS Norway dated 15 Feb 2002
- Contract between Riksantikvaren and ICOMOS Norway dated 09 Aug 2002.

ICOMOS Norway Working Group

Members of the ICOMOS Norway working group are

- Amund Sinding-Larsen, Architect MNAL RIBA, Oslo, Coordinator
- Siri Myrvoll, Dr.philos in Archaeology, Bergen
- Christopher Pound, Conservation Architect, RIBA, Bath, England
- Flemming Aalund Architect DAL, PhD in Conservation, Copenhagen, with
- Bjarte Gullachen, MA History of Art, Bergen
- Dag Nilsen, Architect MNAL, Associate Professor NTNU Trondheim.

Other documentation attached with paper copy

- Contract between RA and ICOMOS Norway dated 9. August 2002
- The Røros Conservation Area
- Røros Bergstad – Current situation
- Røros Bergstad – Situation 1800-1900

Photo credits

- Front page top photo - Dag Nilsen, Architect MNAL, Assoc. Professor NTNU
- Front page bottom photo – Amund Sinding-Larsen, Architect MNAL RIBA, Research Fellow NTNU