CHAPTER VI
PRESENT SCENARIO OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION IN
VISAKHAPATNAM

6.1 General

As a result of the work presented in chapters one and two, it is understood that Visakhapatnam Metropolitan Region in general and Visakhapatnam city in particular are rich in a variety of heritages. However, before proceeding with the matters of their conservation and management it is essential to understand their present condition. Therefore, the status of built heritages in the Visakhapatnam city was dealt with in this chapter in the light of various planning methods, provisions and role of different government and non-government agencies.

Heritage buildings, precincts, sites and other inheritances around the world have been put to constant threat, especially in the light of population explosion coupled with pressure for land and other natural resources as already mentioned in Chapters I and II. In the words of Araoz (2011), "Over the past ten years the cultural heritage community has been repeatedly alarmed by an increasing number of interventions, projects and management approaches that challenge our established conservation approach and that at times even appear to erode the integrity and authenticity of heritage places". These threats have been acknowledged by the global community, national governments and local people alike (Techera, 2011). Therefore, in order to retain these charming heritages as reminiscences of the historical past, social activities and cultural orientation coupled with craftsmanship and innovative ideas of earlier generations; their conservation acquires greater significance, particularly along with the passage of time (de Santoli, 2002; Harun, 2011; Jayakumar, 2011). Heritage conservation process embraces consolidation and preservation of structural fabric by preventing deterioration of building elements through rehabilitation and restoration.

A good deal of effort has been made in this line around the world during recent years. In fact, India has a long and rich tradition of conserving historical buildings and details of these practices were well documented in ancient scriptures such as ‘Mansara’. However, this indigenous system was supplanted with European ideology during the 19th century (Misra, 2004). India is duty bound under international as well
as own laws to preserve heritages in the country. The Burra Charter (ICOMOS 1987) holds that maintenance should be given topmost priority where the fabric of heritage building is identified to have cultural significance. Although constitution of India spells out significance of cultural heritage, only piecemeal legislations are available in addition to the lack of any national or state authority to deal with heritages in a holistic sense (Jayakumar, 2011).

Narrowing down in the topic to Visakhapatnam, the city, as detailed in Chapters III and IV consists of administrative, memorial, institutional buildings, ancient monuments, bungalows, churches, gardens, guest houses, hotels, lighthouses, mosques, palaces, temples and traditional houses that were constructed between 200BC-1947AD. Most of these structures owned by government or other institutions were built with the support of or contributions from the royal families and landlords (Zamindars). All these constructions now stand as proud heritage edifices of the city offering many a reminiscence to the present generation. Almost none of these resources have so far received any serious attention for their protection and preservation from the central, state, regional or local governing bodies. As pointed out by Muttalib (1985) urban conservation including that of the existing heritages is basically a national effort though primary managerial responsibility lies with the ULBs. Therefore, a maiden attempt is put forth in this chapter to assess the present scenario of heritage conservation in Visakhapatnam city as mentioned above. In addition, an opinion survey among members of INTACH and Indian Institute of Architects (IIA) was conducted to identify the agencies responsible for fund raising.

6.2 Planning at Various Levels

Inscriptional records and literary references indicate that conservation of monuments in India has been taken care by the rulers, their subordinates, monks and merchants since early Christian era and the same took a systematic turn during the 18th century (Agrawal, 2002). However, the aspect gained new impetus from the early 20th century through development of legal frameworks and necessary paraphernalia from time to time. The issue derives its importance from the spirit of Indian Constitution. Article 49 of Part IV Directive Principles of State Policy of the Constitution of India contemplates “Protection of monuments and places and objects
of national importance. It shall be the obligation of the State to protect every monument or place or object of artistic or historic interest, declared by or under law made by Parliament to be of national importance, from spoilation, disfigurement, destruction, removal, disposal or export, as the case may be”. The subject of “historical monuments” is included under all the three Lists (I Central List, II State List and III Concurrent List). Therefore, State Legislatures can enact laws related to the subject, but any laws made in the same regard by the Parliament supersede the former. Similarly, any monument or heritage declared by the Parliament becomes a National monument or heritage and only those not covered by Parliament can qualify for declaration by the State Legislatures as State monuments. The GoI through the Town and Country Planning Organization under the Ministry of Urban Development have brought out model heritage regulations to serve the cause of heritage conservation at large in the country (Anonymous, 2011a).

6.2.1 Planning at National Level

India being a party to a number of International Charters is committed to follow their guidelines. In addition, Article 51 of the Constitution of India mandates the State to foster respect for international law and treaty obligations (Jayakumar, 2011). The UNESCO Convention for Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed conflict, 1953; Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970; Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972; Recommendations concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (Warsaw, Nairobi, 1976), Recommendation for the Protection of Moveable Cultural Property 1978; Convention on the Protection of the Under Water Cultural Heritage 2001; Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003; Declaration Concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage 2003 and the Venice Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas adopted by the ICOMOS 1987 and such other instruments indicate the areas to be conserved. As a net result of all these commitments, GoI have declared 150 places as National Heritage Sites (Singh, 2010), but there are several short comings in the conservation of these monuments due to lack of political patronage, people’s movement, dogma of anti-progress attached and money spinning chances further to the absence of effective management, training and infrastructural facilities (Dilawari,
The ‘National Heritage Sites’, however, does not include any heritage existing in Visakhapatnam though deserving category of the kind abound the city and its suburbs. This kind of oddities are chiefly a result of existing legal instruments derived from archaic British laws that cannot address the issues of changing landuse-landcover pattern, loopholes in land and tax policies and unregulated commerce (Nayak and Iyer, 2008).

6.2.2 Planning at State Level

Current laws on the conservation of ancient monuments and sites, heritage buildings and heritage precincts existing in the state are mainly contained in (1) the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 of GoI, (2) the Andhra Pradesh Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1960 and (3) Andhra Pradesh Urban Areas (Development) Act, 1975.

Under the first act, the ASI on behalf of GoI shall issue a public notification calling for any objections on its intention to declare an ancient monument (a heritage resource) as “listed”. After the expiry of two months time and on satisfying any objections received in the matter, the ASI can declare the monument (or heritage) as legally protected. From then on, the responsibility of maintaining the monument (or heritage) solely lies with the ASI. Although ASIHC is taking care of 137 monuments in the state, none of the heritages in Visakhapatnam city fall into its fold (ASI website).

The second act laid rules governing protected monuments in the state spelling out their accessibility, copying, filming and permissible construction, mining, other operations in and around protected areas in addition to excavation and movement of antiquities. An amendment made in 2010 to this act stipulates that destroying built cultural heritage in the state invites up to 2 years jail or Rs 100,000 penalty. According to ASI website, the Andhra Pradesh State Government is looking after 500 protected monuments (ASI website) through its Department of Archaeology and Museums. Similarly, as per the State Department of Archaeology and Museums, the list of monuments existing in Visakhapatnam District are (1) Varaha Lakshmi Narasimha Swamy Temple*, 2) Dharmalingeshwara Temple*, 3) Radha Govinda Swamy Temple*, 4) Visweswara Swamy Temple*, 5) Ancient images of
Nilakateswara Nandi*, 6) Parvati* Vigneswara* Temple, 7) Someswara Temple*, 8) War Memorial (Dutch), 9) Flag Staff Dutch Cemetery, 10) Dutch Devils Mansion, 11) St. Peters Church, 12) Sri Alluri Sitarama Raju, Gangamudora Tombs, 13 to 16 Buddhist Sites at Mangamaripeta*, Maduravada, Pavuralakonda and Bavikonda*). This list includes 10 monuments (marked asterisk ‘*’) out of the total of 500 notified by the ASI website as mentioned above.

Within the legal framework of the third Act, the Hyderabad Urban Development Authority (HUDA) has brought out Zoning Regulations, 1981 that included elaborate rules and procedures to guide in the conservation of heritage buildings and precincts present in the city and subsequently made a number of amendments to it to effectively protect and conserve as many as 151 heritage buildings and 9 heritage precincts identified by the ULB till now (G.O.Ms No.542,M.A date 14 Dec 1995 of GoAP and G.O.Ms.No.185 dated 22 Apr 2006 of GoAp). However, no such effort was put forth so far by VUDA. Yet, a sign of relief according to a recent news report is that the State Government allocated Rs. 50 million each towards renovation of Maharaja Sir Narayana Gajapathi Row Hindu Reading Room and Turner’s Choultry and Rs. 10 million for King Edward VII Market in Visakhapatnam city (Anonymous, 2012h).

6.2.3 Planning at Regional Level

General Town Planning Scheme approved by the GoAP in 1970 formed the initial ‘Development Plan’ of Visakhapatnam city. The plan is aimed at a balanced growth and development of the city in respect of both physical aspects and social infrastructure, but overlooked the subject of heritage and its conservation.

Between 1986-1989, VUDA have prepared a Master Plan that stretches from 1986 to 2001 for VMR for the first time. The same was approved by the GoAP vide No. G.O.Ms.No:247 MA & UD Dept., dated 31-05-1989. This Master Plan does not contain any heritage resources of the Visakhapatnam city, but includes a list of heritage buildings in adjacent municipalities of Bheemunipatnam and Vizianagaram.

i) Provisions in RMPVMR-2021

Since the Master plan referred above had reached the projected year 2001 without much achievement of the contemplated objectives and that VMR had been
experiencing tremendous development due to mega projects such as Gangavaram Port, Industrial Park, National Thermal Power Corporation, Information Technology Park, Apparel Park, National Highway widening, Tourism Development, Vizag-Kakinada Petro Chemicals and Petroleum Corridor; VUDA have thought it fit to revise the existing plan and prepared one that lasts up to 2021.

In accordance with the said developments of the city, GoAP have elevated Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation (VMC) to Greater Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation (GVMC) by bringing in Gajuwaka and 32 other peripheral settlements within the fold of this umbrella.

A temporary heritage committee under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chairman of VUDA was constituted in the year 2001 for the spot listing of heritage resources in VMR. This temporary committee carried out work on the basis of age, architecture, archaeological importance and socio-historical relevance of the structures and made a list of quite a good number of resources as having importance in terms of heritage. However, finally, a list of 59 built heritages was only identified by the VUDA as highly important and regulations required for their effective conservation laid down. This list includes 32 buildings existing in Visakhapatnam city. As a sequel, RMPVMR-2021 also suggested VUDA to constitute a permanent Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) having the following composition for the successful implementation of heritage programmes in the region (Anonymous, 2007a).

i) An expert with 15 years of experience in heritage conservation to head the committee as Chairman,

ii) Two structural engineers, each having 10 years of experience in the field together with a membership in the Institution of Engineers (India),

iii) Architects having 10 years of experience and a membership in the Council of Architecture,

iv) An urban designer,

v) A heritage conservation architect,

vi) Two architects having experience in conservation architecture,

vii) Honorary Director of the Visakhapatnam Museum,

viii) Two environmentalists having independent knowledge and 10 years of experience in the subject,
ix) Two city historians having 10 years of experience in the history of VMR,
x) A member nominee of the State Government not below the rank of Assistant Director from the Department of Archaeology,
xi) A member nominee of the Ministry of Environment and Forests and
xii) Chief Planning Officer of VUDA, City Planner of GVMC, two Regional Tourism Officers (of whom one shall be a Member Secretary of the Committee)

However, VUDA has neither constituted any such committee nor put up any concerted effort to take care of the conservation aspects, at least of the said 59 built heritages approved by the very body itself.

ii) City Development Plan

As an out fall of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) of the GoI, a CDP for Visakhapatnam spelling out the objectives and policies for the infrastructural development of all sectors right from engineering infrastructure, transportation, social services, land use and environmental issues was prepared by the GVMC in 2006 to serve as a guiding policy document for the balanced growth of the city. This plan simply adopted heritage sites of historical and religious importance included in RMPVMR-2021 for conservation further to the development of tourism at those places although JNNURM has prepared toolkit to assist cities to identify the heritage component and formulate a strategy for its protection, conservation and further development (Anonymous, 2006b).

iii) Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission

In order to address various issues arising out of India’s rapid urbanization, GoI had launched Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) that lasts for 7 years from 2005-06 to 2012-2013 and is likely to be extended further. Deriving its spirit from 74th Constitution Amendment Act (CAA) 1992, the mission came into force through the Ministries of Urban Development and Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The Mission is single largest GoI initiative in urban sector with a budget of Rs. 614.6 billion for 7 years. Among the many components included, development of heritage areas also finds a prime preference and cities such as Varanasi, Amritsar, Haridwar, Ujjain, Gwalior and Madurai
internationally known for heritage, tourism and pilgrimage are to be brought to lime light, particularly with reference to their historical and cultural glories. Thus, the mission embraces all State capitals, 63 cities with 1 million and above population and 23 other cities of religious and tourist importance. All these cities prepared multi-disciplinary comprehensive CDPs in collaboration with private agencies and INTACH. These plans specifically taken care of the interests of stakeholders who work for the development of the said cities as they know the city better (Singh 2009, 2010).

iv) Role of Urban Local Bodies and Other Agencies

The 74th Constitutional Amendment Act 1992 accords constitutional status to ULBs, thereby bringing in paradigm shift from “top down” approach to “bottom up” approach to strengthen good governance at local levels (Tiwari, 2002; Jayakumar, 2011). Among the 18 functions and responsibilities listed in the 12th Schedule of this act, protection of cultural and natural heritages finds a place under two separate empowerments. Thus, it becomes an obligation on the part of VUDA and GVMC to take full care of the said heritages within their provincial limits. In addition, INTACH, State Tourism Department and Andhra University are participating in the processes of heritage conservation and promotion of heritage education in VMR. A comprehensive picture of these agencies in planning, development and management of heritages in the region is summed up below besides emphasizing the need for public involvement on these issues.

a) Visakhapatnam Urban Development Authority

With respect to heritages existing in VMR, the RMPVMR-2021 has identified three potential areas, viz., a) Visakhapatnam One Town accommodating a number of British Colonial built, b) Bheemunipatnam Municipality containing Dutch sites and buildings and c) Visakhapatnam suburbs hosting Buddhist archaeological sites for the preparation of detailed conservation plans (Anonymous, 2007a). However, although implementation of Master Plans facilitates orderly and planned development of cities in a sustainable manner as aptly remarked by Tiwari (2002), these methods did not produce any satisfactory physical results over the last few decades in the country, but remained just as policy documents in majority of instances including the one under consideration now.
Greater Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation

A number of heritage sites (28) in and around Visakhapatnam were listed out in the CDP concerned (Anonymous, 2005a) to promote tourism and recreation rather than protecting the interest of heritage theme. In addition, the Corporation is mainly backing upon Tourism Department for the preservation and enhancement of common inheritances. Furthermore, the ULB is seemingly putting the responsibility of heritage conservation on the shoulders of Endowments Department as many heritages of the region are of religious nature. Because of these diversions and inadequate attention to the provisions of infrastructure development, conservation works and fiscal sanctions, the planning tools of GVMC also have met with the same fate as the one mentioned above as pointed out by Tiwari (2002). However, a sign of relief in the line is that the Corporation has recently renovated the Victoria Jubilee Town Hall in One Town expending an ad-hoc grant of Rs. 850,000 (Anonymous, 2012i) although use of heritage-benign materials and adoption of heritage conservation principles were grossly neglected.

c) Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage

The INTACH was founded in 1984 and gradually established several Chapters over the years across the country to redress the processes of steady attrition of a multitude of monuments and heritages neither attended by ASI nor State Archaeological Departments thereby articulating an ideology of heritage conservation off the official line (Misra, 2004). In this long journey, the INTACH Chapters have been taking up documentation of heritages in the country, spreading awareness about them besides taking up conservation of several heritages and extending training programmes to conservation professionals. In tune with these goals, INTACH Visakhapatnam Chapter has been promoting awareness among the public as well as the local administrators about heritage resources in the region, celebrating World Heritage Day, organizing heritage walks and quiz programmes by instituting heritage awards for school and college students, heritage clubs and private owners.
**d) Tourism Department**

State Tourism Department has completed restoration of the following three built heritages between 2003 and 2006 in order to promote tourism in the region (personal communication from INTACH Visakhapatnam Chapter) (Table 6.1).

**Table 6.1: Restorations Carried Out by the State Tourism Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Heritage Building</th>
<th>Approximate Cost (Rs. Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurupam monument, Visakhapatnam</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Choultry, Bheemunipatnam</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peters church, Bheemunipatnam</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Rani Mahal restoration project was taken up by the Conservation Centre at Bhubaneswar. According to RM PVM R-2021, the Department has further committed to fund the following three-heritage conservation projects.

i) Restoration and expansion of temple precincts of Lord Narasimha Swami in Bheemunipatnam,

ii) Development of landscape and ceremonial path at Lord Narasimha Swami Temple in Bheemunipatnam and

iii) Development of Buddhist site as an unique hill top heritage destination at Thotlakonda near Visakhapatnam.

Usually tourism is at loggerheads with heritage preservation and local cultures and therefore the former needs to be properly planned and managed so that historical monuments and cultural heritage are cherished forever by the generations to come (Agrawal, 2002).

**e) Andhra University**

In order to ease heritage conservation approach, Department of Architecture of the Andhra University College of Engineering is documenting the heritage buildings in VM R, their construction techniques, architectural styles and allied aspects.
**Public Involvement**

Although public awareness and local support are two vital factors that ensure preservation of heritages by local residents through effective deterrence of misuse, defacing and allied harm; the same are strongly lacking at present, even at national level. At this juncture, it may be relevant to recall that “Public participation enriches the understanding of heritage and associated meanings; promotes social cohesion and sustainability and work towards a shared vision at a local level. Heritage belongs to the people not to governments. Community organization like community consultations, leadership training, team building, heritage orientation, local history seminars is a basic activity in bonding together the community stakeholders towards a common sentiment, understanding and valuation of the heritage” (Herb, 2002). Further, Mishra (2009), Ghosh (2010), Nayak (2010) and Techera (2011) emphasized that collaboration and cooperation at all levels of government and society will bring about the needed impetus for heritage conservation.

**6.3 Observations**

Certain important facts were noticed during evaluation of the existing scenario of heritage conservation in Visakhapatnam.

**6.3.1 Analysis of the Identified Heritages**

For the first time in RMPVMR-2021, 31 heritage resources of the city were mapped and regulations included for their effective conservation.

Of the 31 identified heritage resources in the City, 2 fall under the category of sacred sites, 7 under religious precincts, 12 under institutional buildings, 2 under residential bungalows, 2 under cultural heritage sites, 2 under archaeological monuments and 4 under common structures. All these heritage resources belonged to seven typologies (Table 6.2) as under.
Table 6.2: Heritages in Visakhapatnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritages</th>
<th>Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Cemetery and Kurupam monument</td>
<td>Scared sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temples of Simhachalam*, Jagannadha Swami, Siva, Appikonda*, Venkateswara Swami; Church at hill top, Kottvedhi Church and Kottvedhi Dargha</td>
<td>Religious precincts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Lodge, Collectorate, District Court, King George Hospital, Town Hall, St. Aloysius School, Jeypore, Vikram Dev College, Rani Chandramani Devi Hospital, Visakha Museum (Old Bunglow or Mukherjee House), Queen Mary School, Waltair Club building and Circuit House</td>
<td>Institutional buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawa Mahal and Railway Guest House</td>
<td>Residential bungalows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali Temple and Kanaka Mahalakshmi Temple</td>
<td>Cultural heritage sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavikonda* and Thotlikonda*</td>
<td>Archaeological monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Memorial Pavilion and Light Houses (3nos)</td>
<td>Common structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: As identified by Temporary Heritage Committee, 2001 mentioned in Anonymous (2007a)*

Thus, the city as a whole is rich in architectural resources related to different periods of history and all these heritages for sure form a part of the proud possession of the city. Only thing needed is their proper recognition, conservation and promotion.

6.3.2 Visakhapatnam Urban Development Authority’s Languor

The heritages mapped in RMPVMR-2021 were neither designated nor listed by the VUDA due to lack of sufficient appreciation, proper concern and relevant attention towards the heritage resources in the city. Lax attitude in notification of the resources results in non-compliance of the provisions that in turn lead to enormous loss and serious damage of several heritage monuments in Visakhapatnam. Due to such government apathy, the said heritage sites in the city have been subjected to vandalism, encroachment and gradual destruction and deterioration over the years. For example, due to negligence and development pressure, “Panchavati”, the local residence of Bharat Ratna Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (the second President of India) constructed by the royal family of Bobbili was demolished (Fig. 6.1).
6.3.3 Fund Allocation

The GVMC is found often failing in implementing heritage conservation and development of related projects due to the absence of economic planning and allotment of financial resources for the purpose. Conservation and renovation of private heritage properties has been also meeting with the same fate. Specific fund allocations for heritage conservation are not made either by the State, VUDA or GVMC in their annual budgets.

6.3.4 Sources of Funds

On the contrary, RMPVMR-2021 has proposed drawl of funds from the Department of Endowments for the upkeep and maintenance of conservation sites, especially of religious nature. The plan suggested that corporate sector should be involved in preserving heritage sites so that tourism can also be promoted deriving more resources for the purposes of heritage conservation. These approaches to generate funds to promote heritage conservation methods were also not taken care of by the GVMC. The net result of these inactions is the unsatisfactory outcome towards the urgent positive steps required to perpetuate the heritage resources in the city.

i) Attention Suggested

Under these contemptible circumstances, other funding platforms such as a) Cultural Functions Grants Scheme (CFGS) of the Ministry of Culture, GoI, b) Heritage Promotion Schemes of the JNNURM, the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation and c) Common Good Fund of the State Government are suggested to be approached to augment funds.
ii) Opinion Survey and Outcome

With regard to the question of funds for heritage conservation in the city, an opinion survey was conducted by the authors among the members of INTACH and Indian Institute of Architects to identify the agencies responsible for fund raising. Results of the survey revealed that out of 50 respondents, 72% opined that municipalities shall take up the responsibility of funding heritage conservation programmes within their region, while 28% replied that the Central Government, Municipalities and public together should raise the funds required for heritage conservation.

iii) Augmentation of Human Resources

A deep void of human resources in the field was noticed to be one of the major constraints in effectively realizing the conservation of heritages in a place. Therefore, concept based management personnel are strongly desired to take up relevant issues of heritage conservation and forge ahead in the matter of synergizing cultural heritage and modern urban environment with great success. For this, a multi-disciplinary team of managers is very much essential as opined by Agrawal (2002), Zerrudo (2008) and Mishra (2009).

6.4 Disquisition

During Granada Convention (Convention for the protection of the architectural heritage of Europe) elaborate procedures were laid down for the promotion of European heritages with emphasis on the adoption of integrated policies for the conservation, promotion and enhancement of the architectural heritages as a major feature of cultural, environmental and planning policies (Anonymous, 1985). Urban Programme in Italy aims at revitalization of degraded part of cities by funding the implementation of initiatives by supporting self-governance, entrepreneurship, employment, services and public health, information and education and environmental valorization (Marco and Torre, 1999). The situation of building conservation in Malaysia was presented in brief by Kamal and Harun (2007). Discussing on the aspects of conservation and change in Singapore, Lih (2005) pointed out that the two processes shall encourage a constructive relationship while accommodating contemporary activities to strike at a balance between the old and the
new. The scenario of heritage conservation and urban regeneration in Kaohsiung and Tainan cities in Taiwan in the context sustainable development was elaborated by Chohan and Ki (2005). Yuen (2005) brought out issues related to heritage conservation activities and planning in Singapore and stated that Singapore’s growing conservation activities demonstrate that heritage conservation and modernity bear a dialectical relationship between the 'search for identity' which look back to the past and ‘demand for progress’ of the forward-looking modernity. Akagawa and Tiamsoon (2005) reported that the safeguarding the physical environment of a historic property in Thailand has been taken into account since Thai Government realize that many monuments in urban and rural areas were under the threat from the changes of its surroundings both in physical and socio-cultural dimensions and that Thai and Danish Governments established a Cultural Environment Conservation System.

Girard (2006) reiterated that cultural heritages in urban environments shall be restored to newer and greater vitality reflecting their contribution to quality of life as well as cultural and architectural identity. In the words of the same author, “the role of conservation of urban physical and cultural heritage can be interpreted not only as an “attractor”, but also as an “incubator” or catalyst for new economic services, from tourism to innovation”. An account of the present condition and causes of decay of the tomb of Jahangir at Shahdara in Lahore was assessed by Awan and Kazmi (2008). Radoine (2008) made an assessment of the conservation programmes in Fez city of Morocco and summarized the success achieved. Challenges and problems such as absence of clear city vision, dearth of conservation guidelines, poor inter-government collaboration, lack of public participation and backward heritage protection laws were identified as the main hurdles in heritage conservation of Macao, a licensed Casino gaming city in China (Wan and Pinheiro, 2009). Heritage building conservation practices in Malaysia are taken care by the National Heritage Department empowered by the National Heritage Act 2005 and experiences and challenges in achieving the goal in the country was detailed by Harun (2011). An overview of current practices in maintenance approaches of historical buildings in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia was presented by Rashid and Ahmad (2011). Zancheti and Hidaka (2011) have for the first time proposed indicators as monitoring toolkit to measure the state of urban heritage conservation through developing scientific theory and mathematical structure and termed it as “Indicator of the State of Conservation-
While stating that modern heritage conservation movement over the past 200 years rested mostly on the values of material forms, Araoz (2011) reiterated that the values of emerging heritage paradigm rest on specific traditional uses or habitation patterns that are indispensable to the well being of community for whose conservation new toolkits are essential. While analyzing the Fijian approach in safeguarding cultural heritage Techera (2011) remarked that despite advances in protecting and managing cultural heritages of the nation, the task is hampered by limited resources, lack technical expertise and weaknesses in the law. Mohd-Isa et al. (2011) opined that heritage conservation activity in Malaysia is not holistic as good maintenance practice alone does not suffice the need, but adoption of good conservation practice is key to achieve an effective management strategy. Urban heritage conservation in Surakarta of Indonesia is beset with the problem of rapid physical development causing deterioration and loss of historic fabric, especially due to lack of local regulations, adequate fiscal provisions, participation of stakeholders and political will (Agustiananda, 2012).

Similarly, a good number of attempts in the line were made during recent past in India. Agrawal (2002) has traced out the history of monuments conservation in India since early Christian era and highlighted the role of British Colonial rule in catalyzing the movement. Ballaney and Nair (2003) while preparing a base map for Tirupati Urban Development Authority Region and Tirupati town employing satellite images and Geographical Information System (GIS) environment among others have built a thematic layer of heritage structures (temples, important monuments and buildings) also. Anonymous (2006c) while dealing with the key issues and strategy options for heritage conservation of Nanded city in Maharashtra briefed up the existing situation of the subject. Hali (2006) presented an overview of heritage conservation measures in Kerala. Chainani (2007) wrote at length about the scenario of heritages in Bombay; Goa, Daman and Diu; Andaman-Nicobar Islands; and some parts of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Rajasthan and Punjab together with details right from legal framework to effective upkeep of an array of heritage resources. A brief history of conservation of heritage buildings in Delhi was documented by Gaur (2008). Philip (2007) highlighted the need for evolving special regulations for urban core area rejuvenation, heritage zones and coastal/island zones in Kochi of Kerala and further stressed that regulations are only a means to an end and the ultimate aim is
enhancement in the quality of life of people. Nayak (2010), Ghosh (2010), Ravindran (2010), Rajamani (2010), Karforma (2010) and Manjunath (2010) summed up the status of heritage conservation in Ahmedabad, Delhi, Hyderabad, Kolkata and Mysore, respectively. Singh (2010) reviewed the status of heritagescape, urban planning and strategies in India. The author has specifically mentioned about preservation plans of the ‘Ganga Ghats’ in Varanasi, Sarnath in Uttara Pradesh, Khajuraho in Madhya Pradesh and Konark in Odisha. Kannojia and Singh (2011) quoted about Central Cultural Fund Act 1980 of Sri Lanka that provides financial assistance for developing, restoring, preserving cultural monuments and development of religious, cultural activities within the country and abroad and United Kingdom National Heritage Act 2002 that provides for the preservation of all heritage sites within the country. The same authors have pointed out that India needs legislations exclusive to heritages and their conservation as every city has many heritage sites. Jayakumar (2011) reviewed the status of the heritage management in India in the light of available laws and the role of public interest litigation in promoting protection and conservation of heritages in the country.

6.5 Conclusions

In order to govern the utility, maintenance and development of the built heritages, VUDA has to seek appropriate and befitting legal protection to them from the government. For this purpose, VUDA needs to conduct a full-fledged inventory of all heritages available in the city, seek opinions, suggestions and objections from the public, carry out designation of each of the available resources, prepare detailed proposals for their conservation and send it to the state government for statutory backup (listing). This will ensure the sanction of finances and tax incentives by the government to promote the much-desired conservation of the diverse heritages of Visakhapatnam city.

As a sequel of inventory of heritages in VMR and understanding of the general conservation status of the heritages present therein, the issue of designation of British Colonial built heritages was taken up in the next Chapter.