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ABSTRACT

A work addressing historic preservation in Honduras does not currently exist. This thesis focuses on highlighting present historic preservation issues and challenges in Honduras through the government institution in charge of the field, the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH) and its management practices. After introducing a short history of Honduras’ capital, the Municipality of the Central District (M.D.C.), the thesis then addresses the present historic preservation issues and challenges within the M.D.C. through its local-government management office, the Historic Center Management office (GCH). The last chapter presents two case studies as evidence of the Honduran government’s weak historic preservation planning management.

The IHAH’s and GCH’s weakness is evidence of the central government’s lack of interest in cultural and historic education and preservation. This has resulted in the carelessness and destruction of numerous historic and heritage properties. One of the major issues of the IHAH is the lack of national standards for the planning of historic preservation in the country. Additionally, it is unfortunate that although historic preservation awareness is developing, hands-on historic preservation activities are not developing at the same pace needed to save the many national and local endangered heritage and historic properties.

The qualitative research methodology from both secondary and primary sources was used in the creation of this thesis. Much of the information was collected through oral interviews, study reports, government reports, books, institutional magazines, newspaper articles, and museum information.

The thesis concludes that in spite of the issues Honduras and its citizens face, the challenges and issues of the historic preservation field in the country are solvable. The recommendations laid out as part of the SWOT analyses provide clear, actionable, and measurable improvements that may be implemented at all levels of government.
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INTRODUCTION

As a Honduran and an architect, the author chose to pursue a Master’s in Historic Preservation Planning, and this particular thesis topic, because she observed historic buildings in her home city, Tegucigalpa, in a state of total neglect. Being frustrated with the little effort and acknowledgement of the problem by any government authority, she was inspired to create a compelling case for change. Any existing historic preservation efforts in Honduras are so new that the effects of them have only impacted awareness at best. They have done little to change the actual state of preserving built and cultural heritage; they have not created any hands-on preservation. Those in authority have little qualifications for their roles. Those with some qualification are often removed following the tumultuous political cycles in the nation. Because of this, the author was compelled to create a thesis that focused on the issues historic preservation has in Honduras and attempt to give her educated recommendations on the subject.

The subject is very important right now, especially with Honduras changing due to globalization and homogenization, and the democratic crisis it is going through. Its society lacks civic education and has little interest in its own culture and historic values because of its own government’s indifference. Honduras is living a tough situation: The deepening corruption and culture of impunity, cyclical regional and electoral crisis, low levels of production and productivity, increasing poverty, the growing demographics, the expanding epidemics, the ethnic crisis, the increasing violence and insecurity, the emigration of Honduran citizens, and the environmental deterioration are only a few examples of the compelling issues at stake in the country. All these factors contribute to Honduras’ identity crisis, causing the nation to glorify the modernity of developed countries, especially the United States of America, attempting to emulate their cultures and traditions while belittling their own.

2 Ibid, 7.
Honduras is in danger of losing its identity and thus, its heritage, especially its built heritage. The need to preserve, and in some cases, restore heritage is urgent. The sense of urgency is even more evident against the accelerating and overwhelming pace of historic changes and destruction in the name of modernization (especially in the country’s capital city) that should not be ignored.\(^3\) It is in the country’s best interest to strengthen national identity and axiology in its citizens; the lack of these elements negatively impacts national unity and its progress.\(^4\) The preservation of heritage, in all its forms, plays a large role in strengthening civic pride and identity; heritage brings communities in a society together under a common history that shaped everyone’s lives evenly and created a legacy that is unique to them. The preservation of the built environment physically connects citizens to their pasts, their traditional ways of living, and their values. All are important for the needed consensus, cooperation, and decision-making to positively affect Honduras’ sustainable growth and development.

A work addressing historic preservation in Honduras does not currently exist. This thesis will first focus on highlighting historic preservation in Honduras, and then discuss the historic preservation of its capital city, the Municipality of the Central District (Central District or M.D.C. for short). The thesis uses the qualitative research methodology from both secondary and primary sources. Much of this information was collected through oral interviews, study reports, government reports, books, institutional magazines, newspaper articles, and museum information. It is the purpose of this work to collect and analyze as much information related to historic preservation in Honduras and its capital city as possible; thus creating a base for future Honduran historic preservationists to build on and improve the field and its application in the country.

In summary, this work is divided into four chapters. The first chapter focuses on the national historic preservation authority, the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH); it discusses its origin, its responsibilities, its regulations and policies, its current state, and


\(^4\) Ibid, 15.
challenges. It ends with a SWOT analysis and recommended improvements for the IHAH. The second chapter focuses on the capital of Honduras, the M.D.C., discussing its unique anthropological, political and architectural history, from its beginning as two of the lowest ranking Spanish settlements to becoming the capital city of Honduras. It is being discussed because of its many endangered heritage and historic properties, even its ‘capital city’ status has not helped it be a representative of Honduran national identity and culture to foreigners, which surely reflects the poor state of historic preservation throughout the country. The need to prioritize a historic preservation plan for the city is exposed in this chapter. The third chapter discusses the recently created local preservation authority in the M.D.C, the Historic Center Management Office (GCH), its history, its development, its historic preservation regulations, policies, activities, and related issues. Additionally, this chapter presents current pro-historic preservation grassroots initiatives and organizations; the chapter ends with a SWOT analysis and recommended improvements for the GCH. The fourth chapter presents two case studies of endangered historic properties, their history, their heritage and historic designation values, the current controversies surrounding them and their current treatment by the IHAH and the GCH. They were chosen for the purpose of bringing light into the much-needed improvement of the historic preservation planning field in Honduras, bringing awareness to avoid the loss of more of its heritage and historic properties.

Throughout the research for this work, there have been many books and articles made use of the terms “conservation” and “preservation.” These sources originate from different parts of the world. The meaning of “preservation” as used in the United States of America has the same meaning as the word “conservation” in the United Kingdom and Latin America. For the sake of avoiding any confusion in this document, the word “preservation” will be used.
CHAPTER I:
HONDURAN INSTITUTE OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND HISTORY (INSTITUTO HONDUREÑO DE ANTROPOLOGÍA E HISTORIA, IHAH)

Introduction

Historic preservation in Honduras is centered in a government institution, the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH). The IHAH is charged with being the steward of all heritage and historic properties of the country. This chapter begins by providing the history of this institution, and the events leading to its creation, to answer why and how it was created. It informs the reader of the institute’s current historic preservation responsibilities, according to Honduras’ Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage, through its internal managing historic preservation office, the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit (within the Sub-management of Heritage office), discussing its historic preservation policies, regulations and planning process. This is all important to understand the institute’s historic preservation scope and capability. The chapter yields a SWOT analysis and recommendations for historic preservation in Honduras.

(1) About the National Institute of Anthropology and History

This government institution, with the original name of National Institute of Anthropology and History (Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia), was created during President Juan Manuel Gálvez’ term through Agreement No. 245, on July 22, 1952. The agreement stipulates that the institution had the main purposes of exploration, restoration, preservation, and vigilance of the archaeological monuments, the study of history, and the improvement of organization and management of the museums, etc. Its first Director, and the first Honduran archaeologist to direct

---

fieldwork in the Copán Mayan Ruins, was Jesús Nuñez Chinchilla⁶ (1952-1972) and its first Organic law was issued by Decree No. 204, on February 2, 1956.⁷ This Organic law changed the institute’s purpose to “lead, plan and execute the work required for the defense and study of the nation’s cultural treasure.”⁸ The aforementioned law was substituted by Decree No. 118 of 1968, which changed the IHAAH’s entire managing system and its legal name to Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH); it became an autonomous institution with legal status and its own estate. In 1975, the institute was annexed to the Ministry of Culture.⁹ In 1984, the Protection of the National Cultural Heritage Law was approved by the Honduran National Congress; this was the first legal frame that empowered the IHAH. A new Protection of the National Cultural Heritage Law was approved in 1997 by Congress to update the previous one, to attempt to keep up with newer practices.¹⁰

In a 2012 interview article of the institute’s current manager, Engineer Virgilio Paredes Trapero, for local Honduran newspaper El Heraldo, talked about the IHAH, stating: “Its purpose is to spread the importance of history, archaeology and anthropology as disciplines to enrich the country’s identity and enrich the research in the diverse archaeological sites, living cultures and historic centers, from Honduran colonial roots to the ones designed in the 19th and 20th centuries.” In addition, Mr. Paredes mentions that all these disciplines and their work are complemented with educational projects for the population, nine museums, archaeological sites and monuments; with

---

⁷ “Historia,” Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia (IHAH), accessed March 11, 2016, http://www.ihah.hn/AcercaDe/AcercaDe;
the purpose of sensitizing the population so that they might cooperate in the fight against heritage destruction and looting.\textsuperscript{11}

The IHAH was created not only to protect Honduras’ heritage, but since the changes in 1968, it also functions as an investigative unit which oversees cultural resource management, cultural tourism, and the rebuilding of a culturally pluralistic national identity recognizing the presence of descendants of multiple ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{12} IHAH’s purpose is to provide a basis for a Honduran identity as a multicultural society.\textsuperscript{13} Archeology serves to connect all Hondurans, but especially the indigenous people (Lenca, Maya-Chorti, Jicaque or Tolupan, Pech, Sumo or Tawahka, Miskito) to their pre-colonial heritage. Historic preservation also serves to connect the mixed-race society (consisting mostly of European, Native American and African descent)\textsuperscript{14} to their post-colonial and the recent past heritage.

(2) Preservation and Archaeology before 1952

Historic preservation in Honduras, and the IHAH, has its origin in Honduras’ archaeological history through the Copán Mayan Ruins. It was through them that the international community and then the Honduran government became interested in Honduras’ Pre-Hispanic history and its Native-American roots.\textsuperscript{15} Copán is the first archaeological and preservation project in the country, it has been the only project that the IHAH has consistently invested in and the one that generates the most revenue; paraphrasing an interview with the current Chief of the Heritage

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 63.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Dario A. Euraque, "Apuntes para una historiografia del mestizaje en Honduras," \textit{Iberoamericana} 19 (2005): 105-117.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Alejandra Gamez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 2016.
\end{itemize}
Properties and Monument s Unit (Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento) of the IHAH, Engineer Alejandra Gámez: “Copán is the project that keeps this Institute running.”

Even though the IHAH was not created until 1952, legislation aimed to regulate archaeology in Honduras was passed as early as 1845, this legislation was considered one of the “earliest and most avant-garde of Latin America.” The Copán ruins were one of the first Mesoamerican sites to attract European and American travelers, explorers and scholars in what archaeologists Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff called the “age of exploration and discovery.” The first explorer at the ruins was Diego García de Palacios in 1576, he recorded the local name Copán, the name it has been known by ever since. Other famous explorers were Irishman John Gallagher (a.k.a. Juan Galindo), and the team of John Lloyd Stephens and Frederick Catherwood in the 1830s; Stephens’ assessment in 1841 brought more scholarly-international attention to the site.

Scholarly expeditions began, starting with Alfred Maudslay who was sent by the British Museum in the 1880s. He recorded the Mayan art and hieroglyphic writing through his detailed drawings from 1889-1902. His archaeological collection can be seen in the Mankind Museum in London.

As a result of the international interest in Copán and the lack of visitor control to the heritage site, the government started writing up the first legislations for its “protection” on January 28, 1845, stating that: “the Central Government prohibits any individual from touching the

---

16 Alejandra Gamez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 2016.
20 Ibid, 6-7.
21 Ibid, 7.
monuments in the Copán Ruins without prior notice, and the local authorities have the protective custody responsibility of the site.”

The Peabody Museum of Harvard University started expeditions in the early 1890s; theirs was the first institutional exploration of the site conducted with the authorization of the Honduran government. They fulfilled all the legal requirements and acquired a permit from the government on July 20 of 1891. According to the concessions granted by the Honduran government the Peabody Museum was allowed to keep 50% of the archaeological objects they unearthed, which resulted in many of the archaeological pieces being taken to museums in the United States of America. It was not until April 2, 1900, that the concessions were cancelled and the export of Honduran heritage was prohibited through Decree 103 of La Gaceta (Honduras’ official government newspaper, its first publication was printed in May 25, 1830), which was later ratified in article 172 of the current Honduran constitution. Article 172 stated: “the exportation of items taken from the Copán Ruins or any other ruin of the Republic is prohibited; but their excavation, exploration and research by competent individuals or scientific commissions are permitted with previous authorization of the Executive Power and in compliance with the regulations issued by it;” this discouraged foreign researchers from coming to Copán for at least

26 Ibid.
20 years.\textsuperscript{30} Other agreements with similar interpretations were issued subsequently in 1927 and 1934.\textsuperscript{31}

In the 1940s, Monsignor Federico Lunardi, an ambassador for the Vatican and an amateur archaeologist, dedicated himself to collecting a great quantity of archeological artifacts from Copán that he took back with him to Italy. This archaeological collection is now in the Museum of Genoa. There is no documentary evidence that Mr. Lunardi had any government permit for the archaeological activities he undertook.\textsuperscript{32}

Later on, the Carnegie Institution of Washington became involved (1930’s-1940’s); and the government of Honduras started assuming a more active role in the archaeological work. Preservation became a major effort to shape a greater sense of national identity in Hondurans and its future generations.\textsuperscript{33} Realistically, the government investment in restoration work, the construction of an airstrip and the building a visitor center and a museum in the city center, were meant to attract tourists and revenue.\textsuperscript{34} Finally in 1952, the first Honduran heritage management institution, the National Institute of Anthropology and History, was created; which in 1968 became an autonomous institution and had its name changed to the what it is known now, the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH).\textsuperscript{35}

Considering the growing international interest in Copán at the early stages of the Honduran republic, and how that interest translated into international monetary aid, investment and

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 85.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
collaboration\textsuperscript{36} and the later acquisition of the UNESCO World Heritage Site status in 1980,\textsuperscript{37} the historic preservation planning of Copán could be considered well advanced compared to the rest of the heritage properties throughout the nation and especially the ones concerning the more recent past which are still in use and therefore are not considered archaeological heritage.

Apart from Copán, there has been little progress in the identification, documentation and preservation of heritage properties throughout Honduras.\textsuperscript{38} In this developing country, the government has “priority issues” to resolve such as public health, public safety, poverty, unemployment, etc.; and will most likely advance projects that create immediate revenue, that in theory would help resolve the mayor aforementioned issues and benefit the entire population. The government does not view historic preservation as a priority or see it having benefits in the long or short term. Given all the socio-economic struggles the country has to overcome, the Honduran population in general does not consider historic preservation a priority either.\textsuperscript{39}

Historical records are the only heritage property that arguably have been consistently preserved. The process of the Conquista of Spanish colonial Americas encouraged record keeping, and it was tripartite: military, economical, and ideological.\textsuperscript{40} The third one has to do with government, in which religion played a great role in the Spanish-colonial government, since the monarchs of Spain were known as the “Catholic Monarchs,” the pope at the time entrusted them to conduct an evangelical mission.\textsuperscript{41} After the use of military force, it is through religion that the Spanish finally subjugate the native Americans to carry on the exploitation of the land and its people for their economic interests. The Catholic Church had governing power equal to the

\textsuperscript{38} Alejandra Gamez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 2016.
\textsuperscript{40} Guillermo Varela Osorio. \textit{Historia de Honduras}. (Tegucigalpa: Copycentro Douglas, 2002), 50.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
monarchy’s representatives and took the liberty to collect “taxes” (tithe) and all pertinent data on its parishioners.

This Spanish-colonial governmental structure comprising church and state was still implemented even after Central America’s [Honduras’] independence from Spain in 1821; the newly formed Federal Republic of Central America followed the same antiquated Spanish laws that were not very effective in creating a stable government for the new republic. In fact, these laws continued the same after the dissolution of the Federal Republic of Central America (in 1839), this is why the historians labeled the years comprising 1840-1876 the “Honduran anarchic period” because they still have no information about what economic model was being used at that time, whether it was the Spanish mercantile model or the French liberalism model that Honduran [and Central American] national hero, Francisco Morazán, wanted to implement for the Federal Republic of Central America. Around fifty years after the Honduran independence from Spain, the “Liberal Reform” took place in Honduras, in 1876, which transformed the Spanish colonial government structure to the more modern structure that is now known, able to participate in the international capitalist economy. Among many of the improvements in government structures, the separation of church and state finally happened, and this included the abolishment of tithe, religious freedom, the secularization of census data and education, and the expropriation of a great quantity of land from the Catholic Church, which was redistributed for agricultural production.

But there is documentary evidence that even before this Liberal Reform, and even a year before the Central American declaration of independence from Spain (1821), that there was an attempt to create a central, document database separate from the data the Catholic Church possessed, an “Archive Foundation of the Mayoralty of the Greater Tegucigalpa (Alcaldía Mayor

---

43 Douglas Vargas (Historian, Honduras National Archive), in interview with the author, March 17, 2016.
de Tegucigalpa),” to aid in document keeping in 1820.\textsuperscript{45} The mayor at the time was Don Narciso Mallol (who was also the last Alcalde Mayor of Tegucigalpa). He stated:

One of the main objectives that one who governs a province must obtain is to secure those documents or papers that constitute or indicate and form the origin of the progressions and state of a man and the domain of property of his things. Without a stable dwelling destined to this aim, there cannot be stability and nothing is safe. This is why the province of Tegucigalpa presents the most deplorable state of property confusion, reducing families to nothing and is in the most decayed state it has ever been in the past 40 years.\textsuperscript{46}

Don Mallol was requesting donations from the most affluent families of the city of Tegucigalpa, to create this archive building to keep government and tax information on properties safe.\textsuperscript{47} To keep better control of these properties, their boundaries and their owners, to make the system more efficient and avoid confusion.\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{(3) Current Preservation Planning in the IHAAH}

As stated before, the IHAAH functions as an investigative unit to provide a basis for a Honduran identity as a multicultural society. It all started with archaeology, used to connect all Hondurans, but especially the diverse indigenous groups, to their pre-colonial roots and heritage; IHAAH has been developing archaeology policies and systematic processes for years thanks to international interest and support. Historic preservation of the recent past aimed to connect most Hondurans (since most of the population is racially mestizo)\textsuperscript{49} to their colonial, post-colonial and even more recent heritage, is a relatively new field that the IHAAH is delving into; this field is developmentally behind in comparison to archaeology. But the field has started and the IHAAH


\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.

does have Article 19 in the *Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage*, that is similar to Section 106 of the USA’s *National Historic Preservation Act*. It states:

Any private citizen that accidentally or in the building of a project, discovers an antiquity or an archeological site, must report it immediately to the IHAH. In all the cases, the suspension of all work will be ordered while an evaluation of the significance of the discovery is evaluated.\(^{50}\)

The IHAH’s office of Sub-management of Heritage is the administrative unit responsible of “the processing, protection registration, rescue and research of the anthropological heritage of the country, including archaeology, cultural anthropology, linguistic anthropology and physical anthropology.”\(^{51}\) Under this office is the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit, which is overall in charge of: “executing the policies and processes related to the restoration and preservation of the heritage resources that make up the cultural heritage of the country.”\(^{52}\) This unit has seven specific responsibilities: \(^{53}\)

- To create preservation, restoration and protection policies for the cultural heritage of Honduras,
- To carry out the registration and inventory, and monitor the movable and unmovable (properties) cultural-architectural heritage of the country,
- To carry out research and evaluation of the cultural heritage involved in communities for their preservation,
- To propose active initiatives in the cultural heritage preservation field,

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid.
• To produce technical reports for the preservation of architectural heritage,

• To authorize interventions and demolition of cultural heritage, and

• To issue excavation, foundation and demolition permits.

The Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit is based in the IHAH’s headquarter office in downtown Tegucigalpa. Because it cannot monitor the entire country from there, it has four Regional Inspectors that are given the responsibility to represent it in their particular regions: The Western Inspector, the North-Central Inspector, the North-Eastern Inspector, and the South-Central Inspector. These inspectors are responsible for: 54

1. Supervising the Historic Centers and/or Historic Assemblages under their regional jurisdiction,

2. Supervising the restoration work done in cultural heritage properties,

3. Planning and designing projects and restoration studies under their regional jurisdiction,

4. Producing and issuing technical reports related to the preservation, protection and restoration of cultural heritage resources under their regional jurisdiction,

5. Advising and giving support to the local municipalities in the management and proceedings of heritage areas under their regional jurisdiction,

6. Producing briefs on the activities done in the region, assisting to the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit’s work meetings, and reporting on activities and work done, and

7. Carrying out any other functions assigned by the chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit.

Figure 1: IHAH Organization Chart
The colored in units represent the Sub-Management of Heritage office, and the offices under it.
A. The Historic Preservation Planning Process

According to the current Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit, Engineer Alejandra Gámez, the process used to designate a property as historic starts with Article 11 of the 

*Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage*. It states:

The Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History will elaborate and maintain an up-to-date national inventory of the properties that constitute Cultural Heritage and will have the obligation to protect them when these would have been semi-destroyed or deteriorated over time, for this goal the Secretary of State in the Ministry of Finance will have to provide the adequate budget upon the request of the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History.\(^5\)

Previously quoted Article 11 sets out the foundation for the proceeding of registering national historic properties in a national inventory. There are no records of which was the first city to get inventoried. The oldest inventory on record is one for the city of San Pedro Sula in 1982.\(^6\) Inventories prior to this one have existed but have been lost.\(^7\)

The current inventory methodology was standardized and implemented in 2006 and involves the IHAH sending an architect and a historian to a specified location (there are no architectural historians in Honduras, and there has been no real study of Honduras’ architectural history), where the historian and architect start a survey (inspection and reconnaissance work) in the area to try to identify the potentially significant historical, anthropological and architectural sites and buildings. After they have an idea of the sites and buildings, they create a pre-inventory, trace a route (that later helps define the historic city center limits), and start doing intensive-level research on the properties within that route. They then decide if a property is historic and should be added to the inventory.\(^8\) The identification process is still a work-in progress because the

---


\(^6\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.

\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
IH AH has not yet invested in the research, identification and creation of Honduran architectural styles.

Most of the historic properties are identified according to their anthropological and political-historical value,\(^59\) while the architectural value is determined by the aged appearance of the building in relation to concepts of architecture history, the actual age of the building and its state of preservation.\(^60\) There is a popular notion that has been fostered by how Honduran historians have classified Honduras’ history, and further supported by the *Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage*, that all Honduran historic building architectural styles are classified within four categories. These categories actually are more defining for Honduras’ political history: they are either pre-colonial/vernacular style (referring to the pre-Columbian/pre-Hispanic time, which usually means indigenous construction techniques), colonial style (buildings constructed under Spanish rule), and republican style (buildings constructed after independence from Spain).\(^61\) Buildings constructed after the consolidation of a political republic and that do not fit in the “republican building style” typology are simply considered a modern or contemporary style (see Appendix 1 for examples of this classification).

In addition, the IHAH has no age requirement for designation of historic buildings as of yet.\(^62\) There is an unofficial cutoff year (or decade) for buildings to not be considered historic, however: the 1970s.\(^63\) Buildings constructed before 1970 are more likely to be considered historic, although the IHAH understands that some buildings constructed after 1970 could be considered architecturally significant.\(^64\) As suggested earlier, the architectural significance assigned to a place depends on the surveyors.

---

\(^59\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.

\(^60\) Ibid.


\(^62\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.

\(^63\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.

\(^64\) Ibid.
The information collected for the inventoried, registered property will include a picture of the facade, a location map, original use, current use, property owner information (current and previous if known), historic category; construction date and the name of the builder or designer (if known). A description of the architecture and construction materials on the facades and in interiors, with images, is also provided, along with a description of architectural significance or style if known, and/or its historical significance, and floor plans (see Appendix 2 for sample of inventoried property).65

(i) Assigning Value to Heritage Properties

The value of a historic property depends on the method for the evaluation of the identified, inventoried historic properties. This methodology has differed throughout the years until 2012, when the IHAH’s then Sub-management of Conservation (now known as the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit), created an unofficial standardized methodology for the evaluation of historic properties’ significance (value) that is currently in use. To create this [still] unofficial standardized methodology for evaluation and to create protection regulations for the historic properties, the IHAH worked in consultancy with the AECID Honduras (the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development) and the AMHON (the Association of Municipalities of Honduras).66

The IHAH, the AMHON and AECID also worked together designing the program called the Urban Management Program (Programa de Gestión Urbana) intended to create several manuals of historic preservation material that would be used to create awareness (e.g. an education manual for elementary school), and guide preservation treatment. The creation of these manuals provided technical information on preservation procedures and processes for authorities in Honduras’

65 Information obtained through the inventory of the Central District.
66 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
municipalities, which lack professionals in the construction/preservation fields.\textsuperscript{67} The AMHON was the program executor and technical contributor, and the AECID aided with the program design and funding.\textsuperscript{68}

The \textit{Processes and Procedures Manual for the Urban Control of Historic Centers}, is one of those manuals that explains every step of the Honduran historic center management process. It provides all of the necessary information: the definitions of the different authorities involved in the management of historic centers, the definition of technical concepts used, how people need to approach the authorities for permits to do anything regarding historic properties, what forms to fill out, and what to do when filing a complaint or accusation of damage to historic properties. Most of these processes are demonstrated by flowcharts.\textsuperscript{69} Ideally local-level authorities in charge of heritage management should exist in every city or town in Honduras. They would be generally referred to as the Historic Center Development Entities (Entidad Gestora del Centro Histórico, EGCH) and they would manage all these processes, only altering them if it was absolutely necessary.\textsuperscript{70} In reality, only four cities in the country have local-level heritage managers.\textsuperscript{71}

The current method for evaluating historic properties’ significance consists of filling out a quantitative ‘Value (significance) and Categorization Form’ for properties that have already been surveyed and are in the inventory, to determine the heritage value they have (see Appendix 3 for a sample form). Each criterion has a numerical value and when one fills out the form and adds up all the criteria met by a property or building, the numerical value sum indicates the specified level of heritage significance. In these categories, heritage value “A-MN” has the highest numerical value and is the highest category in the hierarchy. This category translates as a National Monument in Spanish and is the equivalent of a National Landmark in English. Heritage Value “E” (in the

\textsuperscript{67} Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Aida Francelia Martinez Castillo, Control Urbano 09CL: Ciclo de Gestión de Centros Históricos: Manual de Procesos y Procedimientos para el Control Urbano de los Centros Historicos (Tegucigalpa: Asociación de Municipios de Honduras (AMHON), Programa de Gestión Urbana 2012).
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, 29.
\textsuperscript{71} Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
most recently created management regulation booklet, for the city of Danlí) has the lowest numerical value and is the lowest category in the hierarchy, which means it is a building of no heritage significance.

(ii) The Regulation of Heritage Properties

Currently, the IHAH has no national standard for the heritage significance of properties or regulations for their management. The IHAH is creating different ‘management regulation’ booklets for the management of historic centers in different cities with the goal of having them done for all historic centers in the country.72 Each booklet has varied heritage significance value categories and definitions for them, in addition to varied preservation treatments and protection-intervention level definitions, although they all agree that value MN-A is a national monument. So far there are six approved regulation booklets for six historic centers, and there are 30 regulation booklet drafts for another 30 historic centers that have not been published due to lack of funds.73 These regulation booklets are basically design guidelines for historic city centers. The IHAH works with and depends on each municipality to enforce the regulations.

The regulations’ main focus has been city centers because they are the initial human settlements and usually possess national landmarks, individually valuable buildings, historic assemblages (which would be the equivalent of historic districts), and properties contributing to the historic environment (not counting the non-valuable buildings) which are all registered in the inventory.74 The IHAH has identified some properties outside of city centers that are historic but, because there are no regulations for these buildings, the IHAH uses the same criteria for regulations of historic center buildings and then analyze them on a case by case basis.75 According to the Law

72 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
73 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
74 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
75 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage, the historic properties outside of the historic center and their contiguous non-historic properties must be preserved.\textsuperscript{76}

By comparing the regulations for different cities, it is clear that there are variations in the value category definitions of historic buildings, their treatments and their protection-intervention levels, within the booklets. The surveys have been created throughout the years and new booklets are supposed to “build and improve” on the older ones, even if they are for different cities. These booklets expose a lack of consistency in defining values for historic buildings, and a lack of standardized definitions of heritage significance. According to Alejandra Gámez, all of the drafts and approved regulation booklets are much the same in content (except for heritage significance value categories, preservation treatments and protection-intervention levels) because they are based on the regulations and design guidelines created for the colonial city of Comayagua. The regulation booklet that differs the most is the one for the Honduran capital, the Municipality of the Central District (M.D.C.).\textsuperscript{77}

The most recent booklet of regulations is the one for the city of Danlí in the department of El Paraiso. It was approved and published at the end 2016,\textsuperscript{78} by June 2017, per Honduran news sources, the regulation booklet would start being implemented.\textsuperscript{79} In it, one finds the most recent definitions of the different heritage significance value categories of historic buildings, and the treatments and protection-intervention levels allowed for them. These are all currently used unofficially as a national standard by the IHAH, until a new booklet is drafted, edited and improved.

\textsuperscript{76} Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage 1997. Chapter 4: Of the Inventory and Registry of National Cultural Properties, Article 16.
\textsuperscript{77} Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.
The Current Heritage Significance Value Categories (as translated from the original Spanish document) are:\(^80\)

1. Value “A-MN” (literally Monumento Nacional in Spanish) is National Landmark Heritage Architecture: buildings and open areas, of any style that because of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance, stand out of the national whole for being buildings that constitute unique testimonies and that deserve the specific designation of National Landmark;

2. Value “A” High Significance Heritage Architecture: buildings or open areas of any style, that maintain their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance almost in their entirety. In addition, they are characterized by preserving their authenticity and integrity;

3. Value “B” Medium Significance Heritage Architecture: buildings or open areas of any style, that maintain the majority of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance;

4. Value “C” Low Significance Heritage Architecture: buildings or open areas of any style, that are characterized by maintaining some of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance;

5. Value “D” Environmental Architecture: buildings that because of their characteristics and construction period, do not represent a heritage architectural significance, but they are identified by their integration to the urban assemblage;

6. Value “E” Incompatible Architecture (without heritage significance): buildings in which their mass and shape are dissonant with the urban and environmental context by not possessing rescuable typological elements, not respecting the traditional morphology and massing of the zone. They break completely with the architectural characteristics of the historic assemblage. Under this category one can find temporary buildings, the integrated and modern construction;

\(^{80}\) Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia y la Asociación de Municipios de Honduras n.d., Reglamento para la Protección del Centro Histórico de Danlí y su Zona de Amortiguamiento. Translator: Ana Castillo
the constructions that are discordant with the Historic Centers; the structured open areas and all of the elements that affect the typology of the historic assemblage.

For all buildings that were not registered in the inventory by the IHAH, which are within the limits of a historic city center and its buffer zone, and which have not been assigned a value category, the IHAH’s regional Inspector Office in charge will have the duty of assigning either a “D” or “E” value to those buildings.81

Types of Treatments for Properties within the Historic City Centers: According to the most recent regulation, there are 10 treatments for historic properties and 6 kinds of protection-intervention levels allowed.82 The forms of treatments and their definitions in Honduras are:83

1. Conservation: all actions destined to secure, maintain and care for the presence of certain buildings that are part of the built heritage of a community.

2. Consolidation: carrying out the necessary work to secure and/or stabilize the building or its elements to be preserved, as long as there have been no alterations on the original structures that might alter their appearance and massing.

3. Restoration: the action of carrying out recovery work of a building in its entire structure and formal unit, the reestablishment of altered elements and the removal of degrading additions. This concept is equally applicable to the recovery of building parts and/or elements with heritage value that should be accurately preserved.

4. Rehabilitation: the action of carrying out recovery work of a building with heritage value that because of diverse circumstances has stopped functioning in its original use. Being also able to adapt it to the necessities of modern life and at the same time preserving its elements of cultural interest. This is applicable to the recovery, as well as the adaptive reuse of original spaces.

81 Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia y la Asociación de Municipios de Honduras n.d. Reglamento para la Protección del Centro Histórico de Danlí y su Zona de Amortiguamiento.
82 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
83 Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia y la Asociación de Municipios de Honduras n.d. Reglamento para la Protección del Centro Histórico de Danlí y su Zona de Amortiguamiento.
5. Substitution: the action of replacing elements or parts of a building because of their deteriorated state, without this intervention implying any drastic changes to the spatial and/or urban concept of the building.

6. Elimination: the action of removing added-on elements or parts of a building that detract from the original building characteristics because of its location, deterioration or dissonance with its ‘typology.’ This concept is also applicable to localized, partial or total demolition (razing) of the buildings, when the regulations’ precepts allows and/or demands it. A raze is called a type “A” demolition; a partial demolition is called a type “B” demolition.

7. Integration: the action of adapting buildings or their discordant elements, that lack heritage value, to the typological characteristics of the area. It might imply the removal, substitution and/or adding-on of elements according to regulation precepts.

8. Liberation: to liberate the building, or parts of it, from add-on elements or interventions that depreciate it or hinder its appreciation in an appropriate medium.

9. Reconstruction: the action of reconstructing a building or parts of it. The reconstruction is appropriate only when a building is incomplete because of deterioration or alteration, and as long as there is enough evidence to reproduce it to a previous state. The reconstruction should be easily identifiable in relation to the original elements.

10. New construction: the action of building in empty lots or properties; it is also applicable to additions to existing buildings.

   The IHAH’s definition of ‘Typology’ refers to “Architectural Typology,” which is a condensed architectural description of the of characteristics and patterns that represent the holistic architecture type of the historic center. The typology description is then used in the regulations to create design guidelines for the historic center.
Types of Protection-Intervention levels allowed on Historic City Center Properties (per their Heritage Significance Value Category): The six types of interventions allowed according to the heritage significance value categories in Honduras are: 84

Integral Preservation 1: applicable to all the buildings that have to be entirely preserved, they will be preserved through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution and reconstruction treatments to guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of their original characteristics. The buildings in this intervention level category will be allowed to incorporate new modern service facilities (kitchens and bathrooms) and any other necessary installations for the functional use of the building (air conditioning, electrical upgrades, plumbing, etc.) as long as they will not cause irreversible changes to its typology.

Integral Preservation 2: applicable to all the buildings that have to be entirely preserved. Although they have suffered some localized alterations, they preserve the majority of their original volumetric and spatial elements unaltered. They will be preserved through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution and reconstruction treatments to recover its typological values and guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of its original characteristics. The demolition of all the modified or dissonant elements that clash with the buildings typological characteristics will be allowed. The buildings in this intervention category will be allowed to incorporate modern service facilities (kitchens and bathrooms) and any other necessary installations for the functional use of the building (air conditioning, electrical upgrades, plumbing, etc.) as long as they will not cause irreversible changes to its typology.

Environmental Preservation 1: applicable to all buildings that have had many design campaigns and in which most of their volumetric and spatial elements have been lost. In these types of buildings, all the original existing elements will have to be preserved and restored in their entirety. Preservation work will be allowed through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution, integration and reconstruction treatments. The demolition of all the

84 Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia y la Asociación de Municipios de Honduras n.d. Reglamento para la Protección del Centro Histórico de Danlí y su Zona de Amortiguamiento. Translated by Ana Castillo.
modified or dissonant elements that clash with the buildings typological characteristics will be 
allowed.

Environmental Preservation 2: applicable to all buildings that preserve the façade as an 
element contributing to the quality of their surroundings. The original elements and general 
characteristics that grant significance to the building landscape will be preserved. Preservation 
work of the facades will be allowed through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, 
liberation, substitution, integration and reconstruction treatments. The demolition of all non-
significant elements will be allowed.

Partial Preservation: applicable to all buildings that preserve some of their original 
elements, but that have already been altered in their massing, structure, open spaces, composition, 
etc.; and those buildings that lack value in an isolated form, but that integrated with other buildings, 
constitute a homogeneous assembly (in US terminology, these would be considered “contributing 
buildings”). The original elements identified in the inventory forms and the general characteristics 
that grant significance to the historic assemblage include: the massing, rhythm, and spatial 
typology, which must be preserved. The partial or total demolition of dissonant elements that clash 
with the environmental characteristics of the historic assemblage will be allowed. The new 
building to be incorporated must abide by the planned parameters for each case in the regulation 
booklet.

Exterior Integration: applicable to buildings that are new, modern or dissonant within the 
historic assemblage. Work on the facades must be carried out according to the predominant 
characteristics of the assemblage that ensure their integration to the environment.

The intervention levels allowed on each heritage value category are:85

1. Value “A-MN” is National Landmark Heritage Architecture: for buildings in this category, 
   the intervention level allowed is the Integral preservation 1,

---

85 Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia y la Asociación de Municipios de Honduras n.d. *Reglamento para la Protección del Centro Histórico de Danlí y su Zona de Amortiguamiento.* Translated by Ana Castillo.
2. Value “A”: High Significance Heritage Architecture: for buildings in this category, the intervention level allowed is the Integral preservation 1,

3. Value “B”: Medium Significance Heritage Architecture: for buildings in this category, the intervention level allowed is the Integral preservation 2,

4. Value “C”: Low Significance Heritage Architecture: for buildings in this category, the intervention levels allowed could be either the Integral preservation 2 or Environmental Preservation 1,

5. Value “D”: Environmental Architecture: for buildings in this category, the intervention levels allowed could be either the Environmental preservation 1 or 2, and

6. Value “E”: Incompatible Architecture: for buildings in this category, the intervention levels allowed is Exterior Integration.

(4) Government Incentives for Preservation

The *Law for the Protection of the National Cultural Heritage*, Article 29 states:

The investments made on preservation, restoration and rehabilitation projects on properties designated as National Monuments, with the due approval from the IHAH, will be deductible sums from the incomes received for the calculation of income tax according to the established in the corresponding Law. 86

This article is clear that the Honduran law provides a certain tax deduction when investing on preservation projects, but it specifies that these properties must be considered National Monuments for the provision to be applicable. This limits the incentives for preservation projects to only a few properties and most of them belonging to the government. Even so, the law is not enforced because it is not yet regulated.87 The local historic center regulation booklets mention the articles of the *Law for the Protection of the National Cultural Heritage* apply to the protection
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87 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
of historic properties, but there is no mention of Article 29 in any of them. In addition, the law does not provide any tax credit programs or preservation easements. One can deduce that the government does not currently offer any incentives for the preservation of historic properties. There are no economic policies for preservation outside of the Copán Mayan Ruins.  

(5) SWOT Analysis of the Preservation Planning Process in Honduras

The objectives of this SWOT analysis are to: evaluate the historic preservation planning system and its processes, to highlight deficiencies that hinder the effectiveness of preservation of historic resources and to submit educated suggestions to strengthen weaknesses in the system so that the IHAH can more effectively fulfill its objectives.

A. Strengths

1. The IHAH has created a base for the national standards of identification of historic properties through the management regulation booklets for different cities.

2. The IHAH has started an inventory of heritage properties (most of them buildings) for the country.

B. Weaknesses

1. The authorities in IHAH have confusing ideas on what a historic property is, what level of heritage significance a property should have, the appropriate types of treatments and levels of intervention that these properties should be allowed and how to apply them. This is reflected in the entire processes of identifying and the application of preservation regulations.

2. The institution lacks specialized staff in historic preservation planning who could set the guidelines for the right approaches to save or preserve historic properties. It seems like the entire planning process is reactive instead of being proactive.

88 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
3. Because there are no national standards, and only 6 approved regulation booklets for 6 specific cities, it is extremely difficult for the IHAH to manage the preservation of historic buildings preservation of the entire country. Even if the IHAH retained specialized staff and had all the right ideas, standards and processes for historic preservation, the institution is seriously understaffed and is not able to monitor historic properties (be they national or local level) to make sure the regulations, guidelines and any permits are being followed correctly or respected.

4. When permits are being granted, the staff tries to comply with regulations (if there are any), but since the owners do not see the benefits of preservation and complain about their rights as property owners, they all usually come to agreements that are detrimental for heritage preservation. Façadism is often the result. Several beautiful historic interiors that were representative of Spanish architecture in Honduras (the historic floor plan with its interior gardens, historic tile, and columns), have already been destroyed and/or partitioned with no respect or consideration to the buildings’ integrity, in order to create smaller housing projects or for commercial use.

5. The IHAH lacks anthropologists on its staff.

6. Lack of identification and research of Honduran architectural styles makes it hard to identify architecturally significant properties. Heritage value is chiefly determined by the anthropological and/or historic value.

7. Unqualified surveyors are common. When filling out the inventory form of a historic building, the architect or historian surveyor decides what architectural style to assign to it. Most of these surveyors are likely not educated in architectural history and styles which results in naming architectural styles according to the four periods of Honduran History classification that have been previously mentioned.
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89 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
90 Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
8. Because of the lack of defined architectural styles, the IHAH creates a document to describe the architectural typology of a specified historic center to go with the management regulation booklet created for it.\textsuperscript{91} The architectural typology condenses all, presently undefined, architectural styles into a single architectural description that then defines a holistic architecture type for the historic center, which it should try to maintain and create, if necessary.\textsuperscript{92} An architectural typology research waters down the real architectural history of a place.

9. The regulation booklets were created specifically for the management of the historic centers of each of six cities, not considering any historic assemblage and properties outside of their historic centers. The IHAH approaches the property owners, and on a case by case basis, decides what criteria is applicable.\textsuperscript{93}

10. The different local regulations for historic centers including their heritage value categories, preservation treatments and the interventions permitted, are not in concurrence and do not reinforce each other. The treatments and levels of interventions should be consistent with and directly related to the heritage value categories assigned to the properties. The newest management regulation booklets are “improvements” on the initial publications. The regulation booklet for the city of Danlí is considered to have the most up-to-date definitions for heritage values, treatments and interventions, suggesting that the IHAH will unofficially use it for all the country.\textsuperscript{94}

11. Most of the country’s cities, towns, villages and communities, do not have local preservation authorities or management regulation booklets. The aforementioned Urban Management Program has stated the need for Historic Center Development Entities (EGCH) in each city, which would include local-level preservation authorities.\textsuperscript{95} The government has not yet

\textsuperscript{91} Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, April 21, 2016.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{93} Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Aida Francelia Martinez Castillo, Control Urbano 09CL: Ciclo de Gestión de Centros Históricos: Manual de Procesos y Procedimientos para el Control Urbano de los Centros Historicos (Tegucigalpa: Asociación de Municipios de Honduras (AMHON), Programa de Gestión Urbana 2012), 29.
created these local preservation authorities, which means the IHAH has to act as a local authority as well as the national authority of preservation. This creates a lot of work for the understaffed institute. In the few places where these preservation local-level authorities do exist, the IHAH still micromanages everything and is the definitive decision maker of any local level intervention or treatment in a heritage property in the end.

C. Opportunities

1. The staff is willing to listen to any suggestions for improvement.

2. The IHAH can use its existing management regulation booklets to create a national standard by consolidating the information about the heritage value categories, and the treatment and the intervention levels allowed on historic properties.

3. The IHAH does not have a specific date or a minimum age requirement for a building to be considered historic, but its management and staff unofficially consider buildings from the 1970s to the present as non-historic, which suggests a defined age for a building to be considered historic. There is an opportunity to set a specific building age for a building to be considered historic and make it easier for the IHAH to identify potential historic properties that they may invest time in surveying, allowing them to prioritize preservation activities.

4. There are clearly visible and identifiable architectural styles in historic centers, so it will not be too difficult to start researching these styles and later training the staff to identify them and describe them.

5. The AMHON and AECID have collaborated with the IHAH in the past. The AECID has even provided funding for some of the IHAH’s initiatives. Perhaps there are other non-government, foreign entities that could also collaborate with the IHAH.

6. Because all the regulations for different cities are created from the basis of the regulations for the city of Comayagua, it makes sense to consolidate the standards at the national level.

7. The government could create a program for education and awareness to start the dialogue with its citizens, to instill heritage values and to strengthen national identity.
D. Threats

1. The government’s indifference is a significant, noticeable problem. The budget and investment assigned to historic preservation is very small. The government probably does not invest in it because, as in any developing country, it does not see the value of culture or heritage unless it generates revenue. This way of thinking reflects the weakness of the IHAH and its lack of monetary and technical empowerment to achieve its objectives.

2. The government’s indifference in acknowledging preservation also affects the national identity, which can be a tool to bring the nation together. This is extremely important right now, when the country is being divided by social-economic crisis, political crisis, and national security crisis.

3. There is a lack of national and local government driven public awareness programs.

4. There is a lack of financial incentives in the Law for the Protection of National Cultural Heritage.

5. If the IHAH continues to be the only real manager/micromanager of heritage properties then it needs to correctly identify and define their significance, to create proper and efficient policies to protect them, and to correctly propose or create effective programs that raise awareness. The failure to do so results in the current situation, in which the population is not able to understand the priceless heritage they possess, and it suggests that historic property owners will continue to destroy their historic properties to create parking lots.
The SWOT analysis leads to several recommendations. They are prioritized from the most important to the least crucial, but all should be considered carefully.

(6) Recommendations

a. It is recommended that the IHAH create standardized National Criteria for the Evaluation and Preservation of Historic Properties; which should include an initial criterion of a defined minimum age for a property to be considered historic, and a second criteria of integrity (how much the property has changed, or not, since it was built) to be able to identify and survey historic properties more efficiently. Since 1970 is the year the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit at the IHAH uses unofficially to draw the line between what is probably historic and not historic, it is recommended that the minimum age for a historic property be 50 years. The recommended IHAH National Criteria for the Evaluation and Preservation of Historic Properties should also include standardized regulations involving the national heritage significance value categories for historic and heritage properties, the types of treatments recommended for historic properties, and the intervention levels allowed according to the historic properties’ value categories.

b. In reference to the IHAH’s Protection-Intervention Levels allowed, these were specifically written for only one type of historic property: buildings. It is recommended that these should be changed to Criteria for the Historic Preservation Treatments and their Application on all historic properties.

c. It is recommended that the IHAH standard ‘National Criteria for the Evaluation and Preservation of Historic Properties’ have a defined classification of historic and heritage properties. The following is the recommended classification of historic and heritage properties:\(^\text{96}\)

i. Buildings: human constructed shelters for different types of human activities. They can be: houses, office buildings, hospitals, libraries, detached kitchens, detached garages, schools, bus terminals, hotels, stores and churches.

ii. Landscapes: distinct open area or location for human or nature activity. They can include: parks, plazas, squares, pedestrian malls, zoos, streets, and roads.

iii. Sites: a location that has historic, cultural, or archaeological value of pre-historic or historic human activity. They can have erect, ruined or defunct structures. They can be: archeological sites, battlefields, caves, rock carvings (petroglyphs), ruins of buildings or structures, cemeteries, and shipwrecks.

iv. Structures: immobile human constructions not created for human shelter. They can be: bridges, roads, streets, highways, dams, canals, gazebo, tunnels, and windmills.

v. Objects: smaller, usually movable and artistic structures or monuments include: sculptures, obelisks, fountains, statues, posts, or markers.

vi. Assemblages: a cluster of historic buildings, landscapes, sites, structures and/or objects, that contribute to a thematic connection, can have continuity of features and could be connected by physical development and/or by esthetic design. They can be: a historic assemblage of industrial buildings, a historic assemblage of 1920s Art Deco architectural style buildings, or a historic assemblage of statuary of national heroes sculpted by a famous national sculptor.

d. The IHAH standardized National Criteria for the Evaluation and Preservation of Historic Properties should not be limited to historic city centers, as it is currently done by the IHAH, but used to evaluate all historic properties wherever they may be located.
e. It is recommended that the National Heritage Significance Value Categories for Historic and Heritage Properties be used to only classify properties that are in fact historic, be they buildings, landscapes, sites, assemblages, structures and objects that are significant to Honduran history, architecture, engineering, culture and archaeology. This is because all properties within the historic city center limits are currently evaluated, whether or not they have been inventoried and all have a heritage significance value category designation, whether they be historic or not. In addition, it is recommended that there should be a distinction between national and local significance.

f. New edits should be adopted- see Appendix 4 for recommendations on Heritage Significance Value Categories, Historic Preservation Treatments, and Protection-Intervention Levels.

g. About the application of specific treatment to historic buildings, the following is recommended:

i. The choice of treatment to be used on a historic building will depend on a variety of factors including the building’s heritage significance value category, its existing condition, its purpose (the purpose of the preservation project and the building’s intended use), and Honduran code requirements. The advice of qualified historic preservation professionals should be obtained early in the planning stage of the project, because they would be able to guide the appropriate treatment for a building.

ii. The current physical conditions of a building should be recorded and evaluated before choosing any treatment, and after executing it, a good record, should be maintained.

iii. If a preservation or rehabilitation treatment is chosen for a historic building, the building’s massing, details of its architectural materials, and its historic character defining features should be identified and retained to preserve the building’s historic
significance. This generally involves the least invasive intervention (repairs are favored over replacements and reconstructions).

h. An intensive-level historic/architectural documentation project should provide information before choosing a restoration or a reconstruction treatment for a building so that the restoration or reconstruction treatment is as historically accurate as possible. This should identify the building’s form, details, architectural materials, and historic character defining features. In the case of a reconstruction, that the purpose (usually education) should be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.

i. It is recommended that the IHAH invest in the research of Honduran architectural history. Because the field does not yet exist, architecture is not identifiable and properties cannot be really evaluated based on architectural significance. With the creation of Honduran architectural styles, there is no need to create city center architectural typology studies.

j. It was and is recommended that the IHAH create a school for trades and crafts training for the preservation and restoration of buildings (training in historic carpentry, masonry work, ironwork, adobe, lime plaster, etc. techniques)\(^97\) it is frankly one of the best suggestions one has read about for this research and would contribute to the entire country’s historic preservation process.

k. It is recommended that the IHAH create specific, more detailed guidelines for the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction of the exterior and interior elements and materials of historic buildings according to the historic and traditional architectural styles, construction materials and construction techniques used in Honduras.

l. It is recommended that the IHAH contact the Latin America Chapter of the Association for Preservation Technology (APT) International for membership. To acquire technical consultancy, training and education, and conferences for updating themselves in APT successfully proven technologies.

m. Since the current management regulation booklets are basically design guidelines, it is recommended that the local-level historic preservation planning departments be in charge of issuing publications in their particular cities. In addition, they should be in charge of issuing the pertinent permits for the local project treatments and interventions on local historic properties and monitoring the compliance of the local guidelines and regulations.

n. It is recommended that the IHAH hire and keep on staff at least one anthropologist and one historic preservationist, both are important for the interpretation and evaluation of historic and heritage properties. This is in addition the archaeologists, historians, conservationists, architects and engineers that are regularly staffed by the IHAH.

o. It is recommended that the IHAH, the local preservation authority of a city (if a city has one), and any non-for-profit preservation organization in a city (if they exist) should collaborate to create awareness and to educate the local population about their heritage and its significance to local history or national history.

p. It is recommended that the local preservation authorities and not-for-profit preservation organizations (if they exist) collaborate in programs that educate and generate revenue at the same time. The profits should be used in preservation efforts. Suggested programs include: historic-themed walking tours of the city center, fundraiser activities, etc. If the government researched and invested in local heritage tourism, they might find a source of revenue to reinvest in preservation activities.
Conclusion

As seen throughout the chapter and the resulting SWOT analysis, the IHAH has a poor grasp, scope and capability to manage heritage and historic properties as it is now. It is unmistakable that the Central Government has no concern about the institute, unless it has any financial benefits, and surely corruption has infiltrated this institution. The historic preservation field has developed by trial and error. With no historic preservationist in staff or as consultant, this is evident in the lack of national standards for historic preservation, and instead, the creation of individual historic center management regulations booklets and policies based on one of Honduras’ cities, with distinct characters that are not applicable to most. This creates the reactive manner in which historic preservation properties are treated by the IHAH.

One hopes the given recommendations are taken into serious consideration for the improvement of the historic preservation planning process in Honduras.
CHAPTER II: 
MUNICIPALITY OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Introduction

In the previous chapter the IHAH and its role in local government historic preservation policies was discussed. This chapter focuses on history and development of the capital city of Honduras, the ‘Municipality of the Central District’ (Municipio del Distrito Central in Spanish, M.D.C.). The next chapter will introduce one of only four EGCH local government offices in the country created to aid the IHAH to manage historic preservation activities within its jurisdictional city.

The capital city of Honduras is popularly called Tegucigalpa because the capital of Honduras was transferred from Comayagua (the first capital of the Honduran Republic) to the city of Tegucigalpa in 1881. The current official name of the capital of Honduras is the M.D.C. The District was created in 1938, a union of the [twin] cities of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela. The Constitution of the Republic of Honduras states it as follows:

Article 8.- The cities of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela, jointly, constitute the capital of the Republic.

Article 295.- The Central District is constituted into a single Municipality by the old cities of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela.

This chapter focuses on the unique anthropological, political and architectural history of the M.D.C. that contributed to its transformation from the lowest ranked of Spanish settlements (‘Royal Mine and Pueblo de Indios’), to the “twin cities,” and the capital of Honduras. The chapter begins with a brief history of Honduras that takes the reader to the origin of Tegucigalpa

---

98 Juan Manuel Aguilar Flores, Tres Inmuebles del Patrimonio Cultural de Tegucigalpa Periodo Republicano (Tegucigalpa: Ediciones Guardabarranco, 2012), 9, 14.
99 Daniela Navarrete Cálix, Tegucigalpa a Pie, Guía Histórica (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, 2008), 27.
100 Constitution of Honduras, 1982. Article 8, Chapter I Of the State Organization. Article 295, Chapter 11 Of the Departmental and Municipal Regimen.
101 Daniela Navarrete Cálix, Colección Centros Históricos: Diversidad Patrimonial en las Ciudades de Honduras (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, 2008), 16.
as a Spanish settlement and later Comayagüela as its ‘Pueblo de Indios’. After that, the chapter focuses on both settlements individually discussing their different settlers, communities, architecture, economy, and their political and social growth and settlement expansions resulting from their settlers and their activities, which led them up in Spanish settlement ranking system, both becoming cities and eventually joining together under one local government and becoming the seat of the national government.

(1) History of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela

The history of the modern nation of Honduras begins on July 30, 1502, when Cristopher Columbus arrived at the island of Guanaja. On August 14th of that year he discovered Continental America’s mainland in Honduras when he arrived to what the Spaniards called Punta Caxinas and on the 17th he claimed the land in the name of the Kings of Castilla. These events all took place during his 4th and last trip to the “new world.”102 During colonial times, Honduras was one of the provinces of the Kingdom of Guatemala (also called the General Captaincy of Guatemala), which included the current day countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and the region of Chiapas, México. The Kingdom of Guatemala was part of the Viceroyalty of New Spain which had jurisdiction over North and Central America, the West Indies and Venezuela.103

For the Spanish conquistadors, the locations and founding of settlements was determined by many criteria from their own European ordinances (which gave way to the Law of the Indies). Some of the most important criteria were: the existence of indigenous settlements, good weather and mineral deposits. All of these criteria were met by the Tegucigalpa region.104 Other important early guidelines for locating and founding settlements were an elevated location with a healthy

104 Daniela Navarrete Cálix, Colección Centros Históricos: Diversidad Patrimonial en las Ciudades de Honduras (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, 2008), 15.
and fertile terrain, access to a body of water, woods, and pasture. In addition, the settlements founded by the Spanish had different rankings according to size, relevance and function. The settlement types in order of rank were: cities, villas (sometimes officially called ‘Real Villa,’ or ‘Royal Villa’ in English), ports, royal mines (‘Real de Minas’), and Indian pueblos (‘Pueblo de Indios,’ the lowest ranking settlement where the Native-Americans were made to live by the Spanish settlers).

Soon after the Spaniard’s arrival in continental America, the expeditions of the ‘Conquista’ were initiated. The first Honduran cities were founded: Trujillo, San Pedro de Puerto Caballos, Naco, Triunfo de la Cruz, Gracias a Dios, Tencoa, Choluteca, Comayagua, and Jerez de la Frontera. There is no mention of Tegucigalpa, and in fact, no one knows of its existence until the word “Teguycegalpa” was mentioned in a public document, an Order of Repartimiento (colonial labor system imposed on the natives) of July 20, 1536, when the Adelantado (governor) Don Pedro de Alvarado granted the pueblos of Cetapal and Teguycegalpa with all its ‘señores,’ indians, barrios and estates to a man named Alvaro Gil.

Teguycegalpa is not heard of again until the 1570s. Honduran historians believe that the first mention of Teguycegalpa referred to a native tribe that the Spaniards had only heard of at the time (1536), because there is no tax information of this native settlement until 1578. The theories of why there is no information are that it might have not been within their known routes at the time, or that the informants just reported the tribe but did not give its location. It could also have been both reasons plus the possibility that those natives were probably trying to flee the conquistadors and hiding in the thick and mountainous jungle of what is now known as Tegucigalpa, where the Spaniards had not yet advanced.

---

The conquistadors were just starting to venture into Honduras by 1528, and the colonial foundations were limited to the north coastal territory, specifically Naco and Tencoa. It is hard to imagine them arriving to Honduras’ south/central region where the modern-day Tegucigalpa is located and quickly subduing the native Americans. Even Comayagua, the first official capital of Honduras, located in the west/central region and to the north of current Tegucigalpa, was only founded in 1537. According to historian Daniela Navarrete Calix, the Conquista process in Central America lasted from 1520-1542. Three rival conquistador expeditions arrived in Central America to claim regions under their name and governance, and Honduras was the convergent territory for all of them (this Conquista process would later have its effects on the jurisdictional governance of Honduras).\textsuperscript{110} In addition, Daniela Navarrete asserts that these conquistadors had no interest in developing Central America and were just looking to build their personal wealth, and probably acquire elite titles. This is probably why the real Conquista process was not concluded in Honduras, and the management of the region started almost 20 years after the discovery of mainland.\textsuperscript{111} Evidently, in the early days of the Conquista, the Spaniards were building with ephemeral construction materials. They were not thinking of settling in the new land permanently, preferring to build their fortunes and go back to Spain. The Crown had to step in and issue orders for them to build their houses in permanent materials.\textsuperscript{112}

The 1530s-1540s were a period when the conquistadors were slowly venturing into east/central Honduras without knowing what kind of native settlements they would find.\textsuperscript{113} Some Spaniards settled in neighboring areas of Comayagua and claimed land for cattle and agriculture; others ventured further in search of minerals and discovered a rich lode of silver. These men were benefiting from the finds without doing the corresponding reports; they were eventually found out,
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captured and taken to Comayagua, where they declared that they had found the mines on the late 1575. These Spaniards also declared that the natives called the site Agalteca and its ownership was unclaimed; the names of the men that signed the declaration were Juan de Oñate and Jose de la Cruz.\textsuperscript{114}

The authorities of Comayagua appointed a Mayor of Agalteca, Don Alonso Caceres, to corroborate the declaration, to look after the mines and to make sure that the Royal Treasury would get its shares. Don Alonso Caceres carried out his duties, confirming the existence of the mines, surveyed the site, and reported that there were 3 families of native Americans inhabiting the site with a total of 10 people, and that 4 Spanish families lived near them in their own shacks with a total of 18 people. He also reported that the land was good and that the natives did not claim ownership of the site.\textsuperscript{115}

A. Tegucigalpa

Beyond Agalteca, the vegetation was so thick and the mountains so high that very few Spaniards dared to risk further exploration. There was no certain information about the site of Tegucigalpa, but the natives of Agalteca had referred to native populations found further in the south/east.\textsuperscript{116} The story goes that:

Beyond the river was a really steep and vegetated mount, filled with big pine trees and a diversity of oak trees; the explorers went up and down long and fatiguing slopes and hills until they finally found, between the thick pine groves and the depths of the sierras, the old native population of Teguycegalpa, which was settled in the skirts of a rocky hill that the natives called Sapusaca.\textsuperscript{117}
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It is assumed that the river mentioned in the previous quote is the Rio (River) Choluteca, also referred to as Rio Grande. Some historians believe that the meaning of Teguycegalpa (or sometimes Tegusgalpa) was: “the place where the lords gather.” According to the documents found, the natives received the foreigners well and the foreigners were also peaceful towards them; it is also mentioned that the foreigners that arrived to Teguycegalpa were lower class Spaniards.

(1) Foundation of Tegucigalpa

Historians have not found the certificate of foundation of Teguycegalpa as a Spanish settlement or any written testimony from the first Spanish inhabitants. Historians believe that since the first Spaniards that came to settle in the area were lower-class, informal miners, referred to as “gurrugueses and güirises” in the old Spanish documents, they did not know how to read or write. These first miners simply ignored the royal dispositions about foundations and just started building shacks next to the natives’ settlement, even though the Spaniards had guidelines for the foundations of their settlements in the “new world,” which were by that time guided by the Law of the Indies. Many Honduran towns and cities had the same improvised beginning as Tegucigalpa.

It was only until 1977 that the Metropolitan Council of the Central District (currently known as the Mayoralty of the Municipality of the Central District, A.M.D.C.) requested historians from the Honduran Academy of Geography and History to research the foundation of Tegucigalpa, because of its unmethodical beginning and the lack of its certificate of foundation, so that the city would have an officially recognized date to commemorate its 400 years and declare an annual

---
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The Honduran Academy Of Geography and History responded with the date that most historians agreed on: September 29, 1578. The justification for that date is that the Spaniards had the habit of “designating places with the name of the saint on whose day the place was discovered or founded.” The municipality accepted the foundation of Tegucigalpa was on September 29, 1578, since the settlement was dedicated to Saint Michael Archangel on that year, and September 29 corresponds to his festivities. In addition, 1578 was the year that the Province of Honduras was divided into two regions: the Government of Comayagua with its authority, the Governor, and the region of Tegucigalpa (also known as the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa or the Mayoralty of Greater Tegucigalpa) with its authority, the Mayoralty Mayor in 1579 (see Figure 2). By the end of the 16th century, the Province of Honduras had three regions; the third one was the region of Tencoa.
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126 Ibid.
(ii) The Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa (or Greater Tegucigalpa)

The histories of the current cities of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela are deeply rooted in what was known as the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa, which would currently be considered the equivalent to the Honduran Geographic division called a Department (see Figure 2). Its extent was about 20,000 square km²; it included the mines of Guasucarán with its Indian Pueblo. This area also had jurisdiction over: “Ula, Joxona, Tatumbla, Lugarén, Cuareni, Redituca, Lepaterique, Tegucigalpa, Comayagua of the indios (Comayagüela), Támara, Agalteca, Liquitimaya, Tapali, Guarabuqui, Urca, Guaimaca, Apasapo, Pasaquina, Caperique, Aguanqueterique, Ticla, Locterique, and the Villa of Choluteca with its pueblos.” Through a Royal Provision of October 31, 1580, the Audience of Guatemala incorporated the Villa of Jerez of the Frontier of Choluteca
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(Villa de Jerez de la Frontera de Choluteca), with its Indian pueblos, the Fonseca Bay, the Gulf of Fonseca, and its islands to the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa, which extended Honduras’ jurisdiction to the Pacific Ocean. According to historian Mario Felipe Martinez Castillo, before the provision, all those properties were under the jurisdiction of the Province of Guatemala.

Tegucigalpa was the Mayoralty’s capital and Comayagüeula was its “Pueblo de Indios.” Historian Daniela Navarrete stated that like most of Central America, the Province of Honduras’ activities revolved more towards the Pacific than to the Caribbean. Because the area was under the jurisdiction of the Mayoralty, it probably had advantages over the region of the Government of Comayagua.

Documents show that there was much valuable ore in the mines of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa, so much so that by royal decree of April 27, 1574, the King commanded that the mercury provisions were to be met and made available as soon as the region demanded them. He also decreed a special provision for the packaging and handling instructions of mercury and other travel instructions for its arrival to Tegucigalpa, due to the rough, uneven terrain.

(iii) 16th Century Tegucigalpa

In 1579, the president of the Royal Audience of Guatemala, Don García Valverde, got the news of discoveries of the mines of Apasapo, San Marcos and Agalteca because their owners were requesting mercury and laborers. He sent an assayer to corroborate the mining information; the assayer confirmed the information and added that the recently discovered mines of Tegucigalpa were “as rich as had been informed.” With the positive report, Don García de Valverde authorized the officials of Comayagua to send mercury and also proceeded to designate the ‘Mayoralty of

---

Mines of Honduras,’ later renamed to ‘Mayorality of Tegucigalpa’ (or Greater Tegucigalpa, see Figure 2). He also informed the King [of Spain] and requested authorization for future supplies so activities in the mines would not have to be interrupted in detriment of the Royal Treasury.\textsuperscript{136}

On June 22, 1579, Don Juan de la Cueva was appointed as the first Mayor of the Mayorality of Tegucigalpa, vesting him the jurisdiction of administrative, judiciary and “all matters pertinent to the discovery and work of the mines;” and granting him civil and criminal power as well as political government functions amongst the natives, mestizo and Spaniard population. The mining settlement of Tegucigalpa was then known as the Real de Minas de San Miguel de Tegucigalpa (Royal Mines of Saint Michael of Tegucigalpa, or Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa for short),\textsuperscript{137} and although it was not required to set the seat of the Mayorality in an urban setting, it seems that the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa fulfilled the role from the beginning.\textsuperscript{138} This first mayor found only a few shacks with a small population when he arrived, so he was supposed to start the first real constructions to the north side of the Choluteca River, known at the time as the Rio Grande (Grand River), which was named so because of its volume and intensity.\textsuperscript{139}

By 1582 the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa had nine Spanish families “with some wealth,” and the population totaled 63 “Christians.” There were also 50 tributary “indios” (natives).\textsuperscript{140} For years the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa’s development was static. By the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa went through many appointed Mayors, the authorities from Guatemala kept replacing them because they would not fulfill their obligations in developing the region and the mines. One of them, Juan Nuñez Correa (appointed in October 6, 1585), reported
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on his arrival to Tegucigalpa on May 1586, that his predecessors had accomplished very little since the foundation of the Royal Mines. He found no place to lodge except for the ex-mayor’s house that doubled as the Town Council (Cabildo/Ayuntamiento), which was in a ruinous state and in an isolated location, away from the “Central Plaza.”

He also found that there was no real outline for this Plaza except for the fact that the church and the parochial house were there.

There was little progress in the small settlement. There were no real commercial activities, except for some development in neighboring haciendas and ranches. There was also a lack of construction and mining workers, even though mining was the only developing activity. To try to meet this demand, the mayor resolved to gather natives and force them to stay in Tegucigalpa. Despite the slow development, historic records from 1594 inform that mining in the area is still profitable for the crown, mentioning that “500,000.00 pesos were sent [from the Royal Mines] to King Felipe II.” By the end of the 16th century, Tegucigalpa started to shape up as a permanent settlement, with a plaza, a mercury warehouse, and the Town Council building, all constructed with wood walls and thatched roofs.

(iv) 17th Century Tegucigalpa

By the early 17th century, the geographical jurisdiction of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa is fully consolidated; the civil, ecclesiastic and military authorities were getting organized in the Villa. The Mercedarian friars arrived and founded the Convent of Our Lady of Mercy of Redemption of Captives (Nuestra Señora de la Merced de Redención de Cautivos). In 1609,
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the Town Council and prison building, was built with eaves, pillars and corridors facing the Royal Street (the longest street).  

Mining was thriving, but the Spanish miners lacked adequate laborers, probably because of the demographic decrease of native population (between 1549-1582), they were decimated because of diseases brought by the Europeans and because of slavery and exportation. It is the author’s opinion that the improper handling of mercury may have contributed to the decline of the native population. On August 16, 1618, African slaves arrived at the port of Trujillo, they were “admitted by the petition of the miners from Tegucigalpa.” On September 4, 1620, two more ships arrived with more Africans. Opposition developed as some claimed that “the land is full of blacks,” but it is assumed slaves arrived in increasing numbers. 

As the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa started to develop, sites were set aside for public buildings, churches, markets and recreational plazas. As the population grew, there was a need for more agricultural activities. The annexation of the Villa of Choluteca to the Mayoralty in the 16th century provided complimentary husbandry activities to mining around the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa, which according to historian Daniela Navarrete lead to the eventual consolidation of the Royal Mines in a larger political context. The Town Council often passed some ordinances to regulate the commune’s activities. The settlement grew and sprawled. New families and individuals arrived, not all of them miners, as more merchants and artisans joined the community. There was also the arrival of people with questionable reputations: shysters, bonesetters, magicians, health charlatans, pen pushers, and “noblemen” with no titles. 
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The settlement grew to approximately 900 inhabitants. The city center was the only part where there was physical continuity and order. Aside from the core, houses were built in a less organized manner with many empty lots in between. In the outskirts, order was completely lost because people built houses wherever they wanted without following a grid outline with streets. People also created their own routes of travel with no respect for private property.152

The rough terrain made it hard for “engineers” and explorers, sent by the Crown, to visit the Royal Mines, this resulted in almost nonexistent descriptions of the settlement in their reports. Explorers who wandered the community, however, noted that it was not a shantytown. People in the market were happy to talk, and there was a variety of merchandise. Pulperías (Honduran mini-market, known as bodegas to Americans), provided food, drinks, and clothing. Furthermore, they noted that although the houses were modest, many were built with adobe and had tile roofs.154

As the population gained wealth and purchasing power, homes could be constructed with better materials. It is possible that brick and tile factories, carpenter shops, limestone quarries, and kilns already existed. One assumes that there were construction workers and master builders among the population.155 During the 16th and 17th centuries, Tegucigalpa’s construction workers, artisans and artists who built and embellished the Royal Mines, were often instructed and guided by the Franciscan and Mercederian monks.156

The Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa started to have a more orderly grid layout in its streets and plazas by 1638.157 Social classes started to become more distinct by the late 1640’s: the upper class made up by the Spanish and Creole, the middle class included artisans and mestizo workers,
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and slaves and blacks were the lowest class. The upper classes started to employ tutors for their children’s education.\textsuperscript{158}

As communication increased with other parts of the world, the Province of Honduras became renowned for its gold and silver mines. The mines of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa were considered inexhaustible\textsuperscript{159} and new mines were discovered\textsuperscript{160} in the central region of Honduras during the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{161} By the end of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa had the 4\textsuperscript{th} wealthiest population in all the Kingdom of Guatemala (under the settlements of Guatemala, León, and Comayagua).\textsuperscript{162} Although the Province was rich in minerals, many people still lived in poverty.\textsuperscript{163}
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18th Century Tegucigalpa

The period from 1730-1780 is called the “Golden Half-century” of Tegucigalpa because those decades were the most prosperous. This is the era in which the community’s best private, public and religious buildings were constructed. The 18th century brought about the increase of residents and the profile of the social nucleus was more defined. The Royal Mines’ physical
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appearance improved, as it stopped looking like a hamlet and more like a villa. There were signs of improved communication with neighboring settlements, and the heads of political and ecclesiastical powers were more cultured compared to their predecessors.166

The settlement was extending to the west, and the houses built were no longer made of wattle and daub (bahareque) with thatched roofs. Instead they were built with adobe walls and tile roofs.167 Although building materials evolved, larger houses had a mix of Castilian features on the exterior, with Andalusian house characteristics in the balconies and the interior patios.168 The patios were the most important spaces in the house, destined for the recreation of its inhabitants, usually having gardens and surrounded by the rooms.169 Residents started building for their comfort as much as they could afford. Some justified their constructions saying that they built to embellish the town, while at the same time trying to manipulate the street grids to their convenience.170 All the houses’ roofs had eaves, meant to protect pedestrians from sun and rain. The ornamental woodwork and ironwork of balconies and entry doors with bronze nailing gave these houses the touch of distinction and wealth of the owner.171 The wealthy of Tegucigalpa would build one or two-story houses with little variation.172 The larger houses organized around a patio often had corridors with wooden pillars in stone bases.173 It is worth noting that 18th century Tegucigalpa, had more two-story houses than any other city in Central America. In part, this was

168 Mario Felipe Martínez Castillo, Apuntamientos para una Historia Colonial de Tegucigalpa y su Alcaldía Mayor (Tegucigalpa: Editorial Universitaria, 1982), 41.
169 Ibid.
171 Mario Felipe Martínez Castillo, Apuntamientos para una Historia Colonial de Tegucigalpa y su Alcaldía Mayor (Tegucigalpa: Editorial Universitaria, 1982), 41.
172 Ibid.
173 Juan Manuel Aguilar Flores, Tegucigalpa, Su Trazo Urbano (1578-1920) (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, ca. 2005), 8.
due to the small parcels of land granted by the Council to owners. This also meant it was the first Central American city to have over-crowded housing.174

The flourishing mining industry drove commercial progress. As better roads were built, the products that usually came from the city of Comayagua were sold in the Plaza Mayor (the Central Plaza). Peddlers also started selling on the streets of the Plaza and the shopkeepers, who paid taxes to sell their products, felt that the peddlers were detrimental to their businesses and complained to the Mayor.175 This story remains true today. The Plaza Mayor is currently in a pedestrian mall that was created in the 1970s in downtown Tegucigalpa and peddlers continue to walk around with their products, or set-up display stands daily. This problem and its relation to historic preservation in the city will be addressed in the next chapter of this document.

The economy further improved when the settlement became a commercial distribution center for the mines of Yuscarán in 1744. The settlement was improving and streets started to be paved.176 New commercial establishments were opened, and they did not just do business with the miners of Tegucigalpa, but with all Central American region and even México.177 All of these things contributed to the aspiration of getting the Royal Mines promoted to the title of Villa.178

On June 18, 1762, Don Alonso Fernandez de Heredia, Captain General [of the General Captaincy of Guatemala] and President of the Royal Audience, issued the order bestowing the title of Royal Villa (Real Villa) to the community of Tegucigalpa. The official name at that time was the “Royal Villa of Saint Michael of Tegucigalpa of Heredia” (Real Villa de San Miguel de Tegucigalpa de Heredia).179 Among the obligations that the title brought were: the creation of an
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Equity Fund (Fondo de Propios), a donation of one thousand pesos to His Majesty, the construction of council houses, the construction of a prison, and the construction of a new armory hall.\textsuperscript{180} The new title of Villa brought about the formation of its first official Municipal Council (‘Cabildos or Ayuntamientos’ were the smallest administrative unit for urban centers during colonial times, which roughly translate to a Municipal Council in English)\textsuperscript{181} made up of notable members of the society, and they were awarded common land.\textsuperscript{182} In 1763 the Mayoralty Mayor ordered Mr. Antonio Jose Aviles and Don Lucas Romero, Scribe, to draw a plan of the Villa and to specify the jurisdiction of the “Town Hall/Municipal Council” (see map in Figure 5).\textsuperscript{183} The map shows how far the new jurisdiction reaches (around 50km) from the urban center (the Villa), how most of these territories are located north of the Villa, and how the “urban center” is not located in the center of the plan, but on the far left (marked by a blue circle on the map).\textsuperscript{184}

The royal decree officially granting the title of ‘Villa’ was signed in Madrid, Spain on July 17, 1768.\textsuperscript{185} King Carlos III, agreed to grant the title with the condition that the new Villa’s population donate three thousand pesos for the construction of consistorial houses and a prison.\textsuperscript{186} On September 1769 the Royal Audience received the proposed Coat of Arms for the Villa (see Figure 4), and it was not until December 24, 1770 that the Mayor received the Royal title documents from Spain.\textsuperscript{187} A census from 1777 recorded that Tegucigalpa had 398 Spaniards, 3,788 mullatos, 115 indians of Tegucigalpa and 185 slaves. Comayagüela had 1,273 indians.\textsuperscript{188}
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Figure 4: Coat of Arms of the Royal Villa of Saint Michael of Tegucigalpa of Heredia (Real Villa de San Miguel de Tegucigalpa de Heredia).

Source: http://www.amdc.hn/.
Figure 5: “Map of the jurisdiction of the Villa of Saint Michael of Tegucigalpa
Measured by order of the Mayoralty Mayor and the Lieutenant of the Captain General of that Province,” by Antonio Josheph D. Aviles, 1763.

SYMBOL

☐ The Villa of Tegucigalpa
The building of the Town Hall began in 1762, and was completed in 1778.\textsuperscript{189} The building housed many activities related to the civil and political life of its people. Figure 6 shows the façade, where the top floor housed the Chapter House with its decorated entrance. The doorway was flanked with “twisted” columns, characteristic of the Hispanic baroque, and was the place where the Municipal Council met. The armory room was next door. The bottom floor housed various offices and the municipal prison.\textsuperscript{190}

![Figure 6: Façade of the Town Hall (Cabildo) and prison of the Villa of Saint Michael of Tegucigalpa, 1763.](image)

Source: Sydney David Markman, Architecture and Urbanization of Colonial Central America (Tempe, Arizona: Center for Latin American Studies, Arizona State University, 1993), 249.

The Town Hall with all its rooms and functions marked the beginning of modern political practices in society. In the economic front, a Royal Mint was built in the Villa in 1780, which
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provided officials in the government more control of the coinage and its distribution. The Royal Mint building still exists today as the ‘Juan Ramón Molina National Library,’ with its colonial architecture maintained of the interior, but with significant modifications from the late 19th century to its façade. This is one of the few colonial buildings that have known architects, their last names being: Quiñonez and Maradiaga.191

(vi) The End of the Colonial Period and the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa

By Royal decree, on December 4, 1786, an Ordinance of Governors for the New Spain came into effect, by which the Province of Honduras would change its government organization. This ordinance greatly affected the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa by incorporating it to the Government of Comayagua. The consolidated Province was approved by Royal Decree on July 24, 1791, in Madrid, Spain. The government then became centralized in Comayagua, with Governor Quezada taking control of both regions in 1788.

With this reorganization, the Mayoralty and its Mayor disappeared, and the Villa of Tegucigalpa came under the authority of Comayagua.192 Instead of a Mayor for the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa, the community was led by a Sub-Delegate Governor, and the municipal organization started to slowly deteriorate.193 The termination of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa turned out to be unfavorable for the mining industry of the Villa. The purchase of mercury was reduced, the workers in foundries and mines were laid-off and started looking for other jobs in other places, and there was also a decrease in commerce.194 For the Villa, the reorganization also ruined any aspirations of becoming a city.195
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By the end of the 18th century, it was generally accepted that the mines of Tegucigalpa were in full decline. The local commerce was weakened and the agriculture and cattle raising also declined, but the economy was not completely dead. Even with the economy in decline, the authorities of the Villa were still working on keeping it ornate, with clean plazas and paved streets.\textsuperscript{196}

The residents of the Villa, who were used to managing their lives through the Mayoralty Mayor and their Municipal Council, were deeply disturbed by the change of government.\textsuperscript{197} In 1799, the Villa’s Attorney General requested for the Villa to be separated from the government of Comayagua, and in 1807 he petitioned for the title of city.\textsuperscript{198} The community achieved the temporary reinstatement of the Mayoralty and a Mayor in 1812, with much opposition from Comayagua,\textsuperscript{199} but did not acquire the official title of city until after independence from Spain.\textsuperscript{200}

(vii) After Independence from Spain

The title of City was given to Tegucigalpa and its Municipal Council was commended as “patriotic” by the “independent” authorities of Guatemala,\textsuperscript{201} on December 11, 1821.\textsuperscript{202} Under President Marco Aurelio Soto’s administration the “Liberal Reform” was implemented, that transformed Honduras’ political, economic, and social operations.\textsuperscript{203} The new government ideology also changed the city’s public spaces by altering their names and motifs from “Spanish-colonial” to names and motifs that commemorate patriotism, independence and Honduras’ national
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heroes. In addition some colonial-government and religious buildings were repurposed for government use. Tegucigalpa’s patriotism rose as a result of their resentment towards Spanish authorities who changed their governance and organization, favoring Comayagua.

In 1865, General Jose Maria Medina, President of Honduras, visited Tegucigalpa and then ordered some improvements to be made in the city which included: the building of a cemetery “in the most convenient location,” and the instalment of lighting (oil lamp lighting) in all the principal streets. The property owners along these streets were told to build sidewalks. Other public health and safety improvements were made related to the river laundresses.

B. Comayagüela

Although Comayagüela was established for different reasons than Tegucigalpa, both forged a common destiny very early, which later made them known as the twin cities. The Municipality of the Central District, as it is currently known, was a couplet from the beginning.

Comayagüela was settled almost simultaneously with ‘Tegucigalpa.’ In a decree appointing one of the Mayors of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa, the King mentions the settlement of “Comayagua of the Indians” as if it were distinct and not a part of the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa. Comayagüela began as an indian pueblo (or reduction) to provide mine laborers, agricultural supplies, and domestic labor for the Spaniards in Tegucigalpa. The two communities are separated by the Choluteca River, then known as the Rio Grande (see Figure 204).
From ethnographic and philological studies, some historians believe that the first native Americans moved in the mid 16th century to settle in Comayagüela, were of Nahuatl or Mexican origin. Other historians believe they came from a place called Lejamani, in the current department of Comayagua. These first settlers settled in the site known as Toncontín, where the modern day Capital’s international airport, also called Toncontín, is located, on the plain called El Potrero.

(i) 17th Century Comayagüela

In the 17th century Comayagüela started to consolidate as a legitimate settlement, a “Pueblo de Indios.” The natives had multiplied and the mestizo population grew as hacienda builders and owners in the neighboring valleys. Comayagüela’s terrain, plain and wide, stretched from the banks of the Choluteca River to the foot of the mountain, and further from the Guacerique River to the plain of the site called El Potrero or Toncontín; all of which offered a better land for agriculture, farming and ranching. As the population grew, so did the number of houses in the area. A Plaza was designed less than a mile from Tegucigalpa, surrounded by wattle and daub houses with thatched roofs. The mestizo population became known by acquiring lands and building agricultural farms, ranches or mills; they were able to supply goods to the Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa and their other neighbors.

Eventually the population started building adobe houses with tile roofs that were separated by large, street-like yards that almost stretched to the banks of the Choluteca River, in front of Tegucigalpa. Humber homes would spread throughout the plain. They were more like ranches
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surrounded by vegetable gardens and farm animals in pens. Later on, the transversal streets started to divide the community and the mestizo population started driving the natives to the outskirts of the pueblo. Soon there were houses built in front of the banks of the Choluteca River.

A tax document recorded between 1684-1685 mentioned the pueblo of Comayagüela. The report said the pueblo was 800 meters away from Tegucigalpa, which at the time was considered a great distance, especially because it was a remote area with scattered houses. The pueblo had no street grid plan, but had “a vegetated mountain with plenty of fruit trees and local fauna.” A first-hand account from historian Salvador Turcios' grandfather, Don Gregorio Turcios, mentions how the Town Council of the Pueblo de Indios of Comayagüela already had a building by 1762. It was made of wattle and daub walls and thatched roof, described more as a “modern ranch of indigenous style” than a building of importance.

(ii) 19th-20th Century Comayagüela

The Mallol Bridge (1818-1821, see Figure 7) built over the Choluteca River, finally connected Comayagüela and Tegucigalpa and highly improved the relationship of both settlements. Most of the construction workers for this bridge were citizens from Comayagüela. Its architects were the Spaniards Juan Bautista Jauregui and Juan Benito Quiñonez. The bridge cost 36,000.00 pesos and was the first of its kind in the Kingdom [of Guatemala]. The bridge survives and has withstood recent hurricanes and tropical storms.
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Comayagüela also showed progress when in November 30, 1820, its Town Council was transformed into an official Municipal Council. One of the first actions that followed was that homes were to be built inside the settlement, because most of the population lived in the outskirts and only ‘came to town’ for Town Council meetings. In that same time period (1820s), Comayagüela displayed the same patriotic, pro-independence tendencies as Tegucigalpa.

Between 1830-1840, Comayagüela had only 30 or 35 houses, most of them with thatched roofs, distributed in the area and surrounded by nature. Between 1840-1850, the Municipal Council ordered the first street paving by the property owners of Royal Street. On August 22, 1849, Comayagüela’s title of a “Pueblo de Indios” was promoted to the title of Villa and granted the name of “Villa of the Conception of Comayagüela” (Villa de la Concepción de
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Comayagüela. On 1850, the Council decided to grant land on Royal Street, and the villa center, for the population that could afford to build adobe and tile roof houses. The Council also granted land in the outskirts to people who could only afford thatched houses.

Comayagüela received the title of city on April 10, 1897, during the government of President Policarpo Bonilla (1893-1899). Comayagüela’s first Town Hall (built in 1842), was rebuilt in its same location in a neoclassical style in front of ‘The Conception Plaza,’ now known as Liberty Park, between 1915-1916. The building is currently going through a controversial period because it is in danger of perishing because of deterioration, poor maintenance and the natural elements. One of its walls collapsed in August 2016, and no stabilization had then been provided by local authorities, even though it is categorized as a Value “A-MN” (National Monument) building in the current inventory of heritage properties. In addition, it has housed the National School of Fine Arts since 1940 and the school authorities have made it clear that the building has exceeded its capacity. In 2016, the school authorities called the building “obsolete and collapsed,” and it was in danger of closure because of lack of funding, government incentives, and deficient budgeting. The students have organized in peaceful protests urging the government...
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to invest in the arts education,\textsuperscript{240} for a new building,\textsuperscript{241} and for the stabilization of the current building.\textsuperscript{242}

![Figure 8: Façade of the old Town Hall (Cabildo) of Comayagüela](image)

Current National School of Fine Arts, 1948.


(2) How Tegucigalpa became the Capital of Honduras

Honduras has had a number of ‘capital cities’ since the Spanish colonization.\textsuperscript{243} The Spanish colonists finally chose a government and ecclesiastic seat for Hígüeras (one of Honduras’ historic names). This was the city of Comayagua, its last colonial capital, and also its first capital
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\textsuperscript{243} Juan Manuel Aguilar Flores, \textit{Tres Inmuebles del Patrimonio Cultural de Tegucigalpa Periodo Republicano} (Tegucigalpa: Ediciones Guardabarranco, 2012), 8.
as an independent Republic. Comayagua was founded as a Villa in 1537, and declared a city in 1557.

During colonial times, the creation of the Mayoralty was a process that involved four power groups: local (Tegucigalpa), provincial (Comayagua), central (Guatemala) and foreign (Spain). The overlapping jurisdictions in the Province were evident with a Governor for the Government of Comayagua appointed by the King, and a Mayor for the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa appointed by the Royal Audience of Guatemala. Both jurisdictions (Government and Mayoralty) were under the same bishopric. Since its creation [the Mayoralty] in the late 16th century, the decision of the authorities of Guatemala to segregate the territories of the Mayoralty of Tegucigalpa from the region of Comayagua started a conflict with the Government of Comayagua, because it greatly limited their jurisdiction and their participation in the mining activities and the distribution of their earnings. The city of Comayagua also lost many of their indian pueblos because they became laborers at the Mayoralty’s mines.

The progressive development of the Mayoralty and its Royal Mines of Tegucigalpa (later a Villa) created an economic, and soon after also political, rivalry between Comayagua and Tegucigalpa. The rivalry makes sense when comparing the origins of both settlements. Comayagua was planned and founded as a colonial settlement following Spanish urban ordinances, first as a villa and soon after as a city and seat of the Honduran government. Tegucigalpa was founded as most Royal Mines were because of the discovery of minerals and the improvised planning of the settlement ensued. The mining wealth and production of the Mayoralty shifted the
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economic axis of Honduras from North-Central (San Pedro Sula-Comayagua established in 1530) to Central-South, dominated by Tegucigalpa-Choluteca by the 1570s. The government reorganization of 1786 put Tegucigalpa back under the jurisdiction of Comayagua, which was not appreciated by the elites of Tegucigalpa. The rivalry continued when the Villa of Tegucigalpa declared itself for-independence from Spain and the City of Comayagua declared itself against it.
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Figure 9: Map of the Spanish Settlements and their foundation dates.  

After independence from Spain and the consolidation of the short-lived Republic of Central America (1824-1839), Comayagua still held the capital city seat for the Province of Honduras, however very early in the Republic’s history it was suggested that the capital city seat should be transferred to Tegucigalpa. In 1824, the Constituent Congress of the State of Honduras declared both Comayagua and Tegucigalpa as alternate capitals, it was suggested the rivalry
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between both cities should stop. Comayagua held the official capital seat after the dissolution of the Federal Republic, but Comayagua started falling in decline due to earthquakes, fires, drought, armed conflicts, and epidemics.

Three decrees were signed for the purpose of the transfer of power. The first decree was signed on June 22, 1849, the second on July 19, 1856. And the last decree was signed on October 30, 1880. The geographic transfer to Tegucigalpa was finalized by April 1881. In 1849, the move was justified to improve health, morals, and because it had a larger population with more wealth, resources and relations. In 1856, the justification for the move was to meet political and military objectives. In the 1880 decree, the emphasis for the move was on finance and communication.

Some historians believe that the final attempt and transfer of the capital seat to Tegucigalpa served to reactivate the mining industry through government concessions to foreign companies with Honduran partnerships. Mining remains more important than any other aspect of the economy, including agriculture and banana production.
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(3) The Municipality of the Central District (Municipio del Distrito Central, M.D.C.)

The current capital of Honduras is located in the Department of Francisco Morazán, in south-central Honduras, at 900 meters above sea level. Its topography is mostly mountainous, crossed by the Choluteca and Guacerique Rivers. The Choluteca River separates Comayagüela from Tegucigalpa. Both cities are popularly known as the twin cities and make up what is currently the M.D.C.

Figure 10: Map of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela, 1889.
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Tegucigalpa has been in a process of “modernization” since it became a city, in 1821, but the process accelerated when it became the capital of the Republic of Honduras in 1880. According to Daniela Navarrete, Comayagüela actually received its city title so that it could have the same political ranking as Tegucigalpa, because the latter needed to take advantage of Comayagüela’s leveled site to install more modern infrastructure. Don Gregorio Turcios mentions that: “On March 2, 1879, Tegucigalpa took over the parcel of land called La Chivera, so the people of Tegucigalpa could build their cemetery.” without the consent of Comayagüela’s Municipal Council, who abstained from selling the land. In this case, the Central Government intervened and ordered the Municipal Council of Comayagüela to surrender it.

The first attempts to unify both cities under one municipality were in the late 19th century. In 1890, the Municipal Council of Tegucigalpa petitioned the Political Governor of the Department (authority, heir of the Mayoralty Mayor), to unite both Municipal Councils under Tegucigalpa. The animosity between the population of Comayagüela and then President of Honduras, Luis Bográn, who supported (and maybe suggested) the decision of fusing together both cities under the jurisdiction of Tegucigalpa, almost created a revolt. Three hundred men (many of them identified as natives) were ready to fight against the union, but the most influential members of Comayagüela’s society calmed them by saying that the union would not happen. The Governor agreed, but the Municipal Council of the then Villa of Comayagüela refused. In 1898, the president of Honduras petitioned Congress to declare Comayagüela integral part of the Capital, but with both cities keeping their independent Municipalities.
During the government of Honduras’ only dictator, president General Tiburcio Carias Andino (1932-1948), Tegucigalpa’s territory grew with the official annexation of Comayagüela, and the Central District was created.

Many new projects were financed by the Central Government (State of Honduras). During President Carias’ 16 years in office, significant urban facilities were built, symbols of national identity, urban and political modernity of their time. The mayor projects included the National Stadium, the Communication Palace, the United Nations Park, the Carias Bridge, the Monument for Peace, and the Toncontín Airport. Minor projects included school buildings, healthcare facilities, parks, and paving. At the beginning of the 20th century, foreign investment, mostly from the United States, first in mining and later in banana production, brought new urban forms and technological advances to the country (electricity, safe drinking water, the railway, the automobile, and the airplane to name a few).

(4) Ongoing transformations of the M.D.C.

As mentioned before, Tegucigalpa has been in a modernizing process for a while. At the time of the transfer of the capital seat from Comayagua to Tegucigalpa (1880’s), Dr. Marco Aurelio Soto was President of Honduras and he started ‘recycling’ some buildings, an extinct newspaper called Diario La Paz stated: “...Dr. Soto has ordered a plan of the area where the buildings are found to give them a modern and elegant shape. Good, everything that transforms,

---

275 Ibid.
276 Ibid, 102-104.
by improving, is good.” Buildings were being bought to be transformed or rebuilt, some were being repaired and others were being rented to create office space for the government and the citizens of Tegucigalpa were all enthused and collaborative in pro of a more modern capital city. Unfortunately this sentiment of trying to make the current capital of Honduras modern is still felt today and is mostly in the detriment of the existing historic buildings (the once modern buildings). One believes this sentiment is the result of how the city was never really founded or planned to be a city, the Spanish-colonial planning regulations were never fully imposed, which resulted in its improvised, disorderly growth and expansion, from its urban grid to the heterogeneous building environment styles and scales. Even today, because of corruption, regulations are not always enforced, and every new local authority campaigns to create an improved, modern Capital City.

The current built environment of the historic center of Comayagüela and Tegucigalpa, in a greater extent, could be described as very heterogeneous in architectural style, construction technology and materials because of the lack of regulations to maintain its integrity and the constant idea that change and modernity is better. There is very little Spanish-colonial architecture left and most of it is religious; most colonial buildings were torn down to build “modern” buildings in the late 19th-early 20th centuries; these newer, modern buildings were of neoclassical style (built during the republican era), that would soon after be joined by art deco style buildings. The third big noticeable stylistic tendency that can be seen is the modern and international style of the 1950s-1960s (which are currently not considered historic by the preservation authorities).

The owners of historic properties are pretty much allowed to let their properties fall to disrepair (to raze the buildings for parking or for new construction) or to modify them completely behind the facades, to mix the historic construction materials with the newer materials when making repairs; most interventions are allowed as long as the historic façade is “maintained.” Most property owners do not hire architects or engineers with proper the technical skills, but master
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builders or simple construction workers; all these contribute more and more to the heterogeneity of the city center. One might say that there are no historic assemblages (historic districts) in the city center, but there are many historic buildings (many of them endangered) scattered throughout, that could still be identified individually as valuable heritage properties and possibly still in time for preservation treatments and interventions to save them.

Architect Javier Ramos Guallart (a preservation specialist and consultant from Spain) described the historic center in 2011, as having a mix of different architectural styles -from eclecticism to the modern movement- that architecture went through in the 20th century. He also described it as displaying lively coloring, with facades maintaining an acceptable state; however, he noted the extraordinary commercial activity that takes place in it and how it has taken over, practically suffocating other activities and unbalancing the land use of the historic center. In addition, his first impression of the historic city center was of it being fully occupied by automobiles where pedestrian space is residual and where the need for electric and telephone communication has been “resolved” by adding power and communication poles with no order or respect for the historic environment in which they are placed.279 One agrees with his perceptions, even though Tegucigalpa had and still has a pedestrian mall, the historic center has limited space with narrow sidewalks and streets, in addition to ubiquitous poles with profuse wiring (which are overlaid on the historic facades); all of which make the historic center look disorderly and over crowded with people and cars.

The following is a summary of facts for why the M.D.C. is special, unique and significant to Honduran society’s history.

1. It is two cities making up the capital, twin cities. Both originated as the lowest ranking Spanish-colonial settlements, Royal Mines and Pueblo de Indios, to rise up to current capital of the Republic of Honduras.

2. Its topography: rough, uneven, hilly/mountainous terrain in the Tegucigalpa side; shaped its unique, urban landscape (with scenic viewpoints, etc.), in which authorities partially followed the colonial ordinances (Law of the Indies) and partially improvised, making it differ from the typical, symmetrical, rigid, orthogonal city grid of planned colonial cities.²⁸⁰

3. The topography is also a factor that distinguishes the architecture of Tegucigalpa from other cities in Central America, making it the city with the most two-stories built (because of the few leveled terrains available to build during colonial times).²⁸¹

4. Since the creation of the Mayorality, it was the most important mining center in the Province of Honduras, and probably the wealthiest in the General Captaincy of Guatemala; which lead it to become geographically, economically and politically self-sufficient in a few decades,²⁸² eventually leading to its current status.

5. Anthropologically speaking, the current M.D.C. is unique from the rest of Honduras in that it was a melting pot of ethnicities and ‘races’ because of the mining industry. There were native Americans, black slaves and white Spaniards; the black slaves would somehow acquire their freedom and incorporate into society, some of them becoming merchants that were able to compete economically and socially with the Spaniards. The Tegucigalpa society was very liberal compared to most of Central America and these ‘races’ would mix together. Tegucigalpa’s society was also historically fluctuating, there is documentary evidence that the dominant elite changed every 50 years, where some of the original elite families (their names) disappeared from records and newer families went up the socio-economic ladder. As historian Mario Felipe Martinez Castillo says “Only Tegucigalpa possessed, next to the 76 criolle-spanish families, more than a thousand mulattos and pardos (browns) in such good economic positions that they decide to compete with the ‘whites’ and build for themselves a church with

²⁸⁰ Daniela Navarrete Cálix, Colección Centros Históricos: Diversidad Patrimonial en las Ciudades de Honduras (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, 2008), 19.
great artistic and architectural quality, building then the church called Los Dolores.”

American explorer William V. Wells writes about 1855 Tegucigalpa in his book *Explorations and Adventures in Honduras*, at the time, he believed that the Caucasian race would soon disappear because he rarely saw a ‘white’ person in the families descending from the Spaniards (quoted in Martinez, 1982).

6. In the two first decades of the 20th century buildings were being constructed for government offices (their construction still framed in the so called Republican era of Honduras). These buildings are distinctive of the city of Tegucigalpa from other Honduran cities for their neoclassic style, and their construction material being colorful quarry stone of green, gray, rose and yellow colors, which are local quarry stones from the hills of northern Tegucigalpa. This construction trend was started by Italian architect Augusto Bressani when he designed and built Honduras’ [Historic] Presidential House. One believes these buildings bring distinctiveness to Tegucigalpa and its architectural history.

7. Many famous Honduran poets and intellectuals were born in Comayagüela’s Royal Street. José Francisco Morazán Quezada, a Honduran patriot and national hero, also considered a Central American hero was born in Tegucigalpa (1792-1842); his original house was sold by his heirs in the mid 19th century and does not stand anymore, but a “newer,” neoclassic building was built in its place. It has a commemorative plaque for him.
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Conclusion

The objective of this chapter is to demonstrate why the M.D.C.’s history matters locally and nationally and why preserving its history and heritage should be prioritized and done efficiently. Many IHAH and GCH employees do not know the history and heritage of the M.D.C., but it is important that its private citizens and historic property owners know more about it because they will not protect what they do not know has value. The unique anthropological, political and architectural history of the M.D.C. has left much history, heritage and historic properties. This city has shaped and continues to shape history of Honduras. It is important to know one’s heritage and care about it if one wants to preserve it.
CHAPTER III:
THE HISTORIC CENTER MANAGEMENT OFFICE (GERENCIA DEL CENTRO HISTÓRICO, GCH)

Introduction

The previous chapter, discussing the history of the M.D.C. and why it should be preserved, served as an introduction and justification to the subject of this chapter: the Historic Center Management Office (Gerencia del Centro Histórico, GCH). The GCH is an office within the Mayoralty of the Municipality of the Central District (A.M.D.C.), which, as previously stated, is one of only four local government offices in the country created to aid the IHAH to manage historic preservation activities within its jurisdictional city. The chapter starts by discussing what was done by the then Metropolitan Council of the Central District (currently the A.M.D.C.) in terms of historic preservation before the creation of the GCH.

It then focuses on the GCH, its history and the events that led to its creation in 2007; the seminars and workshops done to develop the office with the aid of Spanish organizations with their results and recommendations; its current progress and its duties as enforcer of the M.D.C.’s Historic Center Management Regulation Booklet and Zoning Areas regulations in the Historic Center; its historic awareness programs and activities; and lastly plans for its future. Additionally, the chapter finishes with the introduction of recently created organizations and citizens’ grassroots initiatives that are working to create awareness towards the development of culture and historic preservation in the Central District. The chapter yields a SWOT analysis and recommendations for historic preservation in the Central District through the GCH, that complements the recommendations for the IHAH in Chapter I.

(1) Historic Preservation in the Central District before the creation of the Historic Center Management (GCH)
The first attempt at historic preservation in the Central District started in 1975, by decree N°242 of July 18, in which the ‘Metropolitan Commission for the Coordination of the Development of the Central District’ was created. Its purpose was to collaborate with the state and local governments, and autonomous and semi-autonomous institutions in the planning, carrying out and evaluating programs and projects for metropolitan development. Among the many objectives of the Commission, was “the promotion of an adequate relationship between the needs of the community and the environment, preserving the historic, cultural and aesthetic values.” Hence, one of the duties of the Metropolitan Council of the Central District was to preserve the “spiritual values of our ancestors,” by protecting and maintaining their works.

Article 1, of Decree N°242, included an inventory of 34 properties and urban spaces to be preserved due to their historical, cultural and aesthetic values. To preserve the properties mentioned in Article 1, The Metropolitan Council of the Central District had to also comply with three additional articles:

Article 2: “To adapt measures that lead to the saving and protection of all the properties and spaces in the inventory.”

Article 3: “To carry out the necessary work to create awareness, among the Honduran citizens in general and local citizens in particular, to promote the public’s interest and support for their [the inventory properties’] respect and protection.”

Article 4: “It is prohibited that the owners of inventoried properties to demolish or modify them without the consent of the Metropolitan Council of the Central District.”

Over the next twenty years, activities in historic preservation were nonexistent, even with Decree N°242, few follow-up activities were exercised by interested parties or regulating authorities.
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On April 30, 1994, the then Mayoralty of the Municipality of the Central District (A.M.D.C., previous Metropolitan Council of the Central District) and the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH) signed a covenant for the “Conservation of the Historic Center of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela and Adjoining Zones.” The IHAH was the steward for the Central District’s Historic Center. The IHAH made an Anthropologic/Historic study to define the Historic Center of the Central District. The Historic Center was defined and declared a National Monument on December 20, 1994, through Agreement N°527 issued by the Presidency of the Republic through the Institute of Culture and Tourism.

The boundaries of the Historic Center of Tegucigalpa are defined by the Choluteca and the Chiquito Rivers to the south-west, the Guanacaste y Zaragosa Avenues to the north, which is 0.94 Km², with about 1,743 parcels of land that are chiefly in commercial and residential use. The boundaries of Comayagüela are defined by the Choluteca River on the north, the 15th Street on the south, 6th Avenue on the west, and the Choluteca River again on the east. It has an area of approximately 0.57 Km², with a total of 981 parcels of land with chiefly commercial, residential and mixed uses, and a few institutional uses (See Figure 11 for map of Historic Center boundaries for both cities).

These are the first attempts at local historic preservation planning policies and the creation of a commission to administer them in the capital city. There is no evidence of their effectiveness other than the awareness and interest in local heritage, and the fact that inventoried properties still exist today and are included in the current Inventory of Heritage Properties of the Central District. This is shown in a 2007 IHAH project, an inventory of about 42 historic/heritage properties from
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the Historic Center of the Central District that were lost between 1993 and 2007 (see Appendix 5 for the map locating these lost properties and their inventory form numbers).

![Figure 11: Map of the Historic Center boundaries for Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela. Source: Javier Ramos Guallart, Informe sobre el Centro Histórico de Tegucigalpa (Honduras) y las Necesidades que puede Cubrir la Cooperación Española. Government Consultant Report (Madrid: Alcaldía Municipal del Distrito Central, July 2011), 7.]

(2) History of the Historic Center Management (GCH)

There is no written official history about the GCH office of the A.M.D.C. According to one of the original employees of this office, Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator), around 2006 the Mayoralty started working with the [illegal] street peddlers in the historic Center’s pedestrian mall, known now as the Liquidambar Walkway (Paseo Liquidambar since 2007), to relocate them to a market building constructed for them. This structure is called The Island Market (Mercado la Isla).\(^2^9^6^) It is worth noting that since the peddlers where moved to their new facility (provided by the government) in 2006,\(^2^9^7^) They returned to their old ways and old locations in the street of the Historic Center every couple of years. It is called an invasion of informal


\(^{297}\) Ibid.
commerce. The latest one happened in April 2016. The problem has not been resolved since Spanish-colonial times and is a constant battle the A.M.D.C. faces.

Local Authorities saw the need to create an office that could collaborate with the IHAH, because it could not manage the local workload, on top of the national workload. The need the local office would meet is to watch over the compliance of certain guidelines and future regulations for the historic center. A new agreement was reached between the A.M.D.C. and the IHAH, which resulted in the creation of the Historic Center Management office (the GCH) in the Mayoralty in mid 2007. The GCH was created to regulate all subjects having to do with project management and planning in the Historic Center. Two-three months after the creation of the office, the employees attended an intensive-level Seminar-workshop for Latin-American Historic Centers. That seminar and a week of roundtable discussions, provided a starting point for a management plan.

The GCH office started slowly, with only 3 employees and few activities, they have since added more of both (employees and activities). They started with regulating signage placements and interventions. Because 2011 was filled with the reviews for new developments, only after that did the staff have the opportunity to focus more on planning, trying to define the GCH’s mission and the vision for the Historic Center. This broad view was conducted with the aid of the Spanish Agency AECID, the AMHON through the Urban Management Program (Programa de Gestión Urbana), and assisted by Spanish consultant Architect Javier Ramos Guallart, in a “Capital Cities
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Workshop” (Taller de Ciudades Capitales). The results of this 2011 workshop identified issues in the historic center and long-term/short-term solutions for improvements. That same year, zoning areas (see Figure 12 and Appendix 6) and their regulations were created, and a socio-economic diagnostic study was conducted in May 2012.

These studies, seminar/workshops, and the fact that higher-up authorities change every four years, made the GCH employees realize the need to involve the local population to be able to maintain project continuity. Because of this, the Citizen Commission of the Historic Center of the Central District (that began in 2007) was asked to be more involved in project developments.

The Management Regulation booklet for the Historic Center of the Central District was developed and published by the IHAH in collaboration with the GCH, five years after the creation of the GCH, on March 28, 2012. Until the book was published, the IHAH directly regulated all programs and projects in the Historic Center of the Central District with the A.M.D.C. The IHAH already had some guidelines which it used in the Historic Center (which probably came from the one used in Comayagua, just like the regulation booklets). The GCH still uses these guidelines, which are the General Guidelines for the Historic Center of the Central District (Appendix 7), and a “Historic Color Palette” of colors allowed for the buildings (Appendix 8).

(3) Current Management of the Historic Center Office (GCH)

The GCH office is currently in charge of regulating signage placements, interventions, and reviewing the records for land use compatibility (per zoning regulations), that allows private
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individuals to apply for operation or construction permits.\textsuperscript{309} The Office also regulates the use of public spaces for events and permits, and monitors noise pollution. It is in charge of the administration of urban control processes in the Historic Center.\textsuperscript{310}

![Figure 12: Map of the Historic Center Zoning for Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela.](source)

*Source: Alcaldía Municipal del Distrito Central, Reglamento de Zonificación del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central, (Tegucigalpa: Alcaldía Municipal del Distrito Central, 2011), 19.*

The GCH is a single-window entity, meaning that a person can come to that office to go through all the processes for acquiring permits for interventions or any other project in the Historic Center without having to go to other government offices. If the process involves the treatment of inventoried heritage properties (especially of high value properties) or of the adjacent properties to them, the process is moved internally from the GCH to the IHAH to get any notes and

\textsuperscript{309} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.

\textsuperscript{310} Ibid.
observations necessary from the IHAH to acquire a decision. If the interventions are not on inventoried heritage properties, the GCH has the capacity to provide a decision that would allow or disallow permits. All activities done in the Historic Center are supposed to be done in accordance to the Management Regulation Booklet for the Historic Center of the Central District.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.} The GCH is supposed to monitor the interventions that have been permitted and any other treatments being done to check legality. The staff check to determine whether all interventions comply with the extended permits, dictums and the regulations. If they find no permits, they stop interventions and summon the offenders to fix the “irregularities” to make their interventions legal.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.}

The GCH has also created heritage awareness campaigns. In 2013, the campaign was called ‘Mira tú Patrimonio’ (‘Look at your Heritage’) in which historic photograph posters were hung on heritage properties so that people could learn how they looked originally. Brochures were distributed showing inventoried properties and their location in a Historic Center map (see Appendix 9). For Christmas 2011, the staff printed 1.50 M$^2$ historic pictures of Tegucigalpa and set them in the Liquidambar Walkway to show what the pedestrian mall buildings looked like 60 years ago.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.} In recent years, the campaigns and educational brochures seem to be having some positive impact. School representatives and private individuals have come to the GCH requesting more information and historic tours.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.} The GCH, with its low budget and limited staff, does not have the ability to create a local tourism program for the Historic Center. Unfortunately, most of the awareness and work done by the GCH has been done in Tegucigalpa, Comayagüela has not had much work done other than being pointed out in the past brochure.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.} Additionally, the GCH
also promotes cultural events, and plan to have 2-3 events per week in the Historic Center’s public spaces to encourage the flow of visitors and participants in them.\textsuperscript{316} These events usually take place in the Liquidambar Walkway which is in the Tegucigalpa side of the Historic Center.

With the published Management Regulation Booklet, the results from workshops/seminars and studies done, plus the creation of Zoning Regulations (see Appendix 6); in 2014 the GCH started the base for a Strategic Plan of Action by identifying four strategic axes: mobility (traffic circulation), habitability (bringing back residents to the Historic Center), heritage (cultural campaigns and heritage awareness) and economy (incentives); and transversal to all these is security.\textsuperscript{317} By 2016 the Strategic Plan was still not developed. All the same, in October 1, 2016, with the financial funding of the AECID, a formal Master Plan would start being developed by professionals of the University of Sevilla, following the findings in previous studies and the guidelines of the Strategic Plan of Action. The Master Plan was expected to be finalized by July 2017.\textsuperscript{318}

Some of the suggestions from previous studies include:

- Creating a training/workshop school specializing in crafts and trades related to the recovery of the buildings’ appearance. Teaching trades that are required for preservation and restoration of buildings, including historic carpentry, masonry work, ironwork, adobe, lime and plaster. Work is needed to repair the elaborate facades.\textsuperscript{319}

- Introducing Honduran heritage education to the school system’s curriculum.\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{316} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
\textsuperscript{317} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.
\textsuperscript{318} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
\textsuperscript{320} Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), \textit{Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Historicos}, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).
• Motivating citizen participation through the legitimizing of citizen groups. 321

• Creating more spaces for art and cultural activities, such as was started with, building the amphitheater in the Central Park.

• Involving the private-sector companies in the maintenance of public spaces and in spreading local heritage awareness.

• Making all power/communication pole lines go underground. 323

The Inventory of the heritage properties in the Central District was conducted by the IHAH, not the GCH. It was started in 2006 and currently contains 257 properties. The Inventory looks more like a collection of individual building surveys because they describe the interior and exterior of buildings and architectural details, 324 but lack a ‘Statement of Significance’ to justify a property’s value. Currently, not all properties within the historic center of the Central District have been inventoried; however, most have been evaluated and have a and heritage significance value designation.

The Inventory contains information of buildings, alleys, avenues, streets, parks and facades. These properties were built from the Spanish-colonial time through the early 20th century. However, the Inventory is missing some truly significant, historic and heritage properties including the very significant “El Mallol” bridge, and historic vegetation, like the century old Guanacaste tree from the Barrio Guanacaste. The Inventory is also missing all the modern and international styled architecture, which is seen in the Central District and its Historic Center, including the National Congress Building, and the original Central Bank building. Additionally, the staff of the

---

321 Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Históricos, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).
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324 Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento, IHAH. Inventario de Bienes Inmuebles Culturales de la República de Honduras, Ficha de Inventario de Edificios. Inventory, Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia. 2006.
IHAIH would like to consider nominations in neighborhoods outside of the Historic Center. They should be surveyed, inventoried as distinct historic assemblages, and protected.325

The IHAIH is the only entity that includes an Anthropology Unit which, according to the representative of the GCH, is very necessary for the Inventory research.326 The Inventory has not been updated since 2013, because of lack of monetary and human resources.327

The system of property management in the Central District (and probably all of Honduras) is complicated because most of the inventoried properties have incomplete information.328 There is no real local centralized, record keeping entity (e.g. a County Clerk office). Instead, there is a Cadaster Office (Oficina de Catastro) in the Mayoralty office (A.M.D.C.) which should have those functions, but it is not a very useful as a property research resource because many Hondurans do not register their deeds (or deed changes) locally, making it unreliable and not up to date.329 When Hondurans acquire properties, they are required by law to register deeds and deeds changes at the Property Institute (Instituto de la Propiedad, IP) which is the national institute that keeps these records for the entire country, largely used as an information source for tax purposes.330

Local Incentives for Historic Preservation

In 2014, the office was considering creating fiscal incentives in the form of granting building (construction) permits in the Historic Center free of charge or with discount, for approved projects. Another fiscal incentive under consideration was a real estate tax incentive for housing projects, to motivate and increase investment in abandoned and underutilized buildings. This

325 Alejandra Gamez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAIH), in interview with the author, March 2016.
326 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
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328 Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento, IHAIH. *Inventario de Bienes Inmuebles Culturales de la Republica de Honduras, Ficha de Inventario de Edificios*. Inventory, Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia. 2006.
329 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
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would create financial programs to spur agreements between banks and potential residents who could buy or rent housing. Before the 2009 political riots, smaller incentives helped property owners with the painting maintenance of their facades. The GCH was able to secure 40% off paint products with the Protecto Paint Company and provided the painters to do the façade painting. The property owners only had to pay for the paint products. Since the riots, graffiti has returned, but the office still provides painters to help paint facades.\footnote{Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.}

Other incentives were suggested during a 2011 ‘Workshop for the Revitalization of Historic Centers,’ but have not been implemented.\footnote{Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), \textit{Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Historicos}, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).} These include: tax exemptions for rehabilitation projects, sales tax exemptions for construction materials in these projects, and free technical advice; the need for a plan that links commercial uses to the historic center is obvious and tax exemptions seem to be a logical proposal to make to the government.; in addition, some grants or awards for well-done interventions and preservation maintenance are needed.

(4) Organizations involved in Historic Preservation in the Central District

Because the government’s historic preservation activities and policies have done very little to save heritage historic properties within the Central District, a few of the city’s cultural organizations have started to move in favor of historic preservation seeing the symbiotic relationship between culture and history. There are currently three major non-government organizations that are helping the historic preservation activities in the Central District.

On 2007, the IHAH and the A.M.D.C. signed an agreement for the strengthening of the management of the Historic Center of the Central District. One of the essential parts of the agreement was setting up a citizen’s group that would actively participate in promoting the preservation of the Historic Center. On June 19, 2008, after a long process of consensus building
by a transitional commission, a Citizen Commission of the Historic Center of the Central District (Comisión Ciudadana del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central, CCCHDC) was constituted as a civilian, apolitical, not-for-profit, and voluntary entity, whose objective is to support the revitalization of the Historic Center through citizen participation in the promotion, groundwork and defense of the cultural heritage of the capital city.\textsuperscript{333} The Commission consists of “duly accredited representatives of the institutions and organizations that are directly tied to the use of the Historic Center of the Central District,”\textsuperscript{334} neighborhood residents and other citizens interested in participating as volunteers.

Some of the institutions represented in the Commission are: the ICOMOS Honduras, Honduran Institute of Architects (Colegio de Arquitectos de Honduras), the IHAH, Honduran Man Museum (Museo del Hombre Hondureño), the GCH, and Women in the Arts (Mujeres en las Artes, MUA).\textsuperscript{335} Although the Commission is not political, a local government representative from the GCH and a Central Government representative from the IHAH, must be present in all meetings. It is not so much a citizen commission as it is a commission made up of various institutional representatives from the private or public sector.\textsuperscript{336} The Commission acts as a monitoring entity to keep watch over all interventions taking place in the Historic Center, asking questions and to discussing the options to see if they are appropriate. It has focused on cultural events and educational projects to raise heritage awareness in the Central District.\textsuperscript{337}

The second organization is the Tegucigalpa Cultural Centers Committee (Comité de Centros Culturales de Tegucigalpa, CCC). This non-for-profit organization begun in 1999, it brings together twelve of the primary cultural institutions of Tegucigalpa. Its mission is to “provide cultural and artistic choices accessible to the public, uniting efforts to strengthen the

\textsuperscript{333} Comisión Ciudadana del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central Facebook page, accessed October 27, 2016. https://www.facebook.com/ComisionCiudadanaCH/.
\textsuperscript{334} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{336} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
\textsuperscript{337} Ibid.
identity, spread the culture and contribute to national cultural heritage preservation.” Some of the cultural entities represented in this Committee are the: National Identity Museum (Museo de la Identidad Nacional), Chiminike Museum (Museo Chiminike), Honduran Institute of Interamerican Culture (Instituto Hondureño de Cultura Interamericana), Honduran Institute of Hispanic Culture (Instituto Hondureño de Cultura Hispánica), French Alliance Tegucigalpa, Women in the Arts (Mujeres en las Artes, MUA), Foundation for the Honduran Man Museum (Fundación para el Museo del Hombre Hondureño), Spain Cultural Center Tegucigalpa (Centro Cultural España Tegucigalpa), German Cultural Center (Centro Cultural Alemán), Central Bank of Honduras (Banco Central de Honduras), and the UNAH Art and Cultural Center (Centro de Arte y Cultura UNAH).

The GCH works with this Committee to create the (minimum) bi-weekly cultural events planned in public spaces. The Committee creates a list of possible cultural projects to take place in public spaces and buildings of the Historic Center. The GCH chooses the events to execute according to its budget.

The third organization is the Foundation of Comayagüela. This is a group of residents of the city of Comayagüela who have lived their entire lives there and are interested in its revitalization. They are not a formal, official organization, but they call themselves a foundation and are always present to discuss projects being done and those being proposed. They advocate for Comayagüela, because most projects and interest have gone to the Tegucigalpa side of the Historic Center.

---


340 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.

341 Ibid.
(5) Pro Historic Preservation Initiatives

Private citizens of the Central District are starting grassroots initiatives in favor of historic preservation for the same reasons stated in the previous section: the government’s historic preservation activities and policies are ineffective. In addition to the organizations assisting individuals, three initiatives should be recognized for their citizen level advocacy.

The first is the ‘Return to the [Historic] Center’ (‘Vuelve al Centro’), a private initiative that started as an advertising movement in the mid 2015 with the purpose of getting citizens interested in residing in the Historic Center and bringing back residential investment to the area.342 It was specifically focused in getting potential residents interested in investing in the adaptive-reuse project called ‘La Ronda Condominiums’ (Condominios La Ronda), a historic hotel turned into an apartment building complex.343 This project started to materialize in mid 2015,344 and offered apartments for rent and sale in 2016.345 The GCH was pleased with the results of the condominium project, and the staff describe the treatment as respectful to the historic building,346 although the structure was completely gutted on the interior. Only the facade was saved and restored, according to the color and street alignment guidelines provided by the GCH.347

The ‘Return to the Center’ initiative was due to the owners of the La Ronda Condominiums project. Nonetheless, the initiative took a life of its own when historic anecdotes were compiled and spread that contained information about other buildings, public sites and influential figures in

343 Alejandra Gamez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 2016.
346 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
the Central District’s history.\textsuperscript{348} Local cultural organizations (e.g. Honduras is Great), historians, architects and the local government (GCH) itself, started collaborating to promote and bring awareness to the history and heritage of the Central District,\textsuperscript{349} especially its Historic Center.

The initiative has a Facebook page that spreads historic data and promotes events in the Historic Center,\textsuperscript{350} and a website that publishes historic material about the Central District. In its ‘About us’ description it states:

We are citizens. We love our Capital [city]. We understand that only through the union of forces amongst regular citizens we will achieve the objective of giving the Historic Center of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela its success back and the prestige that distinguished it throughout the decades… We know that no one is able to value what they do not know. It is time to know… \textsuperscript{351}

We provide effective tools for the knowledge and value of the wealth of the [historic]center. To create an evolutionary digital portal with high quality content on cultural, touristic, social and urban subjects… To generate constructive dialogue and visionary proposals based on the historic and nostalgic context that forms the basis of cultural wealth of Tegucigalpa and Comayagüela.\textsuperscript{352}

The second initiative was begun by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) in mid-2015.\textsuperscript{353} It originated from a program called Emerging and Sustainable Cities Initiative (Iniciativa Ciudades Emergentes y Sostenibles, ICES) of the IDB, which proposed “an active, participative process” called the “Open Historic Center,” to promote urban debate and the communication between the different institutions and the citizens.”\textsuperscript{354} The IDB worked with universities, local government (GCH), different institutions and citizens in general, to determine the citizens’

\begin{itemize}
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perception of the Historic Center and what was needed in the area.\textsuperscript{355} The IDB sponsored workshops and online activities with the purpose of gaining information, increasing awareness and creating an interest that would, hopefully, propel economic, sustainable development.\textsuperscript{356} The staff wanted to create a public website platform where citizens could share the events that were happening in their vicinity and display them visually in a map. According to architect Cinthia Caballero, the platform exists but is does not work because it needs maintenance. The purpose of the Emerging and Sustainable Cities Initiative was to create a revitalization/environmental project around the Choluteca River, by cleansing the area and creating a new public space for recreation, a walkway that would surround the river.\textsuperscript{357}

The program has provided a lot of information surrounding social and economic activities, security, accessibility, public space and the environment (especially around the Choluteca River);\textsuperscript{358} which corroborates the issues the Historic Center has been facing since before the GCH started doing research and studies in 2011, the resulting information can be used to compare and update the information from the studies done in 2011 by the GCH, in collaboration with the AECID and the AMHON.

The third is a citizen initiative started in 2015, its purpose is to restore the ruins of a building called the Castillo Bellucci, the building was a residence built in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century with a design that resembled a middle-ages castle. The owners moved in the mid 20\textsuperscript{th} century and it was completely abandoned in the 1980s, it was not maintained and is now in a ruinous state.\textsuperscript{359} The

\textsuperscript{355} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
\textsuperscript{357} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
property is not visible from the street because it has been sealed off, it has no historic or anthropological significance and, because of its state, it has little architectural integrity; thus, it was not deemed valuable to be added to the inventory.\textsuperscript{360}

One of its adjacent neighbors, who has direct access to the property is the proponent for restoration and advocate for the building’s value in heritage. He has brought the building to the public’s attention through social media and newspaper interviews. He has acquired the collaboration of an architecture school in Tegucigalpa to create the restoration plans. He would like to turn the building into a museum or a cultural center. However, with all these efforts, he does not have ownership of the building and cannot realize his plans.\textsuperscript{361}

(6) SWOT Analysis of the Preservation Planning Process in the Central District,

To conclude this chapter, an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats reviews all the information discussed previously. It is undertaken with the objective of strengthening the GCH and its role in preserving local heritage and assisting the residents of the District.

A. Strengths

1. The M.D.C., unlike most Honduran cities, has a local office of the Mayoralty dedicated to the management of its local heritage and historic properties. This office is the GCH, which has the purpose of protecting these properties as much as possible. This Office is considered the local-level preservation authority.

2. The GCH has 10 years of experience (as of 2017) that can be used to guide real solutions for local historic preservation planning problems.

\textsuperscript{360} Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
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3. The IHAH has provided the GCH with an initial local inventory of heritage and historic properties that should be revisited, updated, and improved.

4. The M.D.C. now has organized, official citizen groups interested in culture, heritage and historic preservation.

B. Weaknesses

1. The Management Regulation Booklet for the Historic Center does not work because they are mostly guidelines based on the historic city conditions of Comayagua and are not applicable to the Central District.

2. The GCH, like the IHAH, lacks specialized staff in the historic preservation planning field, that could set the guidelines for the right approaches to save or preserve historic properties; it seems like the entire planning process is reactive locally and nationally (instead of being proactive).

3. The GCH, like the IHAH, lacks human resources, equipment and funding for their projects; this makes it hard for them to monitor every activity going on in the Historic Center and the rest of the city(ies), to check the legality and compliance of guidelines and regulations.

4. Because the IHAH manages national heritage, and is headquartered in Tegucigalpa, it micromanages the GCH.

5. Because of the lack of a historic preservation national standard, the GCH is still required by law to call on the IHAH to give opinions for all preservation and intervention projects regarding inventoried heritage and historic properties. The GCH has not been able to develop local preservation planning programs for the city that they now should know very well.

6. The local Cadaster Office (Oficina de Catastro) in the A.M.D.C. is ineffective as a building research resource.

7. The government bureaucracy and record keeping make it hard to access the right information and the right people to provide it.
8. None of the previously mentioned organized, official citizen groups interested in historic preservation have proposed or done any hands-on preservation, rehabilitation or restoration project. There are no proposals or activities to fundraise for the purpose of saving a single building or any heritage and historic property.

C. Opportunities
1. The GCH is aware that the Management Regulation Booklet for the Historic Center does not work and are working on a new one with collaboration of the IHAH.
2. The GCH staff is willing and receptive to any recommendations for improvement.
3. Senior staff of the GCH have been trained and learned through experience about the activities of the Historic Center and other heritage and historic properties within the Central District. Their knowledge can help the GCH become more independent of the IHAH.
4. There might be other non-government, foreign entities that could also collaborate with the GCH, e.g. the Latin America Chapter of the Association for Preservation Technology International. The AMHON and AECID have collaborated with the GCH in the past. The AECID has provided and is still providing funding for some of the GCH’s initiatives, projects and staff training.
5. The GCH should create a program for education and awareness in which it uses an endangered properties list to save specific buildings.
6. As an incentive, sponsor an award recognition event once a year for architects, construction companies, and individuals, to recognize their respectful interventions, preservation and maintenance projects providing them with certificates, medals, trophies, or plaques.
7. Taking advantage of the momentum that the heritage awareness campaigns have gained and the public’s interest of heritage, the GCH should create a heritage tour program.
8. Taking advantage of the momentum that the heritage awareness campaigns have gained, also encourage citizens in saving their heritage by suggesting they create advocacy groups for the
property of their specific interest, by facilitating information on that property and collaborating with them in any pro-preservation effort they want to do.

9. The creation of citizen driven initiatives has the opportunity of becoming a catalyst for grassroots movements that would get more people interested and involved in historic preservation of their heritage. The GCH should encourage these initiatives.

D. Threats

1. The Central and local government’s indifference is a big problem, and they have very small budgets assigned to historic preservation and research.

2. Disorderly record keeping and poor management of the preservation processes is evident in the head preservation authority, the IHAH, and extends to the local preservation authority, the GCH.

3. There is a lack of personnel qualified to review preservation projects and to monitor their progress.

4. When permits are being extended, the staff at the GCH try to comply with the regulations, but property owners do not see the benefits of preservation and complain about their rights. They usually come to believe preservation is not possible and façadism is the result.\(^{362}\)

5. Many initiatives and projects are slowing down because of the bureaucracy, when the IHAH micromanages what the GCH does.

6. There is a lack of local government heritage awareness programs for Comayagüela, leading to an overemphasis of Tegucigalpa and an under-emphasis of Comayagüela and its distinct history.

The SWOT analysis leads to several recommendations. They are prioritized from the most important to the least crucial, but all should be considered carefully.

\(^{362}\) Alejandra Gámez (Chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit under the Sub-management of Heritage, IHAH), in interview with the author, March 9, 2016.
(7) Recommendations

a. It is recommended that the IHAH empower and delegate their work to the local preservation authorities, in this case the GCH, so that they can really start managing their local jurisdictions with the full potential of their experience and their knowledge of their historic places.

b. Instead of wasting efforts in creating a new Management Regulation Booklet for the Historic Center, it is recommended that the GCH focus on creating Design Guidelines for the different historic assemblages found in the Central District (not only the Historic Center).

c. Because the GCH is of full potential with 10 years of experience, training and knowledge of their jurisdictions, it is recommended that the GCH be the entity doing the property research, surveying and inventory of their local heritage and historic properties. Besides the historic and architectural significances that a local building might have (acquired through local record research), the GCH could have polls or surveys done to find out which buildings have more local social significance.

d. It is recommended that there be a revision of the M.D.C.’s inventory and a research to add missing heritage and historic properties that were not considered before, especially the modern and international architectural style properties and the “El Mallol” bridge.

e. It is recommended that the local Cadaster Office (within the A.M.D.C.) and the national Property Institute (PI) consolidate their information records, and that they be organized to facilitate information, so that the Cadaster office can become an appropriate property research resource for the future preservation planning of the M.D.C.

f. It is recommended that the GCH start researching historic assemblages outside of the Historic Center to identify them and start planning for their preservation (being proactive).

g. It is recommended that the GCH contact the Latin America Chapter of the Association for Preservation Technology (APT) for technical consultancy, training and education, and conferences for updating themselves in APT successfully proven technologies.
h. With the lack of funding for more staff for the GCH, it is recommended that the GCH use their heritage awareness campaigns to create citizen monitors, by educating them not only about their heritage, but also the value it has and how wrong treatments makes irrecoverable damage, then make it easy for them to denounce any suspicious activity done to heritage and historic properties they might see.

i. It is recommended that the GCH encourage citizen groups to be more proactive in historic preservation efforts by guiding them in the right direction, in suggesting a one-project-at-a-time tackling system, in giving them assessment to realize their projects, in encouraging fundraiser activities for these projects and maybe creating workshops to help them achieve their goals.

j. The creation of a Visitor Center Kiosk (that could be located in the Central Plaza) is recommended for information on heritage tours created, (when and if the GCH creates a heritage tour program).

k. It is also recommended to involve university or high school students, training them to be tour guides, for school credit or extra credit (when and if the GCH creates a heritage tour program).

Conclusion

The GCH is an office within the A.M.D.C. that is not governed by the IHAH. But most of its practices are designed by the IHAH, which means that they have also been working on a trial and error scheme with reactive historic preservation treatments as a result. The office was created ten years ago to aid the IHAH in its management of the Central District’s Historic Center and it is not an autonomous institution because it works under the guidance of the IHAH and its Historic Center Management Regulation Booklet of the Central District. Even with all the workshops and studies done to develop the office, it has not improved because it follows the IHAH’s poor capability to lead. The one thing the GCH has successfully done is create awareness programs that spark the curiosity of citizens, becoming a catalyst for non-government, pro-historic
preservation initiatives. This chapter also yields a SWOT analysis with recommendations for the improvement of this local historic preservation office. It is necessary to fix the head institution first, the IHAH, in order to really fix the issues the historic preservation field has in the country and, in this case locally, in the M.D.C.
CHAPTER IV:
TWO ENDANGERED PROPERTIES IN THE M.D.C.

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the GCH was discussed as an aid and enforcer of IHAH historic preservation policies in the Central District, but even though this city has one of four offices of its kind in existence, there are still many cases that can be used to illustrate the Honduran government’s negligence in the management and preservation of heritage and cultural properties in the country. One famous case is the Midence House in Tegucigalpa, one of the first palatial residences built during the 19th century. A remarkable architectural example, it later became the headquarters of different historic public and private institutions throughout the years, one of them being the US Embassy in Honduras. It was inventoried as a National Monument by the IHAH in 1989. Between 1998-1999, seeing the deteriorated state of the building, different social organizations got together to request that the Central Government buy the property from its owners and to restore it (a ‘taking’). When the government did nothing, the organizations asked for international assistance to save the building. No effort succeeded and the property owners let it deteriorate further. Finally, the tilted walls were standing only with the assistance of shoring. It was razed in 1999 and turned into a parking lot (see Appendix 11 for the news article and IHAH historic inventory forms).

Because of all the heritage preservation neglect and loss that the citizens have seen in the Central District, there has been a recent, growing concern that more built heritage might be lost due to the ignorance and/or inaction of the central and local government authorities. However, as seen in Chapter III, there has also been a growing awareness and a movement towards preservation efforts that have been permeating all levels of Honduran society and the government in the last few years.

This chapter focuses on two case studies that have been chosen as examples of endangered historic properties in the Central District. They are in completely different categories. The first
one, the Toncontín International Airport, has not been evaluated as a heritage or historic building and has not been designated as such by the IHAH. The second, the Villa Roy “Republican History Museum,” has been categorized as a ‘National Monument’ by the IHAH. The Villa Roy maintains the highest designation of historic property in Honduras by the IHAH itself and yet is left deteriorating. Their stories demonstrate the range of Honduran preservation policies and program activities which need much improvement.

(1) Toncontín International Airport

There is not much written about Toncontín Airport’s origin, history and development. Research has only yielded limited information such as old news articles and the history told in the murals of Honduras’ Air Museum.’ The airport is located in the city of Comayagüela M.D.C., in the Capital of Honduras, about 6-8 kilometers away from the center of Tegucigalpa M.D.C.; it is also 994 meters above sea level.

The property is not included in the current Inventory of Heritage and Historic Properties, although the plain where it was built, as a landing field as early as 1908, and its original building, constructed between 1945 and 1948, are important because so many historically important figures arrived in this location. The chief of the Heritage Properties and Monuments Unit of the IHAH admits that it is valuable and should be listed as a heritage property, but the IHAH has not ordered its survey or value assessment, probably because of political controversies, both existing and potential.
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A. History to the End of the 20th Century\textsuperscript{367}

The history of Toncontin International Airport is rooted in the history of Honduran civil and military aviation. Honduras was one of the first Central American countries to have the privilege of knowing about and having an airplane.\textsuperscript{368} Located on the plain known as “El Potrero or Llanos del Potrero” in the city of Comayagüela,\textsuperscript{369} the area was an extended savannah covered in thicket, surrounded by rural housing, about 15 minutes from the city center of Tegucigalpa. A dusty road cut through the area where cattle would graze.\textsuperscript{370} Toncontín and the Capital City are both surrounded by hills and mountains reaching an approximate elevation of 7,500 meters.\textsuperscript{371}

At the end of the 19th century, the “Llanos del Potrero” plain was acquired by Don Concepción Godoy who lived there with his family on a cattle ranch. Gradually, new houses were built along the old access road that leads to Choluteca (and the south of Honduras).\textsuperscript{372}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure13.jpg}
\caption{Photograph of Llanos del Potrero, Toncontín landing strip, ca. 1921. \textit{Source: Museo del Aire de Honduras, “Cuna de la aviación en Honduras, Toncontín,” visited August 3, 2016.}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{367} José Reina Valenzuela, \textit{Tegucigalpa, Síntesis Histórica. Vol. 1.} (Tegucigalpa: Consejo Metropolitano del Distrito Central, 1980), 53-54.
\textsuperscript{369} Salvador Turcios R., \textit{Comayagüela en la Historia Nacional} (Tegucigalpa: Imprenta La Democracia, 1959), 41.
\textsuperscript{370} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Toncontín, La Historia de su Construcción,” \textit{Gestión Aeronáutica} (Tegucigalpa: Graficentro Editores, August, 2000), 8.
\textsuperscript{371} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Datos Generales del Aeropuerto,” \textit{Aeropuerto Internacional Toncontín (Tegucigalpa)}, Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, ca. 1970
\textsuperscript{372} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Toncontín, La Historia de su Construcción,” \textit{Gestión Aeronáutica} (Tegucigalpa: Graficentro Editores, August, 2000), 8.
The first airplane to fly and land on the Toncontín field was a BRISTOL F.2b, piloted by Captain Ivan Dean Lamb, a former member of the Canadian Royal Aviation Corps and British Royal Aviation Force, on April 18, 1921. This airplane was Honduras’ first airplane. Purchased by President Rafael López Gutiérrez’ government, it arrived unassembled by a ship. It was then assembled at the Marathon soccer field in the city of San Pedro Sula, there it took off towards the capital of Honduras. From Captain Dean Lamb’s arrival on, the site became an airdrome and later the first airport in the country was built on it. The civil and military aviation history of Honduras was advanced by the first international flight with the Bristol plane, on September 15, 1921, from Tegucigalpa to San Salvador.

Figure 14: The BRISTOL airplane at Toncontín, 1921.

In 1922, Italian aviator Luigi Venditti made several flights to Toncontín, on the area where the current Honduran Airforce is located. Also in 1922, Italian aviator Luis Stornaiola brought seven new airplanes to Toncontín with the intention of establishing the first school of aviation.
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The Honduran civil war of 1924 allowed General Tiburcio Carias Andino (who later became president of Honduras, 1932-1948) to perceive the value of aviation for the country’s future, not just as a means of transportation but as a strategic military weapon.382

Commercial aviation in Honduras began when Dr. Thomas C. Pounds started operations with a SWALLOW and an AEROMARINE 391, airplanes that carried airmail and passengers to the north coast of Honduras in 1925. On January 3, 1928, famous aviator Charles Lindbergh arrived at Toncontín with his airplane the “Spirit of St. Louis,” and stayed in the Capital of Honduras for 3 days.383

![Figure 15: The “Spirit of St. Louis” at Toncontín Airport, 1928.](image)


At the end of 1931 the TACA Airlines Company was founded by Captain Lowell Yerex (from New Zealand).384 TACA is an acronym originally meaning Central American Air Transport (Transportes Aéreos Centro Americanos), later called the Air Transport of the American Continent (Transportes Aéreos del Continente Americano). TACA Airlines built hangars and installed its first office in Toncontín.385 TACA Airlines was the second oldest, continuously operating airline
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in Central America and the Caribbean, after ‘Cubana de Aviación,’ until October 7, 2009, when it merged with the South American, Avianca Airlines.386

In 1933, with the growth of aviation, General Tiburcio Carias Andino (then president of Honduras) bought 18 manzanas (12.6 hectares, or 44.46 acres) of land from Doña Maria Godoy de Bustillo’s heirs, and traded 2 hectares of land with Don Concepción Godoy. The government also paid 900 pesos for clearing vegetation, and for the drainage, leveling and modification of the airdrome, that was from then given an orientation north to south.387 On January 5, 1934 the new and improved airdrome was officially inaugurated with the landing of a new, modern Pan American (Pan Am) Airways DC-3 airplane arriving from the United States. Months later TACA opened the Toncontín Hotel nearby for travelers.388

In 1935, Pan American Airways left its seaplane base in San Lorenzo (in Honduras’ southern coast), and officially arrived in Toncontín, intending to operate in the Capital. The Company requested the Honduran government’s permission to build a terminal for its facilities and offices, and its operations started that same year. The terminal was a one-story building that was located at the south-east area of the current landing strip. It was built with colorful quarry stone from the quarries of Tegucigalpa.389 Currently, the Aeroclub of Honduras occupies the location.390
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In 1944, Servicio Aéreo de Honduras, S.A., (SAHSA) Airlines was founded in Tegucigalpa as the first Honduran owned (mostly) national airline. Its original investment capital consisted of 20% from the Honduran government, 40% from Pan Am Airways, and 40% from private Honduran citizens’ investment (Julio Lozano, Fernando Lardizábal, Ruben Barrientos, Marcos Carias Reyes and Carlos Izaguirre).\footnote{Museo del Aire de Honduras, “SAHSA,” visited August 3, 2016.} SAHSA Airlines initiated its operations on October 22, 1945, and in 1953 it acquired and absorbed the original (regional) TACA Airlines.\footnote{Ibid.} In 1957,
SAHSA purchased 41,500 shares of stock in Transportes Aéreos Nacionales, S.A., (TAN) Airlines, founded by Cornell Newton Shelton in 1947. This airline was from then on known as TAN-SAHSA Airlines.\textsuperscript{393} TAN-SAHSA unfortunately ended its operations in 1994 because of a series of airplane accidents, some of them fatal.\textsuperscript{394}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{SAHSA_airplane.jpg}
\caption{SAHSA airplane, 1974.}
\small\textit{Source: Museo del Aire de Honduras, “SAHSA,” visited August 3, 2016.}
\end{figure}

Eventually, the need arose to build a modern terminal. The airport was rebuilt beginning in 1945 under the government of General Carias Andino. More property was purchased to extend the landing strip so as to accommodate larger aircrafts.\textsuperscript{395} The design and construction was led by the Honduran civil engineers Francisco J. Mejía, Francisco J. Prats, Guillermo Inestroza and Raúl Lardizabal. The construction was completed in March of 1948 with a broad landing strip; a modern, three-story terminal; a control tower; a waiting room; a customs and immigration area; a cafetería; and the offices for the nascent General Directorate of the Civil Aeronautics (Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, DGAC).\textsuperscript{396} The building’s design and materials employed the famous rose-colored quarry stones from the quarries of Tegucigalpa and reinforced concrete for the walls,\textsuperscript{397} granite for the floors, with Mayan motifs and representative images of Honduran traditions as decorations.\textsuperscript{398} A bust of Brazilian aviator Alberto Santos Dumont, the precursor of
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  \item \textsuperscript{395} Museo del Aire de Honduras, “Cuna de la aviación en Honduras, Toncontín,” visited August 3, 2016.
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  \item \textsuperscript{397} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Datos Generales del Aeropuerto,” \textit{Aeropuerto Internacional Toncontín (Tegucigalpa)}, Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, ca. 1970
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world aviation was also installed in the interior. Studies of the airport have shown that the runway was oriented to take advantage of the prevailing winds.

Figure 19: Toncontín International Airport, ca. 1946.

The first Honduran aviation authority was created in 1934, called the Civil Aeronautics Inspection (Inspección de Aeronáutica Civil). It was dependent on the Honduran Army Air Corps. It later became the General Directorate of the Civil Aeronautics (DGAC) through Legislative Decree N°121, on March 14, 1950. This agency was created to provide organization, vigilance and guide the development of civil aviation; it was integrated as a dependency of the War, Marine and Aviation Ministry. By Decree N°58 of February 16, 1952, it was moved to the civil government in the Ministry of the Secretariat of Development and Public Works (ministerio de la Secretaría de Fomento y Obras Públicas). The DGAC is currently housed in the Secretariat of Public Works, Transport and Housing (Secretaría de Obras Públicas, Transporte y Vivienda, SOPTRAVI, created in 1997 to substitute Secretariat of Communications, Public Works and Transport, SECOPT).
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When the construction of Toncontín Airport began, there were 72 airdromes scattered throughout the entire country.\textsuperscript{405} It was asserted at the time that all Honduran towns had a church, a Cabildo and an “airport” (referring to an airdrome), and that many people were carried in planes before they ever rode in an automobile.\textsuperscript{406} Many of these airdromes were also used for cattle grazing, so that pilots would have to fly lower and go around many times so that the noise would disperse the animals, allowing the plane to land. Aviation was a popular way of transportation because of the lack of roads and the mountainous, rough terrain that exists in most of the country.\textsuperscript{407}

![Figure 20: Toncontín International Airport, 1948.](image)


The Airport underwent many improvements in the next few decades. The house known as the “House of Pleasures” (formerly a vacation home for the president located in the Toncontín plains) was turned into the Honduran Air Force Headquarters. The road to Choluteca was diverted to create a buffering/expansion zone. By the 1970s, discussions surfaced regarding extending the Toncontín terminal or building a new one. Many studies suggested moving the airport to a different location (see the list in Appendix 12), most of them agreeing that the location called “El Pedegral” or “Laguna del Pedegral” would have been a better location because it was nearer to the

\textsuperscript{405} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Toncontín, La Historia de su Construcción,” Gestión Aeronáutica (Tegucigalpa: Graficentro Editores, August, 2000), 8.


\textsuperscript{407} Dirección General de Aeronáutica Civil, “Toncontín, La Historia de su Construcción,” Gestión Aeronáutica (Tegucigalpa: Graficentro Editores, August, 2000), 8.
In 1974 the Hurricane Fifi hit Honduras and Toncontín was the only functional airport in the country because all the other airports were flooded. Toncontín is where international aid, food and supplies could land. About 1983 another report about the airport stated that: “given the limitation of the building’s plot area, the specifications for airports and the technical advances in aviation, the Toncontín Airport is insufficient and inadequate to fulfill the current needs.” This [1983] report also mentioned the statistics of international air traveler traffic, stating that 65% of users that come or leave Honduras stated Tegucigalpa is their place of origin or departure. In addition, it stated that since 1980 the airport has been functioning to its full capacity, projecting that by 1987 the facilities would not be sufficient to satisfy passenger demands.

Figure 21: Toncontín International Airport, ca. 1975-1980.
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The modernization process of Toncontín’s current terminal started in the 1990s, with the support of Tegucigalpa’s Chamber of Commerce and Industries. Again, in 1998, because of the flooding created by Hurricane Mitch, Toncontín was the only functional airport in the country during the international aid support efforts and the country’s recovery. In 2000, the concessions of Toncontín (and all Honduran international airports) were granted to Interairports, S.A. (also called Aeropuertos de Honduras) for 20 years. The expansion of the concessions in terminal has continued.

In 2002, once more, there were considerations about moving the international airport to the “El Pedregal” location to allow the landing of the current generation of bigger planes. The government planned construction with guidelines that followed the requisites of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). The plan was set in stages that would take 10 years to complete. The project’s estimated cost was $110 million. The project’s benefits would have
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416 Raúl E. Lopez, Lineamientos Generales para los Diseños Finales de un Nuevo Aeropuerto para Tegucigalpa (Zona Central Oriental y Sur), prepared at the reqeus of the Secretaria de Obras Públicas, Transporte y Vivienda (SOPTRAVI), Tegucigalpa, December 17, 2002.
included its location being a 20-minute travel time from the city center, with much larger facilities.\textsuperscript{417}

(i) Toncontín International Airport at Present

In 2006, the airport started an expansion and renovation project that ended around 2010, resulting in a new terminal that is three times the size of the original terminal (1948), while integrating building renovations.\textsuperscript{418} Additionally, the runway was extended, and the customer and operational areas were also refurbished.\textsuperscript{419} Interairports invested more than 114 million lempiras on the project to improve Toncontín’s runway. The project consisted on a 300-meter expansion of the runway that allowed an additional 150 meters of useful runway, 60 meters of runway security zone, 90 meters of leveled security area of the end of the runway, clearance construction added to each side of the active runway, and the construction of a 1,900-meter perimeter fence to comply with safety in the aeronautical zone. The project also contemplated the removal of obstacles in the charge zone, which meant the removal of over 180,000M\textsuperscript{3} of earth.\textsuperscript{420}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure23.png}
\caption{Photograph of the Toncontín International Airport, ca. 2010.}
\label{fig:airport_2010}
\end{figure}
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The terminal area now has four gates, and two passenger boarding bridges for international flights. It receives between 20-30 national and international flights daily. Its airstrip is 2,012 meters long, with taxiway, radio aids vor/dme, papi lights, runway lights, signage, signaling in movement area, and cat 7 SSEI reference code 4C. It currently has 220 public parking spaces, with a plan to refurbish and expand to 360 spaces. Even with all of these improvements, however, the airport chiefly functions during the day.

Internally, there are currently 59 sub-concessions in the airport including airlines, souvenir kiosks, and restaurants, as well as VIP lounges and a Room for Diplomats. The international commercial airlines serving the Toncontín Airport are: American Airlines, Avianca, United Airlines, Copa Airlines, Delta, and La Costeña. The local commercial airlines are: CM airlines, Sosa Airlines, and Regional Avianca.
B. The Current Discussion on the Toncontín Airport

Although the Toncontín Airport is one of the most advanced terminals in Central America, at the start of the 21st century it was named “the second most extreme airport in the world” with many interpreting this to mean “the second most dangerous airport in the world.”

Since 1962, there have been a series of tragic accidents (some news sources say there have been 10, others say 15) while landing in the Toncontín runway. Most of the accidents were due to human error,
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the difficult terrain approach, and bad weather conditions. The deadliest of these accidents happened in 1989, on the TAN-SAHSA Flight 414, in which 158 passengers perished.

Another controversy arose following an accident that occurred on May 30, 2008, when TACA flight 390 overran the runway killing three passengers on board and two Toncontín employees on the runway. Sixty-five passengers on board were also injured. This accident caused then president, Manuel Zelaya Rosales, to state that Toncontín’s runway was to blame for
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the accident.\textsuperscript{435} He ordered the temporary cancelation of the international flights on May 30, 2008, without even waiting for the results of an investigation.\textsuperscript{436} He also stated that in 60 days (after the accident in 2008) all its functions had to be transferred to the air base located in the José Enrique Soto Cano military base (popularly known Palmerola and located at Comayagua), to create a new modern terminal there.\textsuperscript{437} In the end, the investigation report from the ICAO found that the accident was caused by human error (the pilot) and not the Toncontín Airport facilities.\textsuperscript{438} The report also stated that the airport met all requirements to function properly and that the terminal’s limitations regarding the approach and landing of airplanes were manageable, however the reviewers did give some recommendations for improvements.\textsuperscript{439} The airport was not closed by any international entities, its international flights were resumed,\textsuperscript{440} and to this day the airport is certified and functional.

After the 2008 accident, the controversial decision to relocate the airport to Comayagua escalated. In 2012, suggestions arose for the use of an alternative property.\textsuperscript{441} The Palmerola air base in the Soto Cano military base located 86 kilometers from the Municipality of the Central District,\textsuperscript{442} was built between 1984-85 during the Cold War, by the United States’ military.\textsuperscript{443} Today, US and Honduran military forces work together in this base that currently hosts 500 US
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soldiers (as of November 2016). The base is also home to the Honduran Airforce Aviation Academy.

The 2014 studies about the relocation stated that, if an international terminal were built in Palmerola, the Toncontín International Airport must be closed or become a regional airport to ensure the success of the Palmerola Airport. The same study stated that Toncontín could be functional for another 10-15 years, however the study did not make recommendations about where the new airport should be built.

In 2015, president Juan Orlando Hernandez, announced that flight operations would be transferred to the new airport to be built in Palmerola. He then ordered that the bid for the project be done in 2015, for construction to start on 2016 and finished in January 2017. Honduran news sources say the basis for the argument of Toncontín being dangerous come from a ranking of “The 10 Most Extreme Airports” produced by the History Channel, not scientific studies; additionally, the international authority in aviation, the ICAO, has never referred to the Toncontín Airport in that manner.

News sources started to make comparisons of the advantages and disadvantages that the Palmerola International Airport would have for the potential travelers coming and going to the Central District or the south of Honduras. The advantages for pilots include a shorter visual
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distance clearance (500 feet rather than 6,000 feet), fewer chances of flight cancelations due to weather, a longer runway, and day and night flight operations.

The disadvantages of the Palmerola Airport would have for potential travelers would be: The length of time (one hour and twenty minutes) it would take to go from the M.D.C. to the airport (since it is located 86KM away). The Palmerola Airport would become the farthest airport from a destiny city in the region (Central America and the Caribbean), and the second farthest in Latin America. In addition, people from the M.D.C. or the south of Honduras who wish to travel internationally would have to travel by land to Comayagua, on a road which is one of the most traffic and accident ridden highways in Honduras. The disadvantages associated with financing the new facilities were never addressed.

Because so many sectors of society were against the closing of Toncontín, the Palmerola International Airport project stalled. The first protests started in March, 2015, with the airport employees protesting at the Presidential House to keep the Toncontín Airport open. The president of the Tegucigalpa’s Chamber of Commerce and Industries also publicly stated that the closing of Toncontín would have a negative impact on the Capital City’s finances and investments. The local authorities had mixed and contradictory opinions, some thinking of the current employees who would eventually lose their jobs. Closing Toncontín would mean a loss of income from the passengers that arrive daily, which represents 40 million lempiras. Others
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have pointed out how tourism in the region would be affected as well.\textsuperscript{462} One could add that losing this valuable historical property would be negative for Honduras.

In June, the concerned Industrial Sector’s representative announced that closing the Toncontín International Airport would condemn the capital of Honduras and its southern regions. The representative of the Industrial Sector also opined that Tegucigalpa cannot be left without an airport, and that the (decades-long) recommended region of “El Pedregal,” should be reconsidered for the project.\textsuperscript{463}

In June 2015, the government also proposed various alternative functions for the Toncontín Airport property: an emergency military runway,\textsuperscript{464} a recreational family park, a bus terminal,\textsuperscript{465} a commercial area, or a parking lot with rentable storage units.\textsuperscript{466} The minister of finance stated that the government was poised to close Toncontín because, if not, the Palmerola project would not be financially viable.\textsuperscript{467}

By the end of 2015, the Palmerola International Airport project appeared to be moving forward; the construction project bid was granted to the Honduran business EMCO Investments S.A. de C.V. in December, with the Munich International Airport operator as its subsidiary.\textsuperscript{468} The government still maintained its stance on the imminent closing of the Toncontín International Airport.

\textsuperscript{463} Carlos Nuñez, "Industriales "condenan" decisión de cerrar Aeropuerto de Tegucigalpa," \textit{Radio América}, June 17, 2015, accessed November 9, 2016, http://radioamericahn.net/2015/06/17/industriales-condenan-decision-de-cerrar-aeropuerto-de-tegucigalpa/
\textsuperscript{466} Alejandra Valle, "Cerrarán aeropuerto de la capital de Honduras," \textit{La Prensa Gráfica}, June 16, 2015, accessed November 9, 2016, http://www.laprensagrafica.com/2015/06/16/cerrar-an-aeropuerto-de-la-capital-de-honduras
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At the beginning of 2016, president Juan Orlando Hernandez, started changing his rhetoric about the fate of Toncontín Airport saying that there were possibilities of it remaining open “if the construction bid’s financial operation numbers give way to keep Toncontín open, at least for regional/local operations.” According to the head of the National Congress, Mauricio Oliva, the president’s statements contradict a clause in Palmerola’s construction contract that orders Toncontín’s operations to close within 90 days of the start of Palmerola International Airport’s operations. If the Toncontín airport does not close operations within that time, the Honduran government will have to pay an $800,000.00 monthly fine (around 20 million lempiras) to the Palmerola Airport concessionaire; if the clause is not changed and Toncontín remained open, it would mean an enormous cost and tax burden to Honduran citizens. The aforementioned concession contract also states that there cannot be another airport operating within a 100KM radius of the Palmerola Airport.

Because the project seems to be moving forward and the closing of Toncontín still looks imminent, more people have joined the protests for keeping open the Toncontín Airport. The first general protests by concerned private citizens of the capital of Honduras happened in May 2016, and they organized to present a citizen initiative to the National Congress to prevent the closing of Toncontín.

In the same month, the president of the Honduran Association of Technical Aeronautical Personnel (APTAH), Carlos Aguirre, stated that the aeronautical professionals were never
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consulted by the government about the Toncontin situation.\textsuperscript{475} It was their professional opinion that Toncontin could contribute to Palmerola because traveling by land to Comayagua is a hundred times more dangerous than flying from Toncontin.\textsuperscript{476} Regarding the concession contract, they believe that Toncontin being operational could feed passengers to Palmerola and complement it, rather than have a negative impact on it.\textsuperscript{477} Carlos Aguirre also stated they believed that the government has demonized the Toncontín Airport by calling it ‘dangerous’ and uncompliant with regulations, just to sell the Palmerola Airport project, when in fact, the government had not consulted the professionals about Toncontín’s safety.\textsuperscript{478} It is their opinion that Toncontín is not dangerous, but that it is a special airport that requires different ‘carefulness;’ they also reminded everyone that relocating operations to Palmerola will not reduce accidents caused by human error.\textsuperscript{479} Like most sectors of society, the APTAH stated that it is not against the Palmerola project, but it is against the closing of the Toncontín Airport.\textsuperscript{480}

Still in May, the ex-president of the Honduran Council for Private Businesses (COHEP), José Maria Agurcia, reminded all citizen that Toncontín International Airport has been the only consistently operational airport during national disasters, while all the other national airports have flooded.\textsuperscript{481} He stated that the government is being obstinate in wanting to close it for some unclear reason, and that citizens will have to pay tolls while traveling the one hour and twenty-minute distance to an airport.\textsuperscript{482}

For some reason, from 2008 to the present, the Honduran government has insisted that Palmerola is the ideal location for the new international airport, when most of the studies done by
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different national and international institutions have pointed to the best relocation spot being at “El Pedregal” (see the list of studies made in Appendix 12). The latest institution suggesting this location was the ICAO in the 1990’s, with studies being done for that purpose, the proposal was then called “Faldas del Pedregal.” Even in 2002, “El Pedregal” was still being considered as the best and most logic location for a new airport for the Capital City. Whatever the argument, the construction of the Palmerola International Airport became official on June 2016, as it was published on the government’s official newspaper, Diario La Gaceta. Palmerola Airport is planned to start operations on 2018, which means Toncontín Airport might also be closing that year.

Further adding to the airport disputes, it appears that the rivalry between the city of Comayagua and the Central District is again surfacing. Taking into consideration all the previously stated negative impacts that closing Toncontín Airport could have for the Capital City, there are also considerations that Comayagua would eventually develop to grant the services that are currently provided by the Central District, e.g. the provision of hotel and convention center services. It is also thought that the government is attempting to decentralize public sector investments towards Honduras’ geographic center (Comayagua), since as of now, it is all concentrated in the Central District.

484 Raúl E. Lopez, Lineamientos Generales para los Diseños Finales de un Nuevo Aeropuerto para Tegucigalpa (Zona Central Oriental y Sur), prepared at the request of the Secretaria de Obras Públicas, Transporte y Vivienda (SOPTRAVI), Tegucigalpa, December 17, 2002.
488 Ibid.
There are polarized positions among the authorities, businessmen and citizens of the capital and the rest of Honduras. Most of them are against Toncontín’s closing because of the negative economic impact it would cause to the capital and the logistics of traveling to Comayagua without a functional, expedite transportation system. They all seem to agree however, on two aspects: they accept the construction of the Palmerola International Airport, and that the Toncontín Airport be left as a regional/local airport.

Section conclusion

Historically, Toncontín has been used for aviation consistently for 96 years. It is Honduras’ first airport and the place where Honduras’ civil and military aviation history started; also, making it one of the oldest airports in Central America. In addition, many significantly historic figures have arrived at Honduras through this airport throughout the years; and it has been a reliable airport through the different natural disasters that have occurred and affected Honduras in the last century. In modern times, it has been renown for being one of the most extreme airports in the world because of the unique situation of being closely surrounded by mountains and residences, which does not equate to dangerous; although it does require the attention of some of the most experienced pilots flying to and from this special airport.

The airport is utilized and is valuable to employees, business travelers, tourists, and family members visiting loved ones abroad; its closing would greatly affect the citizens of the M.D.C. The fight to save it is unusual because this is a building that is not designated as ‘historic’ by the IHAH, and yet is considered very significant to the citizens of the M.D.C and its southern neighbors. It is so significant that it is the first “non-historic” building, in recent Honduran history, for which citizens are organizing to protest in order to save it. Protestors include a broad range of
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people of different socioeconomic levels of Honduran society. The current idea to close and the 
relocate its functions to Comayagua is clearly fueled by the selfish interests of the country’s 
political leaders because the idea of relocating Toncontín has been in discussion since 1958 
without any progress (see the list of studies made in Appendix 12), since the airport is up-to-date 
with international codes and regulations. This potential relocation is also awakening past rivalries 
between Comayagua and the M.D.C. The resolution of this conflict will require the society of 
Honduras as a whole to work together and resolve deep rooted issues.

(2) The “Republican History Museum,” “Villa Roy”

The “Republican History Museum,” also known as the “Villa Roy Museum” (or simply 
“Villa Roy” to Hondurans) is the first house turned museum in the Municipality of the Central 
District (and probably in Honduras). It is located at a natural viewpoint on a hill between the 
Bosque and Buenos Aires barrios (neighborhoods). The address is barrio Buenos Aires, Sector 
01, Block 126, Plot 01, in one of the oldest, historic neighborhoods in the city of Tegucigalpa 
M.D.C. It was a mansion intended as a temporary residence that later became the permanent 
residence of Honduran President Don Julio Lozano Diaz (president from 1954-1956), and his wife, 
Doña Laura Vijil (see Figure 28).

494 Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento, IHAH. Inventario de Bienes Inmuebles Culturales de la República de Honduras, Ficha de Inventario de Edificios. Inventory, Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia. 2006.
Figure 28: President Julio Lozano Diaz (1955), Doña Laura Vijil de Lozano (1947).
Source: Autonomous University of Honduras (UNAH) Website, accessed November 24, 2016,
https://fototeca.unah.edu.hn/picture.php?/289/category/16
https://fototeca.unah.edu.hn/picture.php?/290/category/16

Figure 29: Lime stone paving, slopped road leading up to Villa Roy, 2004.

The “Villa Roy” property complex is made up of the residence and several minor buildings surrounded by a garden and trees, which contrasts with the urban density in the city center.\(^{497}\) It has a vast plot, half way up the barrio Buenos Aires hill, reached via a wide entry to an uphill driveway. The paving starts with cobblestone that changes into limestone half way up, until it reaches the residence at the top of the property (see Figures 29).\(^{498}\) The driveway leads to a garden enclosed by a balustrade that surrounds the main façade, the garden also integrates a central


\(^{498}\) Ibid, 201.
fountain on the end of the driveway (that is used as small traffic circle). This façade and garden have a great viewpoint with a beautiful view of Tegucigalpa’s historic center and beyond (see Figure 30).499

![Fountain on the end of the driveway](image)

Figure 30: Front Façade view of the fountain, the garden and viewpoint of Tegucigalpa, 2004.

At a first glance, the building is characterized by its accentuated Italian influenced design (see Figure 31).500 The building exterior walls are painted in pastel yellow, while all details are painted white. Next to the rear façade’s frontage is the carport that has a six-vehicle capacity and currently holds the collection of historic, bullet proof vehicles of Honduras’ past presidents (see Figure 32). The beautiful mansion and its premises were donated to Honduras and its citizens by the then widow, Doña Laura Vijil, after her death in 1974, for it to be reused as a museum.501

Subsequently, the IHAH became the steward of the “Villa Roy” estate and all its activities. The headquarters of the IHAH were built on the premises around 1995, located half way up the hill (because of the current property’s controversy there are currently only a few of its offices still operating there). It was adapted into a museum that was first known as “National Museum of
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Honduras” inaugurated February 4, 1981; in 1997, it became the “Museum of Republican History” of Honduras.\textsuperscript{504}

The building was included in the current Inventory of Heritage and Historic Properties in 1995 and was given the highest significance value category level in current Honduran preservation policies, the level of A-MN National Monument (see Appendix 2 for its inventory form).\textsuperscript{505}

A. Early History and Transition into a Museum

The first owner of the Villa Roy mansion was a very wealthy US citizen named Roy Gordon, who was the General Manager and partner member of the New York and Honduras Rosario Mining Company.\textsuperscript{506} The second owner was Julio Lozano Diaz, who inherited the property from Mr. Gordon in 1932.\textsuperscript{507} Their friendship changed Mr. Lozano Diaz’ life.

Roy Gordon met young Julio Lozano Diaz, when he worked in the Rosario Mining Company before 1915.\textsuperscript{508} Because of Sr. Lozano’s dedication and reliability, Mr. Gordon sent him to study business accounting in the US.\textsuperscript{509} After returning to Honduras, Julio Lozano Diaz achieved national prominence because of his professional training. He went back to working in the Rosario Mining Company, where he became Chief Accountant.\textsuperscript{510} In 1915, he became Rent Administrator of Cortés (working for the government) and by the 1920s, Mr. Lozano had already worked in both, the private-sector and the State of Honduras.\textsuperscript{511}

\textsuperscript{503} Ana Avendaño, \textit{Una Compilación de Villa Roy}, (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, IHAH, ca. 2004).
\textsuperscript{504} Magdalena Torres Hidalgo, \textit{Honduras, An Architectural and Landscape Guide} (Tegucigalpa/ Sevilla: Colegio de Arquitectos de Honduras, Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Fomento y Vivienda 2013), 200.
\textsuperscript{505} Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento, IHAH. \textit{Inventario de Bienes Inmuebles Culturales de la República de Honduras, Ficha de Inventario de Edificios}. Inventory, Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia. 2006.
\textsuperscript{506} Carlos Arturo Matute, “¿Por qué se llama “Villa Roy”?, “La Tribuna, February 21, 2015, accessed November 18, 2016, http://www.latribuna.hn/2015/02/21/por-que-se-llama-villa-roy/
\textsuperscript{507} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{508} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{509} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{510} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{511} Ibid.
Julio Lozano Diaz became a trustworthy, faithful and good friend to Roy Gordon.\textsuperscript{512} Their relationship remained strong even after Mr. Lozano Diaz left his employment at the Rosario Mining Company in the early 1920s.\textsuperscript{513} Their friendship was evident in Mr. Gordon’s support of Mr. Lozano Diaz’ run for congressman for the then Department of Tegucigalpa, during the government of Honduran president Vicente Mejía Colindres (president from 1929-1932).\textsuperscript{514}

In 1931, Roy Gordon hired Italian architect Augusto Bressani (a prominent architect in Tegucigalpa during the Honduran Republican historic era)\textsuperscript{515} and the Honduran master builder and decorator, Samuel Salgado.\textsuperscript{516} Roy Gordon planned the building to be his Tegucigalpa residence for when he had to do business travels and to entertain friends, since his permanent residence was at San Juancito, where the mines were located.\textsuperscript{517} The construction work was started in 1931, on the top of the hill on a sector known as Miramesí; the premises had around 8,200 varas (about 6,642 linear meters)\textsuperscript{518} and a building construction area of 499.62 M\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{519}

Construction work was halted in 1932, after the sudden death of Roy Gordon in an airplane accident during a storm over San Jerónimo, México, on his way to the United States.\textsuperscript{520} Despite his wealth, Roy Gordon had no family. He appointed Don Julio Lozano Diaz as only heir to his entire fortune in his will (a considerable fortune for its time), “in gratitude for his friendship, and above all, for his loyalty and his people skills.”\textsuperscript{521} Don Julio Lozano Diaz inherited all of Mr. Roy

\textsuperscript{512} Carlos Arturo Matute, “¿Por qué se llama “Villa Roy”?,” \textit{La Tribuna}, February 21, 2015, accessed November 18, 2016, http://www.latribuna.hn/2015/02/21/por-que-se-llama-villa-roy/
\textsuperscript{513} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{519} Unidad de Patrimonio Inmueble y Monumento, IHAH. \textit{Inventario de Bienes Inmuebles Culturales de la Republica de Honduras, Ficha de Inventario de Edificios}. Inventory, Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia. 2006.
\textsuperscript{520} Carlos Arturo Matute, “¿Por qué se llama “Villa Roy”?,” \textit{La Tribuna}, February 21, 2015, accessed November 18, 2016, http://www.latribuna.hn/2015/02/21/por-que-se-llama-villa-roy/
\textsuperscript{521} Ibid.
Gordon’s wealth and businesses, including the future mansion’s estate (future Villa Roy) in 1932.\textsuperscript{522}

The mansion’s construction work resumed in 1936 with the same designers and architectural plans; it was finished in 1940, and was considered one of the most elegant residences of the Capital City.\textsuperscript{523} Apparently, it was a custom to name large temporary residences, villas, thus Don Lozano Diaz decided to name it “VILLA ROY” in honor of his benefactor and friend (even though the ‘villa’ became his permanent residence). Don Lozano Diaz and his wife, Laura Vijil, moved into the residence in 1940 (see Figures 33 and 34).\textsuperscript{524} In 1957, Don Julio Lozano Diaz passed away, Doña Laura becomes his widow and sole heir. From then on, she lived alone in Villa Roy because they did not have children.\textsuperscript{525}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Villa_Roy_1940.png}
\caption{Bird’s eye view of Villa Roy, 1940.}
\end{figure}
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Halfway through the year of 1973 the Organization of American States’ (OAS) cultural unit technicians arrived to Honduras with the intent of designing the premises for a museum, and to “locate it in a place with touristic preferences.” The death of Doña Laura Vijil de Lozano on August 22, 1974, changed the future of the property because she donated her residence to the government of Honduras with instruction that it be turned into a museum. The testament had a clause specifying that if in the next ten years, the installation of the museum was not carried out, the donation would be annulled and the estate would immediately become the property of her sole heiress, Maria Villar de Cáceres.

Because of this generous donation, in 1975 members of the OAS’ cultural unit had a meeting with the IHAH ministers to speed up matters concerning the museum, and they also sent architect Guillermo Trimmiño Arango and his team to carry out and present a proposal for the
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museum premises (see Figures 35, 36, and 37). That same year, the IHAH began taking the necessary steps towards remodeling the “Villa Roy” estate, in which the “National Museum of Honduras” would definitely be installed. Subsequently, the permanent facilities of the IHAH were built in the lower part of the premises. The National Museum was finally inaugurated on February 4, of 1981, displaying collections in botany, the natural sciences, history, civil wars, and philosophy and politics. Almost fifteen years later, the IHAH reviewed the museum’s theme and decided that it would become the venue of the new “Republican History Museum,” meant to show historical and political collections of the history of Honduras from its independence onwards. The collections were displayed orderly and chronologically in 14 rooms. The estate was restored, the garden areas were opened to the public, and the new museum was inaugurated on March 6, 1997.
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Figure 35: OAS design proposal Site Plan for the National Museum of Honduras project in Villa Roy, 1975.

Figure 36: OAS design proposal perspective view for the National Museum of Honduras project in Villa Roy, 1975.
Source: Guillermo Trimmín Arango, Proyecto the Adecuación de Villa Roy para la sede del Museo Nacional de Honduras, Album Fotográfico, (Bogotá: Organization of American States, OAS, 1975), 86.
The “Republican History Museum” was in operation until September 16, 2010, when the IHAH announced the ‘temporary closing’ due to damage caused to its structure by rain and the Berrinche geologic fault, the source of the current controversy.

B. The Controversy

The geological fault going through the Villa Roy Property and the entire Buenos Aires neighborhood was first detected in 1975. The cracks that started to become obvious in Villa Roy’s structure and terrain presented no immediate threats. Since then several soil and structural studies have been done to create schemes meant to stabilize the faulty mass and to repair
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the damages on the Villa Roy building. All of the studies confirmed the existence of a landslide of the western hillside slope. In 1986, the IHAH hired a structural engineer consultant to study the fault and the damages to Villa Roy, and his work yielded a “National Museum Structural Restoration Final Report” that referred to previous work done. The consultant reviewed previous structural reinforcement, subsoil studies, a 1980s damage report and a geologic study done by geologists Nancy de Houghton, José Maria Gutierrez and Napoleon Ramos as a cooperation from the General Directory of the Mines and Hydrocarbons. Also included was an overview of an inspection visit done by Professor George F. Sowers (geotechnics expert), Eng. Rafael Rivera M. (SECOPT advisor) and geologists from the Sir Williams Halcrow & Partners Company, and photography showing the damages from 1975 to 1981 prepared by Mr. José Luis López N., Chief of the Museums Department of the IHAH.

In the 1986 report, the consultant found that “all the works previously done on Villa Roy have focused on eliminating the effects of the problem without attacking the fundamental cause,” although all the previous studies established the cause and made corrective proposals. This report also established that this problem started with a local fault originated by water infiltration that provoked a reduced shear resistance between the filler material and the natural soil. The water also increased the volumetric weight of the embankment material. In referring to the state of the Villa Roy building in 1986, it was reported that: the largest concentration of cracks were grouped in the north and western parts of the building. Several of those cracks were located close to, or in the same zones that had already been treated in the past. A small percentage of the
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cracks permeated the walls, from side to side, and that most of the cracks were superficial. This 1986 report also yielded a structural restoration solution proposal.

Moving forward to 2010, the IHAH announced the ‘temporary closing’ of the Villa Roy Museum facilities due to damage caused to its structure by rain and the El Berrinche hill’s geologic fault (called the El Berrinche fault or El Reparto fault), to start an emergency intervention on the property. The IHAH also stated it would act to obtain the necessary funds to fully restore the building and stabilize the terrain. As stated before, the geologic fault was detected around 1975, and was activated in May 2010 by a 7.1 magnitude earthquake on the Richter scale. The geological fault originates at the Berrinche hill that crosses the riverbed of the Choluteca River and deepens in the Miramesi zone.

On July 2010, there was a “final report,” the Geologic-Structural Study and Proposal of Villa Roy, from a study done by the TECNISA-Rafael Ferrera & Assoc. S. de R.L. engineering consortium, which stated that the buildings in the Villa Roy premises had been suffering of earth settlement movement, deformations and cracking; the museum had visible, thick, interior and exterior cracks that were also visible in the surrounding ground. The team identified the problem in the museum area as a slow moving landslide that would slowly, but surely, deteriorate the building. They considered the number one priority should be a design that stabilizes the

---

553 Boris Vladimir Viscovich, Restauración Estructural Museo Nacional, Informe Final (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, November 1986), 4.
554 Ibid, 11.
556 Ibid.
557 Ibid.
558 Ibid.
559 Boris Vladimir Viscovich, Restauración Estructural Museo Nacional, Informe Final (Tegucigalpa: Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, November 1986), 1.
land in the museum premises and the stabilization of the neighboring area. The recommendation of this report was the use of tie-backs for the museum area as the most economic and aesthetic solution.

On May 2013, a Villa Roy Museum Terrain Stability Geotechnical Solution Report was issued by the GeoConsult engineering and geotechnical consultants, which stated that the museum presented cracking due to its foundation’s differential settlement produced by a combination of the soil’s weight capacity (under the structure) and the horizontal mass movement of the soil towards the hillslope. The report stated that the work to stabilize and restore the building should be oriented to underpin the museum’s foundation, adding mitigation measures to prevent the slope displacement and avoid that displacement’s effect on the structural integrity of the building. Additionally, the report also stated that the study done in the previous report (2010) fell short in that the rock base is not located at 9 meters below, but at 30 meters below, and the soil material was lutite, not tuff; the consultants also found that the hill where the premises are located could be interpreted as a geologic anomaly. The recommendation of this report is to install a set of micropiles that would go through all the different soil strata and fault zones to provide an increased shear resistance of terrain materials, which would finally stabilize the terrain and its slope.

In April 2014, the museum was still closed to the public and in restoration, so that the IHAH stated it would be opened in 2015. The IHAH was still working on the second phase of the stabilization and restoration plan for the Museum. The contract the IHAH had with the Geo
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Consults enterprise had a November 4, 2014 deadline. At the time, the work meant a national investment of 5.8 million lempiras, consisting on installing 33 micropiles at 33 linear meters in depth, which meant making perforations and then smelting, uniting the micropiles by a top beam. The micropiles would function as a retaining wall to stabilize the grounds that are crossed by the geological fault, which would avoid more damage. Once the grounds were stabilized, the IHAH planned to restore the building, which was considered very deteriorated then. That year, the building had some raking shores placed on its walls (see Figure 38), which is a superficial mitigation measure, since the problem was determined to be the soil and would require serious interventions.

Figure 38: Damage mitigation raking shores placed on Villa Roy’s walls, 2014.
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On May 2014, news sources stated how the efforts made by the IHAH in the last four years to restore the mansion were useless, and that the IHAH had basically wasted 7 million lempiras.\textsuperscript{578} On the first week of May, a considerable 3.50 meter deep sinkhole opened up in a storage room of the Archaeology Unit in the IHAH offices and the museum was getting more cracks (see Figures 39 and 40).\textsuperscript{579} A Geological Report made by the Permanent Contingency Commission (Comisión Permanente de Contingencias, COPECO) from May 15, reported that the museum has had structural problems for over 30 years, for which many consultant companies (dedicated to these disasters) had been hired to make geotechnical studies to solve or mitigate the problems, but that all had been useless because of the enormous investment required and for which the government did not have the necessary budget.\textsuperscript{580} The COPECO report also stated that there is a possibility that Villa Roy is not only affected by geological faults, but also its lithology, tectonics and the presence of subterranean waters.\textsuperscript{581} On August, after the COPECO geologists made inspections and another report, it was established that the slope’s movement was still constant, and the recommendations made included the evacuation of IHAH offices that showed dangerous structural damage,\textsuperscript{582} the immediate removal of the entire archeological collection in the storage room,\textsuperscript{583} the performance of a structural study on the museum to identify the areas with total damage, the demotion of impossible-to-repair-areas that were previously analyzed by specialists, and the restoration of the damaged areas, taking care not to overload the IHAH buildings that remained in operation.\textsuperscript{584}
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After receiving COPECO’s first report, the IHAH manager, Virgilio Paredes, stated that nothing could be done and that the Villa Roy Museum cannot be rehabilitated because of the risks involved, but that the building would not be demolished.585 He also stated that the affected IHAH offices would be demolished in later weeks, to avoid the disaster of them falling on the houses at the bottom of the hill.586 However, his statements contradict the reports done by COPECO and previously done by private consultant companies that stated that the geologic fault does not make it impossible to stabilize the Villa Roy building. Nevertheless, some of the IHAH offices and items of the museum collection were transferred to the Historic Presidential House in downtown Tegucigalpa.589


**Figure 39: Example of wall cracks on Villa Roy Museum, 2014.**
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Since the sinkhole happened in the IHAH offices, the IHAH Workers Union got involved, concerned with what was going on with the heritage property and within the institution. The Union requested and sent letters to all the members of the IHAH Board of Directors, the highest authority within the institution, requesting that they have an extraordinary session to discuss the problems and propose the appropriate mitigation measures.  

The IHAH Workers Union was also concerned with the IHAH manager, Virgilio Paredes, making decisions that were not under his authority to make and without the counseling of IHAH’s employees’ professional input.  

Paredes is a systems engineer and did not have the knowledge to create the appropriate Contingency Plan that met international standards on preservation. When the Board of Directors never held the session, and they exhausted all other government institutions’ (related to the IHAH) resources, the IHAH Workers Union sent a letter to Honduras’ current first lady, Hilda Hernandez, on July 2014, to request a meeting to discuss the problems that the IHAH was having.
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Additionally, an Interagency Committee was created made up by COPECO, the National Autonomous University of Honduras (UNAH), and the IHAH, to create a team of professionals that would yield recommendations to save the buildings. The Committee visited the Villa Roy premises and buildings on July and submitted a report to the IHAH manager. The conclusions yielded were the urgent need for geological study of the entire zone, the production of a complete geotechnical study, the production of morphological study, and the production of structural engineering study.

On February 13, 2015, the IHAH received a letter “Proposal for the Stabilization of the Slope on the Villa Roy Museum,” from the international RODIO-Swissboring firm, in which they proposed the use of injection micropiles to stabilize the terrain. Nothing came of any of the proposals. By August the IHAH’s first level office building (containing the storage room with the sinkhole and condemned by the IHAH manager in 2014) had yet to be demolished. José Escobar (interim chief of Heritage Properties) explained that the IHAH has continued doing mitigation work on the buildings (museum and offices) because there is significant structural damage (walls, slabs and columns). They were then waiting for a final report from Japanese geologists and geophysicists to determine if the museum could be stabilized and restored.

By June 2016, Honduran news sources referred to the complete neglect of the Villa Roy building. In a newspaper interview with El Heraldo, Alejandra Gámez stated that work on Villa Roy has been stymied by the IHAH’s lack of funds since 2013. The stabilization of the terrain,
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which is crucial to save the National Monument, has not been concluded.\textsuperscript{601} Up to now, the IHAH has supposedly invested L.7,512,000.00 (Lempiras: Honduran currency) on the first phase and a fraction of the second phase of the project. The first phase was meant to stabilize the terrain with retaining walls in the bottom part of the property (downhill) and drainage repairs.\textsuperscript{602} In the second phase, the engineers have only installed 14 of the 33 micropiles projected to stabilize the terrain.\textsuperscript{603} As stated before, COPECO and private consultants stated the property could be stabilized and restored, considering all phases of the project working together in the projected design.\textsuperscript{604}

It appears the government is again allowing another historic and heritage property to deteriorate and collapse on its own, like has happened to many other sites in the Historic Center of the M.D.C. (and in Honduras in general). The GCH, which has called out and fined the IHAH for the recent negligent intervention done at the Historic Presidential House (another National Monument),\textsuperscript{605} has not denounced the IHAH for the obvious neglect of the “Villa Roy” property. Meanwhile, to mitigate any more damage, the “Villa Roy” building has had more shoring installed, and now has a yellow tarpaulin partially covering it from rain (see Figure 41).\textsuperscript{606}
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To this day, the Board of Directors has not held the session requested by the IHAH Workers Union, and all of their efforts have fallen on deaf ears.607 There is a 2016 budget estimate to finish the project the IHAH started in 2010, but it has not been approved by the government, and it might be too late if they take too long to approve it.608
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Figure 42: Interior view of the central bay with its imperial staircase (2004).

Figure 43: Examples of art nouveau interior windows and wall decorations (2004).

Figure 44: Art nouveau interior balcony detail (2004).
Conclusion

Previous chapters have addressed the issues the historic preservation field has in the country and locally in the M.D.C. This chapter shows evidence and denounces the aforementioned poor historic preservation planning policies and regulations exhibited by the IHAH and the GCH. This is meant to inform the reader about the concerning state of both institutions and to question the IHAH’s credibility as manager and steward of national heritage and historic properties in Honduras. The IHAH not only has management shortcomings but is unable to identify historic properties. The objective of this chapter is to show evidence of the government’s mismanagement of Honduras’ heritage and historic properties. The ultimate goal is to create awareness for change.
CONCLUSION

This work, in its entirety, lays out the issues and challenges with Honduras’ historic preservation institutions and their management practices. In the IHAH’s case, even with 65 years of existence, there is room for much improvement within its historic preservation planning policies. The same is said for the local [and micromanaged] Central District’s GCH and the activities it performs. Their activities are not directly related to preservation planning, safeguarding, and the protection of historic heritage, but mostly endeavors in granting permits to property owners who do anything they desire to their historic properties.

It is true that Honduras as a developing country has its “priority issues” to resolve, but as current political events, and the historic/cultural awareness trends that have recently emerged show, the government’s weakness is evident in its lack of interest in cultural and historic education and preservation, which is mirrored in the population’s ignorance of their history and heritage. This has resulted in the carelessness and destruction of numerous historic properties. The government’s disinterest is also shown in the lack of incentives for the population to preserve and invest in their heritage and historic properties. When the government does not invest in the heritage properties they steward for the country, why would its citizens try to preserve their own historic properties given all the socio-economic issues they already have. These issues are closely related to the country’s position across a range of educational, economic, political, and capital concerns. Concerns over economic production and corruption are at the forefront of most challenges in the country and historic preservation is not excluded from this. Just like its government, the Honduran population in general have not considered historic preservation a priority and there are very few advocating voices able to effect change.

In spite of the issues Honduras and its citizens face, the challenges and issues of the historic preservation field in the country are solvable. The recommendations laid out as part of the SWOT analyses in this work provide clear, actionable, and measurable improvements that may be implemented at all levels of government. To name a few, setting national standards and enforcing
those standards will result in immediate improvements for the preservation planning process. The recommendations yielded in this thesis can set the base for the direction of Honduran preservation policies.

Perhaps most important for Honduras today, and the M.D.C. in particular, is the population’s growing curiosity for its built heritage and a developing historic preservation movement. This work references numerous hours from interviews and primary data that shows evidence of the population’s growing heritage and historic preservation awareness in addition to the IHAH’s and GCH’s employees’ willingness to improve the historic preservation planning policies. It should be the goal of this work and any subsequent work related to the field of historic preservation in Honduras to capitalize on this energy and channel it toward a specific end of improvement. Honduran citizens are faced with challenges every day and the use cases presented here (such as the Toncontín International Airport) give a direct example of the need for historic preservation. It is unfortunate that although historic preservation awareness is developing, hands-on historic preservation activities are not developing at the same pace needed to save the many national and local endangered heritage and historic properties. Educating the population on their history, from its youth, is always key for the beginning and ongoing protection of heritage and historic properties. As stated in the past, the populations’ knowledge of their history and the protection of the historic built environment and properties, will connect them to their heritage, traditions, values and beliefs. This will serve as foundational steps in strengthening their national identity and sense of moral and civic duty.

Unfortunately, despite its length, there was no time in this work to develop a detailed analysis on the possible preservation incentives that could be implemented in the national or local level by government organizations or future preservation NGOs. These could be tax exemptions, sales tax exemptions for construction materials for rehabilitation projects, free technical advice, and grants or awards for well-done interventions and preservation maintenance, to name a few. With the right policies and regulations already in place, incentives would be the next item to
improve on in order to develop success in the preservation of heritage and historic properties in
Honduras.

This work omitted the research around capital and market opportunities for historic
preservation. And because budgets and the lack of capital are the most important limiting factor
for preservation progress, the next topic for a thesis on historic preservation in Honduras may
analyze the use of tourism as a financial source for historic preservation planning in Honduras. A
thesis topic that analyzes the symbiotic relationship between tourism and historic preservation
could result in a holistic and balanced tourism/historic preservation plan. A plan that could be
applied and developed in Honduras to generate capital for commercial growth and preservation
activities, without creating negative impact for heritage and historic properties. Another future
thesis topic that could be considered is research on how to create or set-up a local, self-sustainable,
hands-on historic preservation NGO that would rehabilitate one building at-a-time; and keep the
historic preservation government institutions and their activities in check.

This work is a first step in outlining and implementing improvements for the historic
preservation field in Honduras. The work left to be done represents an arduous, but valuable task.
It is the position of this report that implementing and improving the issues outlined here will result
in a stronger Honduras, with more self-aware citizens valuing their heritage and thinking of how
to use it to improve themselves and develop their country.
APPENDIX 1
ARQUITECTURA DE HONDURAS

PERIODO PREHISPÁNICO

Los expertos señalan que la mayor parte de las obras arquitectónicas precolombinas aún son desconocidas y permanecen veladas bajo los bosques y las capas superficiales del suelo. El más destacado exponente de la impresionante arquitectura maya es el Parque Arqueológico de Copán, declarado Patrimonio Cultural de la Humanidad.

Las construcciones más notables de este período, son las impresionantes pirámides que construían alrededor de grandes plazas acompañando los palacios gubernamentales, los centros de observación astronómica; y las residencias de los nobles.

La arquitectura de este período se caracterizó por el empleo de piedras calizas para la construcción de edificios de muros muy anchos, con cuartos estrechos, decorados con falsos arcos escalonados y fachadas adornadas con figuras en estuco. Hacia las afueras de la ciudad se iban extendiendo rústicas construcciones con paredes de lodo y techos en hojas de palma, en las que residía el común de la población.

PERIODO COLONIAL

La arquitectura del período colonial refleja la mezcla cultural entre europeos e indígenas; reflejando los cánones propios del renacimiento y el barroco español, con el arte indígena. Este período se caracteriza por un notable interés en lo religioso que se demuestra en obras tan importantes como la Catedral de la Inmaculada Concepción de Comayagua; las Iglesias de La Merced, de Los Dolores, y de San Miguel Arcángel en Tegucigalpa; La Iglesia de San Manuel Colohete en Lempira; o la de Santa Magdalena en Machuca.

Dentro de las construcciones “no religiosas” se destacan varias obras civiles como el Centro Histórico de Trujillo, primera sede del gobierno de la Corona Española; La Casa Real de Comayagua. A este mismo período pertenecen algunas obras militares de gran valor tanto histórico como arquitectónico tales como la Fortaleza de San Fernando de Omoa y el fuerte de Santa Bárbara. En la actualidad, varias poblaciones mantienen buena parte de su arquitectura colonial; como es el caso de Comayagua, Ojéjona, Yucuar, Trujillo y Gracias.

PERIODO REPUBLICANO

Este período se caracteriza por grandes cambios arquitectónicos en los que se percibe la influencia neoclásica e historicista de finales de siglo XIX y comienzos del XX, hasta la revolucionaria arquitectura. De este período datan obras tan destacadas como la Casa Presidencial (1916-1919), el Palacio del Distrito Central (1937) la casa de Villa Roy (1936) El Teatro Manuel Bonilla; el edificio de la Alcaldía de San Pedro Sula; y el Palacio Legislativo (1951).

En la década de los cincuenta, Tegucigalpa marcó el desarrollo arquitectónico nacional, cuando se comenzaron a construirse edificaciones más altas; cuyas principales innovaciones fueron los ascensores, y que los tejados fuesen reemplazados por terrazas. Surgieron así el hotel Prado; el Banco Municipal, el Palacio de Hacienda; el Banco Atlántida del Centro; el Banco Central de Honduras; el Banco de Fomento, el edificio Larach y otros. En la siguiente se perdería definitivamente el temor a las construcciones altas; y surgieron así edificaciones emblemáticas como el edificio Midence Soto o el Hospital Materno Infantil que señalarían la ruta hacia un diseño cada vez más moderno y contrastante con la arquitectura colonial.

ARQUITECTURA CONTEMPORANEA

Desde finales del siglo pasado (XX) la arquitectura Hondureña ha entrado en una línea modernista caracterizada por la importancia que concede el diseño a la funcionalidad; el uso masivo del hierro, el vidrio y los materiales prefabricados. Son principalmente las grandes cadenas hoteleras, los Bancos y los Centros Comerciales quienes han abierto la puerta a este estilo arquitectónico que se caracteriza por conceder una gran importancia a la luz; por incorporar en sus diseños elementos naturales (o que asemejen la naturaleza) tales como jardines, cascadas y fuentes; y por el empleo de colores y contrastes fuertes.

A pesar de esta “modernización” en Honduras se puede apreciar un tipo no monumental de arquitectura llamada Arquitectura Vernácula que se caracteriza por su estilo práctico y campirano que refleja una forma sencilla de vivir y emplea materiales naturales del entorno. Ejemplos de esta arquitectura son las casas construidas con adobe y bahareque (en el interior) o con madera (en la zona costera) por lo general estas casas cuentan con corredores que en el interior del país van desde la fachada hasta un patio central; mientras que en la zona costera constituyen el propio frente de la casa. Lamentablemente la falta de recursos no ha permitido que estas construcciones se mantengan bien conservadas de acuerdo a sus diseños originales; y a ello se ha sometido los estragos causados por fenómenos naturales como el Huracán Mitch.

Cualquier observación o inquietud sobre nuestros productos o servicios será respondida a la mayor brevedad... editoexcelencia@Gmail.com
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A. Plano de Ubicación

B. Datos Generales

B.1 Identificación
- Código de pintura: 08-01-01-014
- Clave de pintura: IP
- Clave de pintura: Municipal
- Nombre Actual: Museo Villa Ray
- Nombre Tradicional: Casa Villa Ray

B.2 Localización
- Departamento: Francisco Morazán
- Municipio: Distrito Central
- Ciudad: Tegucigalpa
- Barrio: Casco
- Dirección: Bo. Buenos Aires, Tegucigalpa, MD

B.3 Georreferencia
- Presentación de GPS: Punto Central 1
- X1: Y1
- Punto Central 2
- Y2

C. Regimen de Propiedad
- Nombre del Propietario: Gobierno de la República
- Registro de Propiedad: Público estatal
- Dominio: Pleno
- Condición de pago: Pleno, no presenta pago

D. Uso de Suelo
- Tradicional
  - Vivienda: Educación
  - Salud: Recreación
  - Comercio: Agropecuaria
  - Cultural: Religiosa
  - Gubernamental: Comunitaria
- Actual
  - Vivienda: Educación
  - Salud: Recreación
  - Comercio: Agropecuaria
  - Cultural: Religiosa
  - Gubernamental: Comunitaria

E. Marco Legal
- Figura de protección: Monumento nacional
- Observaciones: Declarado Monumento Nacional Casco Histórico del Distrito Central y Zonas Afectas, Acuerdo No. 527, Escuela No. 27, S.N., 2000

Inscripciones
### F. Referencia Histórica

#### F. 1 Datos Obra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha de Construcción</th>
<th>Autor o constructor</th>
<th>Arq. Agustín Berridi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entre 1936-1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevención y intervenciones:** Se han cambiado el piso y el techo.

**Nombre Tradicional:** Villa Roy

**Propietarios:** Julio Lozano y su esposa Luisa Villalobos.

**Usos:** Vivienda.

**Hechos y Personajes:** Vicaría del Sr. Julio Lozano Presidente de la República entre 1954-1956.

**Fiestas Religiosas:**

**Datos Históricos del Conjunto:** Museo Nacional 1882 y Museo de Historia Republicana de 1933 a la fecha.

**Fuente:** Guía del museo.

#### F. 2 Datos Documentales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha de Construcción</th>
<th>Autor o constructor</th>
<th>Arq. Agustín Berridi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entre 1936-1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevención y intervenciones:**

**Nombre Tradicional:** Villa Roy

**Propietarios:** Gobierno.

**Usos:** Museo.

**Hechos y Personajes:** Vicaría del Sr. Julio Lozano Presidente de la República entre 1954-1956.

**Fiestas Religiosas:**

**Datos Históricos del Conjunto:** Museo Nacional 1882 y Museo de Historia Republicana de 1933 a la fecha.

**Fuente:** Album Fotográfico de 1936 Proyecto de adecuación de Villa Roy.

### G. Esquema Arquitectónico

#### H. 1 Esquema Arquitectónico

- [Diagrama de planta]

#### H. 2 Planta alzado

- [Diagrama de alzado]

- [Diagrama de estructura]

- [Diagrama de detalles]

- [Diagrama de instalaciones]
### H. Descripción Del Inmueble

| H.1 Tipo de predio | H.2 Número de Niveles | H.4 Parámetros Exteriores  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tipo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piedra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATiempo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### H.5 Parámetros Interiores

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tipo</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladrillo De Barro</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Embaldado</td>
<td>Renovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATiempo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### H.6 Estructura de Techo

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tipo</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casi Cielo</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### H.7 Cubierta

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tipo</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teja De Barro</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Pizarra</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### H.11 Imagen de Detalle

[Image of a building]

### I. Características Formales

#### I.1 Puertas Externas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo puerta</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Estado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Puerta 1</td>
<td>Recta</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acero</td>
<td>Adibad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I.3 Ventanas Externas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo ventana</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Estado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ventana</td>
<td>Recta</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acero</td>
<td>Adibad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I.5 Escaleras

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escaleras</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Concreto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I.6 Acabados Externos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapaderos</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Cal Y Arena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Puertas interiores</td>
<td>L2 Ventanas interiores</td>
<td>L7 Pisos</td>
<td>L8 Corredores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipo puer 1</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Arco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipo puer 2</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Arco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipo puer 3</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Estado</td>
<td>Arco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservación</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intervenciones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tipo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concreto</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albañilería</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cemento</strong></td>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cemento</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construcción</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conservación</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tipo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comisa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tipo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mensula</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Otro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cemento</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cocina</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conservación</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tipo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plastico</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tipo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varios</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cemento</strong></td>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cemento</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bueno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construcción</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conservación</strong></td>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Pinturas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinturas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estado</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservación</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Estaciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baño</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construcción</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Balcones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balcones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construcción</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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J. Descripción de El Inmueble

Descripción Interior

El inmueble de planta cuadrada, con azoteas importantes en el centro, está orientado hacia el norte con respecto a la entrada. Las azoteas presentan placas de tejas de barro, como es característico del estilo colonial, mientras que las ventanas presentan una decoración clásica. En el segundo nivel se ubican comedores con detalles ornamentales típicos del estilo colonial. En los diferentes ambientes se destacan muebles antiguos y detalles arquitectónicos como las ventanas con marcos de madera. El acceso al segundo nivel se realiza a través de una escalera, con detalles de madera y tejas. Las habitaciones contienen muebles antiguos y detalles arquitectónicos como las ventanas con marcos de madera. El acceso al segundo nivel se realiza a través de una escalera, con detalles de madera y tejas.

Descripción Exterior

El inmueble presenta varias perspectivas de interés. La fachada principal se destaca por su simetría y la presencia de ventanas con marcos de madera. La fachada presenta detalles ornamentales y la entrada dispone de una escalera con detalles de madera y tejas. La fachada presenta detalles ornamentales y la entrada dispone de una escalera con detalles de madera y tejas.

K. Medidas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medida</th>
<th>Valor 1</th>
<th>Valor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Área del terreno</td>
<td>436.82 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fase de construcción inventariada</td>
<td>21.80 m</td>
<td>18.80 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altura de techado hasta cubiertas</td>
<td>5.00 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altura de techado exterior</td>
<td>4.35 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altura interior</td>
<td>3.55 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchura del muro</td>
<td>0.54 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. Servicios

- Energía Eléctrica
- Agua potable
- Telefonía
- Alcantarillado sanitario
- Recolección de desechos sólidos
- Cable
- Otras

El inmueble cuenta con servicios de energía eléctrica y agua potable. La telefonía y alcantarillado son útiles para el funcionamiento del inmueble. La recogida de desechos sólidos es importante para mantener la limpieza del inmueble. El inmueble cuenta con cables y otros servicios adicionales.
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M. Información Adicional

| Renombrar | Errores Tipográficos | Ríos, Mares, Tránsito y Otros | Elementos Naturales |

N. Alteraciones Tipológicas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivisión</th>
<th>Paredes</th>
<th>Entonses</th>
<th>Muros</th>
<th>Puertas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliminación de techos</th>
<th>Nuevos elementos</th>
<th>Elevaron</th>
<th>Recepción</th>
<th>Entregaron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modificaciones</th>
<th>Zaguán</th>
<th>Piso principal</th>
<th>Fachadas</th>
<th>Elementos decorativos</th>
<th>Otros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Patología Del Edificio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daño</th>
<th>Humedad</th>
<th>Insectos</th>
<th>Asentamientos</th>
<th>Desarrollos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causa</th>
<th>Deficiencias constructivas</th>
<th>Calidad de los materiales</th>
<th>Otros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observaciones</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Observaciones

El inmueble necesita pintura y cuidado del tejado para evitar la humedad y eliminar la vegetación que se libera en las paredes.

E. Equipo De Levantamiento

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventario</th>
<th>David Aguilar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levante</td>
<td>Luz Barco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. Peligros Potenciales

P.1 Generales

Existen fallecimientos a la vez que pone mucha atención y prisa en la medida de lo posible la reparación inmediata para que no se extienda más el daño del inmueble. Y humedades en unas de las habitaciones del segundo nivel.

P.2 Detalles

La causa de las grietas que presenta el inmueble en su fachada. Se debe a la inestabilidad del suelo. En lo concerniente a la humedades debido a goteras o fallecimientos en el tejado del inmueble.

P.3 Riesgos Extremos

- Causas de este tipo:...
- Mantenimiento de la fachada...
- Movilidad urbana que puede causar...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desviaciones</th>
<th>Excesos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ensayos...
- Ensayos...
- Examen de... |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Otras cosas que pueden ocurrir</th>
<th>Detalles</th>
<th>Accidentes accidentales</th>
<th>Variables internacionales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P.4 Otros riesgos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incendios</th>
<th>Muebles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emplazamiento</th>
<th>Utnas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugas y desvane</th>
<th>Accidentes</th>
<th>Interrupciones</th>
<th>Inyecciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P.5 Desarrollo de los factores que están expuestos el inmueble

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Según</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inyecciones fiables</td>
<td>Inyecciones pruebles</td>
<td>Inyecciones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desacostumbrados</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material de terreno</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humedades</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viértellos</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valor Histórico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmueble de valor testimonial y documental que ilustra el desarrollo político, social, religioso, cultural, económico, y la forma de vida de un periodo determinado contribuyendo a entender mejor el desarrollo histórico de una comunidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inmueble que desde su creación se constituyó en un hito en la memoria histórica o inmueble que en el transcurso histórico se constituyó en un hito, al ser escenario relacionado con personas o eventos importantes, dentro del proceso histórico, social, cultural y económico de la comunidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inmueble que forma parte de un conjunto histórico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inmueble que posee elementos arqueológicos que documentan su evolución y desarrollo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valor Histórico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valor Arquitectónico</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmueble que se constituye en un ejemplo sobresaliente por su singularidad arquitectónica y artística.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inmueble poseedor de características representativas de estilos arquitectónicos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inmueble que conserva elementos arquitectónicos y tradicionales de interés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autenticidad del inmueble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valor Arquitectónico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valor Constructivo-Tecnológico</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmueble donde la aplicación de técnicas constructivas son de especial interés o realizados por mano de obra especializada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bien inmueble que se constituye en un exponente de las técnicas constructivas y uso de materiales característicos de una época o región determinada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integridad de la configuración física y material del inmueble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valor Constructivo-Tecnológico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valor relacionado con su entorno</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmueble que contribuye a definir un entorno de valor por su capacidad de reforzar la estructura o paisaje urbano en el que se inserta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inmueble con importancia por su emplazamiento, ya que contribuye a articular una agrupación de especial valor dentro del conjunto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valor relacionado con su entorno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Valor Antropológico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nro.</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Peso</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total Valor Antropológico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inmueble relacionado con la organización social o forma de vida: usos, representaciones, expresiones, tradiciones, ceremonias, fiestas cominales o depósito de objetos religiosos o laicos, que las comunidades y grupos sociales reconocen como parte de su patrimonio.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inmueble de especial interés para la comunidad por la identificación que tienen con él.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Valoración relevancia nacional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nro.</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>No tiene</th>
<th>Tiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inmueble que tiene relevancia histórica a nivel nacional, específicamente como testimonio único.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inmueble que tiene relevancia arquitectónica, artística y urbana a nivel nacional, específicamente como testimonio único.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inmueble que tiene relevancia antropológica a nivel nacional, específicamente como testimonio único.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Valor relevancia nacional: 0

Valor Total: 30

CATEGORÍA DEL INMUEBLE: "B"

---

Escala de Puntuación:
- CATEGORÍA 'A' (M.N) Monumento Nacional: 52-66
- CATEGORÍA 'A': 40-51
- CATEGORÍA 'B': 28-39
- CATEGORÍA 'C': 17-27
- CATEGORÍA 'D' (VALOR AMBIENTAL): 07-16
- CATEGORÍA 'E' (INCOMPATIBLE O SIN VALOR): 01-06
Because of the lack of clarity and distinction of the current IHAH’s value categories in the latest regulation booklet, the following table depicts the current and the recommended edits for the IHAH’s Heritage Significance Value Categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE VALUE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED EDITS FOR THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE VALUE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Value “A-MN” (National Monument) Heritage Architecture: Buildings and open areas, of any style that because of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance, stand out of the national whole for being buildings that constitute unique testimonies and that deserve the specific designation of National Landmark.</td>
<td>1. Value “MN” (Monumento Nacional in Spanish): Notable historic buildings, assemblages, landscapes, sites, structures and objects that have a minimum of 50 years since their erection; and have significance in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture. That have integrity of architectural style, design, construction materials, workmanship and location (if still located at the original location); that are associated with national historical events; that are associated with the lives of important people that influenced Honduran history; that represent distinct characteristics of a time period and/or method of construction, of a type of property (the different types of activity(ies) a property was originally designed for and the significance the activity(ies) had to local society, etc.); that is representative of the work of a renowned master builder or architect, and/or that have high artistic value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Value “A” High Significance Heritage Architecture: Buildings or open areas of any style, that maintain their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance almost in their entirety. In addition, they are characterized by preserving their authenticity and integrity.</td>
<td>2. Value “A” Local Monument (Local Landmark): Notable historic buildings, (historic) assemblages, landscapes, sites, structures and objects that have a minimum of 50 years since their erection; and have local-level significance in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture. That have maintained a high integrity of: architectural style, design, construction materials, workmanship and location (if still located at the original location); that are associated with local historical events; that are associated with the lives of important people that influenced local history; that represent distinct characteristics of a time period and/or method of construction, of a type of property (the different types of activity(ies) a property was originally designed for and the significance the activity(ies) had to local society, etc.); that is representative of the work of a local master builder or architect, and/or that have high artistic value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Value “B” Medium Significance Heritage Architecture: Buildings or open areas of any style, that maintain the majority of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance.</td>
<td>3. Value “B” Notable Historic Properties: Buildings, landscapes, sites, landscapes, structures and objects that have a minimum of 50 years since their erection and that meet many of the history, architecture, engineering or culture local-level significance criteria. That have maintained a high integrity of: architectural style, design, construction materials, workmanship and location (if still located at the original location); and/or that represent distinct characteristics of a time period and/or method of construction, and/or of a type of property (the different types of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activity(ies) a property was originally designed for and the significance the activity(ies) had to local society, etc.; and/or that is representative of the work of a local master builder or architect, and/or that have high artistic value. The historic properties in this category are not necessarily associated with local historical events or the lives of important people that influenced local history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Value “C” Low Significance Heritage Architecture:</th>
<th>4. Value “C” Historic properties:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings or open areas of any style, that are characterized by maintaining some of their historic, anthropologic, architectural, constructive and technological significance.</td>
<td>Buildings, landscapes, sites, structures and objects that have a minimum of 50 years since their erection, that still maintain their basic structural elements, but because they have had alterations and lost some or most of their historical, architectural, engineering and cultural integrity, they are not considered significant. Some alterations are so old, that they become part of the property’s history. These types of properties can still be considered contributing properties in a historic assemblage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Value “D” Environmental Architecture:</th>
<th>5. Value “D” Historic Assemblage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings that because of their characteristics and construction period, do not represent a heritage architectural significance, but they are identified by their integration to the urban assemblage.</td>
<td>A cluster of historic properties (be they notable and/or not notable) composed of buildings, landscapes, sites, structures and/or objects, that contribute to a thematic connection that could be: historical (date of erection, historic events, etc.), architectural (style, urban plan, design etc.), engineering (construction techniques, etc.) or cultural (designer, original function, etc.); that have continuity of features and could be connected by physical development and/or by esthetic design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings in which their mass and shape are dissonant with the urban and environmental context by not possessing rescuable typological elements, not respecting the traditional morphology and massing of the zone. They break completely with the architectural characteristics of the historic assemblage. Under this category one can find temporary buildings, the integrated and modern construction; the constructions that are discordant with the Historic Centers; the structured open areas and all of the elements that affect the typology of the historic assemblage.</td>
<td>It is recommended that this Value “E” “Incompatible Architecture” category be deleted because it refers to non-significant/historic properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The original quantitative ‘Value (significance) and Categorization Form’ for evaluating/categorizing historic buildings can still be applicable with the [recommended], edited Heritage Significance Value Categories. The only recommendation to the form is the removal of the current “E” heritage value category as an evaluation option.
The treatments and interventions levels on historic properties should be consistent with, and directly related to, National Heritage Significance Value Categories assigned to them, nevertheless the current regulations do not reflect this logic. In reference to the Historic Preservation Treatments, the IHAH’s current regulations have 10 types of treatments for historic properties; one believes many of these treatments can be reclassified under 4 holistic treatments that encompass them, the definitions could then be simplified. The following table depicts the current and the recommended edits for the IHAH’s Types of Historic Preservation Treatments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT TYPES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION TREATMENTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED TYPES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Conservation: All actions destined to secure, maintain and care for the presence of certain buildings that are part of the built heritage of a community.</td>
<td>1) Preservation: All actions destined to stabilize, secure, repair, consolidate, conserve and maintain the existing integrity, massing, materials, and significant features of a historic property avoiding altering its original [historic] fabric with new construction or replacements, except for the sensible upgrades (electrical, plumbing and mechanical) necessary for modern functionality. Alterations in the property that have become historically significant (as part of the property’s history) will be kept and preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Consolidation: Carrying out the necessary work to secure and/or stabilize the building or its elements to be preserved, as long as there have been no alterations on the original structures that might alter their appearance and massing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Restoration: Is the action of carrying out recovery work of a building in its entire structure and formal unit, the reestablishment of altered elements and the removal of degrading additions. This concept is equally applicable to the recovery of building parts and/or elements with heritage value that should be accurately preserved.</td>
<td>2) Restoration: All actions destined to return a historic property (its design, massing, structure, materials, style, character defining features, etc.) to a specific period of time in its history. The process might require removing (eliminating) added-on elements of other time periods, and/or reproducing (reconstructing or replacing) lost or deteriorated elements of the desirable time period that the property wants to be restored to. Restoration treatments should maintain as much historic fabric as possible; sensible upgrades (electrical, plumbing and mechanical) necessary for modern functionality of the property can be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Substitution: Is the action of replacing elements or parts of a building because of their deteriorated state, without this intervention implying any drastic changes to the spatial and/or urban concept of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Elimination: Is the action of removing added-on elements or parts of a building that detract from the original building characteristics because of its location, deterioration or dissonance with its typology. This concept is also applicable to localized, partial or total demolition (razing) of the buildings, when the regulations’ precepts allows and/or demands it. A raze is called a type “A” demolition; a partial demolition is called a type “B” demolition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Liberation: To liberate the building, or parts of it, from add-on elements or interventions that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>depreciate it or hinder its appreciation in an appropriate medium.</strong></td>
<td><strong>3) Rehabilitation:</strong> All actions destined to adapting a historic property for it to continue its original use or for it have a new compatible use (adaptive-reuse). The process will probably involve repairs, alterations, additions and upgrades (electrical, plumbing and mechanical) necessary for modern functionality; while preserving its historically significant character defining features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7) Rehabilitation:</strong> Is the action of carrying out recovery work of a building with heritage value that because of diverse circumstances has stopped functioning in its original use. Being also able to adapt it to the necessities of modern life and at the same time preserving its elements of cultural interest. This is applicable to the recovery, as well as the adaptive reuse of original spaces.</td>
<td><strong>4) Reconstruction:</strong> The action of re-creating or replicating a no longer existing or a dilapidated (in ruins or highly deteriorated) historic property to a specific period of time in its history through new construction, adding all the upgrades necessary for modern use. Reconstruction is usually done for historic properties with any of the highest significance values for educational or interpretative purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8) Reconstruction:</strong> Is the action of reconstructing a building or parts of it. The reconstruction is appropriate only when a building is incomplete because of deterioration or alteration, and as long as there is enough evidence to reproduce it to a previous state. The reconstruction should be easily identifiable in relation to the original elements.</td>
<td><strong>9) Integration:</strong> Is the action of adapting buildings or their discordant elements, that lack heritage value, to the typological characteristics of the area. It might imply the removal, substitution and/or adding-on of elements according to regulation precepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10) New Construction:</strong> Is the action of building in empty lots or properties, it is also applicable to partial construction additions in existing buildings. (the first part is not a treatment of any kind; the last part is reconstruction and adaptive reuse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IHAH’s current Protection-Intervention Levels seem to allow invasive interventions on highly significant buildings; these interventions include razing and partial demolitions of buildings just because they are deemed dissonant with their surroundings. The following table depicts the IHAH’s current 6 types of Protection Intervention Levels allowed, observations about them, and the recommended edits, [the Criteria for the Historic Preservation Treatments and their Application]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT PROTECTION-INTERVENTION LEVELS ALLOWED ON HISTORIC BUILDINGS</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED EDITS: CRITERIA FOR THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION TREATMENTS AND THEIR APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Integral preservation 1: Enforcement boundary: applicable to all the buildings that have to be entirely preserved; and will be preserved through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution and reconstruction treatments to guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of its original characteristics. The buildings placed under this protection-intervention level category, will be allowed to incorporate new specific service facilities of modernization (kitchens and bathrooms) and any other necessary installations for the functional use of the building (air conditioning, electrical upgrades, plumbing, etc.) as long as they will not cause irreversible changes to its typology. This Protection-Intervention level is applicable for historic | This preservation-intervention level is meant for the total preservation of buildings and allows 6 out of the 10 current preservation treatments. This protection-intervention level is contradictory in that it allows very invasive treatments on a building with the purpose “to guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of its original characteristics.” Ironically, the ‘preservation treatment’ is not one of the 6 treatments suggested for this type of intervention level. In addition, the current “C” heritage value category is given this protection-intervention level, which is the same treatment given | 1. Criteria for Preservation: 609
   a. About the use of the property:
      A property will maintain its historic use, or be given a new, compatible use that will require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric: forms, features, materials, detailing, spaces and spatial relationships. The property should be protected and stabilized (if needed) until the appropriate work to be done is determined.
   b. About preservation treatment work:
      i. The historic character of a property should be kept and preserved. The current conditions of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention.
      ii. Distinctive materials, character defining features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property should be preserved.
      iii. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features should be physically and visually compatible, identifiable when inspected, and documented for future research.
      iv. Replacing historic materials that are repairable or in good condition will be avoided; but where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the

---

properties in the “A-MN”, “A”, and “C” heritage value categories.

to National Monuments, without being a significant value category.

new material should match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.

c. About alterations: Alterations that affect the historic character of a property will be avoided; but historic alterations to a property that have become a part of a property’s history, acquire significance and should be kept and preserved.

d. About Chemical or physical treatments: If deemed necessary, they should be applied in the gentlest ways possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used.

e. About archeological resources: They should be protected and preserved in place. If they must be moved, mitigation measures should be undertaken.

- This treatment could be recommended for all value categories properties, but is especially appropriate for the “MN” and “A” categories.

2. Integral Preservation 2: Enforcement boundary: applicable to all the buildings that have to be entirely preserved, although they have suffered some localized alterations, they preserve the majority of their original volumetric and spatial elements unaltered. They will be preserved through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution and reconstruction treatments to recover its typological values and guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of its original characteristics. The demolition of all the modified or dissonant elements that clash with the This preservation-intervention level is also meant for the total preservation of buildings and also allows 6 out of the 10 current preservation treatments; likewise, the ‘preservation treatment’ is not one of them. It is also contradictory by allowing very invasive treatments with the purpose being “to recover its typological values and guarantee its physical integrity, maintaining and respecting all of its original characteristics.” The purpose of this intervention level

2. Criteria for Rehabilitation: 

a. About the use of the property: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new, compatible use that requires minimal change to its historic fabric: forms, features, materials, detailing, spaces and spatial relationships. Regarding historic buildings, the need to alter or add to it to meet continuing or new uses should be acknowledged while retaining the building’s historic character.

b. About rehabilitation treatment work:

i. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property should be avoided.

ii. Distinctive materials, character defining features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property should be preserved.

iii. Deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced. Where a

---

buildings typological characteristics will be allowed. The buildings placed under this protection-intervention level category, will be allowed to incorporate new specific service facilities of modernization (kitchens and bathrooms) and any other necessary installations for the functional use of the building (air conditioning, electrical upgrades, plumbing, etc.) as long as they will not cause irreversible changes to its typology.

- This Protection-Intervention level is applicable for historic properties in the “B” and “C” heritage value categories.

- Restoring a historic building to a specific historical period and removing all the elements from other historic periods resonates more with the new feature’s severity of deterioration requires replacement, the distinctive feature’s severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature should match the old in composition, design, color, texture, and materials (where possible). Replacement of missing features should be verified by documentary and physical evidence.

c. About alterations:
   i. Alterations that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding speculative features or elements from other historic properties, should be avoided; but historic alterations to a property that have become a part of a property’s history, acquire significance and should be kept and preserved.
   
   ii. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic detailing, materials, character defining features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work should be differentiated from the old and should be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
   
   iii. New additions and adjacent or related new construction should be undertaken in a way that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment should be intact.

d. About chemical or physical treatments: If deemed necessary, they should be applied in the gentlest ways possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used.

e. About archeological resources: They should be protected and preserved in place. If they must be moved, mitigation measures should be undertaken.

- This treatment is appropriate for historic properties with “B” and “C” heritage value categories.
### 3. Environmental Preservation 1: Enforcement boundary:
Applicable to all buildings that have had many design campaigns and in which most of their volumetric and spatial elements have been lost. In these types of buildings, all the original existing elements will have to be preserved and restored in their entirety. Preservation work will be allowed through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution, integration, and reconstruction treatments. The demolition of all the modified or dissonant elements that clash with the buildings typological characteristics will be allowed.

- This Protection-Intervention level is applicable for historic properties in the “D” heritage value categories.

It seems that this intervention level refers to “C” value category buildings. This preservation-intervention level allows 7 out of the 10 current preservation treatments and is meant to preserve and restore in its entirety “all the original existing elements,” which would not be much preserving since these are described as buildings with many design campaigns, removing all the non-original, but probably historic, elements. The purpose of this intervention level resonates more with the restoration treatment of a building to a specific historical period, and/or a reconstruction treatment of a non-significant building.

### 3. Criteria for Restoration: 611

#### a. About the use of the property:
A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which allows for the depiction of that property at a particular time in its history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods.

#### b. About restoration treatment work:

- i. Materials and features from the restoration period should be kept and preserved.
- ii. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period should be preserved.
- iii. Deteriorated features from the restoration period should be repaired, instead of replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
- iv. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period should be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon inspection, and documented for future research.
- v. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period should be verified by documentary and physical evidence.

#### c. About alterations:

- i. There should not be any removal or alteration of materials, detailing, features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the restoration period.
- ii. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods should be documented before any alteration or removal.

---

iii. A false sense of history should not be created by adding speculative features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

d. About chemical or physical treatments: If deemed necessary, they should be applied in the gentlest ways possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used.

e. About archeological resources: If they are affected by a project, they should be protected and preserved in place. If they must be moved, mitigation measures should be undertaken.

- This treatment is appropriate for historic properties with “B”, “C” and “D” heritage value categories.

4. Environmental Preservation 2: Enforcement boundary: applicable to all buildings that preserve the façade as an element that is generator of quality in their surroundings. The original elements and general characteristics that grant significance to the building landscape will be preserved. Preservation work of the façades will be allowed through the restoration, consolidation, rehabilitation, liberation, substitution, integration and reconstruction treatments. The demolition of all non-significant elements will be allowed.

- This Protection-Intervention level is applicable for historic properties in the “D” heritage value categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This intervention level refers to façades only and it is only applicable to “D” heritage value category buildings that make up historic assemblages. It allows 7 out of the 10 current preservation treatments and is meant to “preserve the façade as an element that is generator of quality in their surroundings.” It suggests that the real purpose of this preservation-intervention level is to restore or reconstruct a façade to make it more harmonious with the neighboring façades.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Criteria for Reconstruction: 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit an accurate reconstruction with new materials, and minimal speculation, which is essential to the public understanding of the property (education).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. About reconstruction treatment work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Before starting a reconstruction treatment of a landscape, site, assemblage, building, structure, or object on its historic location, an intensive archeological investigation is necessary to identify and evaluate the elements and artifacts that are essential to an accurate reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. If archaeological resources must be moved, mitigation measures should be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Reconstruction should include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Reconstruction should be based on the accurate replication of historic features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

in a historic assemblage. and elements verified by documentary or physical evidence rather than on speculative designs. A reconstructed property should re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in massing, materials, design, color and texture.

v. A reconstruction should be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.

vi. Historic designs that were never executed should not be constructed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Partial Preservation: Enforcement boundary: applicable to all buildings that preserve some of their original elements, but that have already been altered in their massing, structure, open spaces, composition, etc.; and those buildings that lack value in an isolated form, but that integrated with other buildings, constitute a homogeneous assembly (in US terminology, these would be considered ‘contributing buildings’). The original elements identified in the inventory forms and the general characteristics that grant significance to the historic assemblage: the massing, the rhythm, spatial typology, etc., must be preserved. The partial or total demolition of dissonant elements that clash with the environmental characteristics of the historic assemblage will be allowed. The new building to be incorporated must abide to the planned parameters for each case in the regulation booklet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It seems that this intervention level refers to “C” value category buildings. This preservation-intervention level does not mention any preservation treatments, but it seems to have the same idea as Environmental Preservation 2, it practically states that the real purpose is to make a building more harmonious with the neighboring buildings in a historic assemblage. Partial and total demolition is allowed to maintain said harmony, and a new building must follow the regulations of their specific city center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• According to the regulations, this Protection-Intervention level is not suggested for any historic properties.

6. **Exterior Integration**: Enforcement boundary: applicable to buildings that are new, modern or dissonant within the historic assemblage. Work on facades must be carried out according to the predominant characteristics of the assemblage that ensure their integration to the environment.

• This Protection-Intervention level is applicable for historic properties in the “E” heritage value categories.

| This preservation-intervention level is not applicable to historic buildings. It is a design guideline saying that new building facades must integrate with the historic landscape and assemblages according to the predominant characteristics of neighboring historic buildings. |  |
APPENDIX 6

The Zoning Regulation has established five zones:613

1. Residential Zone (Z-R): Areas defined and regulated for low intensity residential use and similar.
2. Commercial Zone (Z-C): Areas defined and regulated for commercial activities and similar.
3. Mixed [use] Zone (Z-M): Areas defined and regulated for mixed use activities; residential of medium intensity, multifamily, and no nuisance commercial activities, and similar.
4. Flood Zone (Z-I): Any of the previous zoning areas (Z-R, Z-C and Z-M), that are defined and regulated by their periodic flooding locations.
5. Special Zone (Z-E): Areas under special régime (ABRE), the zones known as the Liquidambar Walkway (Paseo Liquidambar) and the zone of the Comayagüela markets.

613 Alcaldia Municipal del Distrito Central, Reglamento de Zonificación del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central, (Tegucigalpa: Alcaldia Municipal del Distrito Central, 2011), 4-5.
Normativa del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central

Lineamientos Generales para la intervención de edificaciones dentro del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central

ALCALDÍA MUNICIPAL DEL DISTRITO CENTRAL - HONDURAS, C.A.
Intervención / Disposiciones Urbanísticas

Alturas de edificios

El límite de la altura de las edificaciones será el equivalente a la altura promedio de las edificaciones existentes.

En caso que el predio colinde con un inmueble inventariado, la nueva edificación deberá respetar la altura de este.

Alineamientos

La línea de edificación de la nueva construcción respetará el alineamiento de calle existente que prevalezca (alineamiento antiguo)
En casos que la parcela tenga retiro y este colinde con un inmueble inventariado, la nueva construcción se regirá con el alineamiento del bien inmueble inventariado.

Se prohíbe la construcción de voladizos.

Cubiertas y Aleros

En caso de cubiertas aparentes, será con pendientes entre 30% y 35% y estas deberán de ser de teja de barro. En casos aprobados por la GCH, las cubiertas podrán ser de materiales que simulan la teja de barro.

Para edificaciones con aleros, estos tendrán que ser de canecillos de madera colocados horizontalmente y entablonados.
Las ventanas y puertas podrán ser de madera o metal y vidrio fijo, de tableros de madera.

El color de los marcos de las puertas y ventanas que sean de aluminio deben ser de una tonalidad oscura.

La altura promedio de los vanos de edificaciones debe ser de dos veces el ancho del vano.
Colores en Fachada

Los colores a utilizar para pintar las fachadas de los inmuebles deberán ser aquellos aprobados en la cartilla de colores para el Centro Histórico. (Solicitar la cartilla en las oficinas de la Gerencia del Centro Histórico.)

Las paredes de adobe deberán ser pintadas con pintura de agua o pinturas con base de cal. En caso de construcciones nuevas de bloque o ladrillo se autoriza el uso de pintura de aceite mate.

No se permite el fraccionamiento de la fachada de un inmueble aunque este pertenezca a varios propietarios, el inmueble deberá estar pintado uniformemente.

Rótulos

Para la instalación y colocación de cualquier tipo de rótulo comercial, se requerirá la correspondiente autorización dentro del Centro Histórico y el permiso municipal.

Se permiten rótulos adosados cuyas dimensiones máximas no podrán exceder 1.00m de largo por 0.50m de alto. En caso de ser letras individuales la Gerencia del Centro Histórico determinará la dimensión máxima de estos según la proporción con la fachada, tomando en cuenta que la altura de las letras nunca excederá los 0.60m.
Se permiten rótulos tipo bandera NO luminosos cuyas dimensiones máximas serán de 0.75m de largo por 0.50m de alto. La altura de instalación de los rótulos no deberá ser menor a los 2.40m.

No se permite:

- Pintar directamente sobre las paredes de los edificios, el rótulo o anuncios publicitarios.
- La instalación de rótulos luminosos, únicamente se autoriza iluminación indirecta.
- La colocación de anuncios publicitarios, solo rótulos con el nombre comercial del negocio.

Materiales

Los rótulos adosados y tipo bandera podrán ser de madera, metal, resinas nunca de material textil.

Los rótulos de letras individuales podrán ser de madera, metal, acrílico o pvc.
Mapa del Centro Histórico de Tegucigalpa / Comayagüela
Para más información visite la
Oficina de la Gerencia del
Centro Histórico en el Barrio La Plazuela.
Avenida Miguel Paz Barahona,
entre Calle Finlay y Calzada San Miguel
50 mts. antes del Arbolito.
Teléfono: (504) 2238-0723
centrohistorico.amdc@gmail.com
¿QUÉ ES EL PATRIMONIO CULTURAL?

El patrimonio cultural es la herencia de bienes materiales e inmateriales que nuestros antepasados nos han dejado a lo largo de la historia. El legado de la cultura que caracteriza a la sociedad donde venimos y nos desarrollamos, que nos permite identificarnos entre nosotros y sentir que somos parte de la comunidad, es aquella herencia que conocemos como Patrimonio Cultural.

El patrimonio cultural está constituido por todos los bienes que, por su valor histórico, arqueológico, artístico, arquitectónico, paleontológico, etnológico, documental, bibliográfico, científico o técnico, tienen una importancia relevante para la identidad y permanencia de la nación a través del tiempo. Es por eso que dichos bienes requieren de una protección y defensa especial, de manera que puedan ser disfrutados, valorados y aprovechados adecuadamente por todos los ciudadanos y transmitidos de la mejor manera posible a nuestras futuras generaciones.

PATRIMONIO MATERIAL
- Inmueble: Se refiere a los bienes culturales que no pueden trasladarse (edificios, sitios arqueológicos, etc.)
- Mobiliario: Se refiere a los bienes culturales que pueden trasladarse de un lugar a otro (muebles, mobiliario, esculturas, etc.)
- Immaterial: Se refiere a lo que llamamos cultura viva, como lo es el folclore, la medicina tradicional, las leyendas, arte culinario, costumbres, etc.

El Centro Histórico del Distrito Central fue declarado Patrimonio de la Nación por medio del acuerdo N° 557, emitido por la presidencia de la República el 29 de diciembre de 1993. Este constituye un sector específico del Distrito Central, comprendido por parte de las ciudades iguales de Tegucigalpa y Comayagüela.

El Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia realizó un inventario de inmuebles dentro del Centro Histórico del Distrito Central, que son considerados Patrimonio de la Nación, esto dales sus características históricas, arqueológicas y arquitectónicas.
¿POR QUÉ CONSERVAR EL PATRIMONIO?

El patrimonio requiere de un cuidado y de técnicas de conservación que nos ayuden a mantener en buen estado aquellos bienes que hemos heredado de nuestros antepasados. Sin embargo, son muchas las personas que todavía se muestran indiferentes sobre el tema, cuando contribuyen a agravar los daños.
Como ciudadanos tenemos la obligación de transmitir el Patrimonio a las generaciones futuras, porque es una fuente de información que nos habla de dónde venimos y porque nos permite establecer vínculos estrechos entre nosotros y con nuestro territorio.

La protección del patrimonio es una tarea que compete no solo al personal de las instituciones, sino también a cada ciudadano. Lo más importante es lograr un cambio de actitud en la comunidad y darnos cuenta de la importancia de nuestro legado.
¡Informate!
Para más información visitá la Oficina de la Gerencia del Centro Histórico en el Barrio La Plazuela, Avenida Miguel Paz Barahona, entre Calle Finlay y Calzada San Miguel. 50 mts. antes del Arbolito.
Teléfono: (504) 2238-0723
centrohistorico.amdc@gmail.com
APPENDIX 10

Elements that affect the Historic Center and are not directly governed by the GCH

Historic Preservation Planning, that should be governed by the GCH, is a field with many variables affecting it, that are governed by other fields and other offices of local government (Transit, Tourism, Urban Planning, Commerce, Local Security, etc.) they all come into play in the Historic Center. Communication, joint planning and alliances will need to happen successfully by the entire AMDC and other government institutions, to revitalize and improve the Historic Center. Some of these variables are the axes that resulted from studies, workshops and seminars done by the GCH; they greatly affect the Historic Center and are related to each other, but are not governed by the GCH directly:

(i) Habitability

The Historic Center has gradually lost residents and residential buildings since the last half of the 20th century; several owners who could afford to, moved to newer neighborhoods and left their centric residences, some of them considered large historic estates, to be partitioned for renting to local businesses. Many of these buildings turned commercial without zoning regulations to govern them in the past, some of them are two-to-multiple-story buildings only utilizing the ground floor for commerce and completely neglecting the top floors. The mostly commercial and, in a minor scale, government/institutional activities are now ruling the Historic Center. With less residential use came less street security, because the area gets deserted after work hours. A theory that bringing back residents to the Historic Center will also bring revitalization to the area and security back, resulted in some of the following conclusions/future action item suggestions to be done in the Historic Center:

- Strengthen the existing residential land use and ease its extension to other buildings in a Master Plan.
- Achieve mechanisms that guarantee the establishment of the residential sector, like housing cooperatives, and to create local government active participation mechanisms in them.
- Create a “fast-track” system for residential permits.
- To rehabilitate abandoned buildings for residential use (this has started with the pilot project of La Ronda Condominiums).
- Promote mixed use in multiple-story properties.
- Motivate the market by calling on real estate sector sales.
- The designation of planned and defined Integral Revitalization Areas to be tackled one by one.
- Involve universities to generate residential pilot projects.

---

614 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.
615 Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Históricos, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).
- Rehabilitate public spaces for public recreation (parks/plazas that are not safe or clean to be in, e.g. La Concordia Park which has a project proposal underway).  
- Create and broadcast manuals for quality interventions.
- Offer free Wi-Fi in the Historic Center (in specific public areas or the entire area).

(ii) Mobility

The Historic Center has become a place of transition because it has gradually lost residential activity and increased its commercial/institutional activities, and because of the insecurity lived in the area (and in the entire country); most people only go into the Historic Center for work, education, shopping and for transitional route for final destinations. Traffic chaos is stemmed on the fact that all mayor traffic routes go through the Historic Center, making it a transitional area to other city locations; and studies have shown all the public bus routes go through the Historic Center (these are big yellow buses imported from the US).

Most people use taxis (taxi vehicles make up 60% of traffic) and privately owned vehicles because of security concerns. Most taxi stops are located in the busiest pedestrian and vehicular traffic areas, this adds to the congested traffic conditions, in addition to all the people that drive their own vehicles (especially in peak hours). All the aforementioned in addition to the urban setting of the Historic Center, its narrow sidewalks with randomly placed power/communication poles and narrow streets, create a lot of traffic and urban chaos. Some of the following are conclusions/future action item suggestions to be done in the Historic Center for improved mobility:

- To create and implement a plan of alternate circuits for private transportation. A route around the river (taking advantage of Flood Zones).

---

616 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, July 28, 2016.
618 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.
620 Cinthia Caballero (Planning Coordinator, Historic Center Management, GCH), in interview with the author, March 26, 2014.
621 Ibid.
622 Ibid.
623 Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Historicos, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).
• In a public-private scheme, create municipal funds to create collective peripheral parking lots, and create sanctioning mechanisms to avoid parking lots in heavy traffic, dense areas (take advantage of Flood Zones to create parking lots).\textsuperscript{625}

• Define loading and unloading zones for commercial use\textsuperscript{626} and/or schedule specific weekly time for this activity in these defined locations with alternate routes for other drivers.

• Elaborate a diagnostic on the current public transit situation to formulate a long-range, high quality mobility plan in which the transit institutions and other key players can create alliances. Consider the relocation of taxi stops and elaborate new route plans.

• Designate some avenues of the Historic Center as pedestrian and bike lanes in the weekends.

• Balance pedestrian and automobile use, and traffic. Maybe create mixed use (pedestrian/vehicular) circulation in a non-hierarchical way.

• The installment of pedestrian traffic lights and traffic signage is necessary. Also invest in driver and road safety education.

• Incorporate complete, city-level traffic planning.

(iii) Security

National and local security is a big priority for Central and Local governments. Some of the following conclusions/future action item suggestions, to be done in the Historic Center for improved security are:\textsuperscript{627}

• The creation or strengthening of a security plan for the Historic Center to generate a better capacity of response, through the training of security forces, an introduction of new protection technologies and surveillance of the Historic Center with security cameras, etc.

• To convene a multi-sectorial security commission that establishes a social pact or compromise of citizen cohabitation, and that also strengthens neighbor integration to increment security.

• Create security posts in the Historic Center entrances, where it would have a more dynamic reception of reports.

Increase street lighting and other public spaces in the Historic Center.

\textsuperscript{625} Javier Ramos Guallart, Informe sobre el Centro Histórico de Tegucigalpa (Honduras) y las Necesidades que puede Cubrir la Cooperación Española. Government Consultant Report (Madrid: Alcaldia Municipal del Distrito Central, July 2011).

\textsuperscript{626} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{627} Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), \textit{Conclusiones del Taller de Revitalización de Centros Históricos}, Workshop Conclusions (Tegucigalpa: Gerencia del Centro Histórico (GCH), 2011).
Echando a perder parte de nuestra identidad
Una afrenta para la justicia y defensores del patrimonio histórico

Es vergonzoso tener que recurrir a la justicia internacional porque la nuestra no actúa contra los destructores de nuestro patrimonio aún y cuando existen méritos suficientes para evitar dicha acción.

Reportaje gráfico
MARIO URRUTIA

Resulta penoso en un país que ninguno de sus ciudadanos se preocupe por conservar y resguardar el patrimonio cultural del mismo. No habiendo conciencia del costo histórico de los mismos, ninguno de nosotros se ha dado cuenta que ni con todo el dinero del mundo podríamos volver a generar los momentos y recuerdos vividos en cada uno de ellos. Eso es, casualmente, lo que sucede casi a diario en Honduras.

En un último esfuerzo por salvar la antigua casa Midence, el Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia, a través del departamento de restauración, han solicitado ayuda internacional a la Fundación "World Monuments Watch", con el propósito de que la casa Midence sea incluida en la lista de los cien sitios con mayor peligro de desaparición en el programa "Vigía de los Monumentos del Mundo".

"El Instituto se ha visto en la obligación de recurrir a este organismo interna..."
HABLEMOS CLARO

ACTUALIDAD. Hace algunos años se hubiera achado de conformidad con la ley, esta fotogra-
ña no sería parte de la historia, ya que este fue uno de los intentos de la casa que se derrumba.

RECURSO. De ser aceptada la solicitud enviada por World Monument Watch, se salvaría uno de los edificios de gran valor histórico, cultural y arquitectónico del país.

MONUMENTO IMPORTANTE. Después de ser una de las principales casas de Tegucigalpa, esta antígona vivienda palaciega vive la mayor de sus desgracias. A pesar de los incansables de aplicar la ley no quieren evitar su desaparición, sin importarles el valor histórico y la elegancia de su arquitectura.

La escalera en brama de caracol elaborada de hierro forjado se constituye en uno de los más bellos valores interiores del inmueble, no siendo extrañado que su recuperación en condiciones privadas, sea el abandono del local.

HISTORIA

La casa «Midence» fue construida a fines del siglo XIX y está ubicada en el centro histórico de Tegucigalpa. El mencionado edificio constituye un sím- bolo del apogeo económico y cultural que vivió la ciudad tras su estreno como nueva capital del Estado en los años 1800's, y se constituye como uno de los ejemplos de las primeras viviendas palaciegas de la ciudad.

Posteriormente, fue sede de diversas funciones públicas y privadas, como ser la embajada de los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica, la Escuela de Ballet, el Instituto Tegucigalpa, Radio América, el Instituto Luis Andrés Zúñiga entre otros, arquitectónicamente es un exponente de la arquitectura republicana, de influencia neoclásica y poseedora de finas silleras y bellos encielados en relieve metalí- cos importados.

VALOR CULTURAL. Personas que tratan de ignorar la historia y la cultura del país son los que promueven la demolición de uno de los edificios de finales del siglo XIX.

La propiedad, que pertenece a la municipalidad, debe tener mucho cuidado porque la familia Midence Lainez está pidiendo tres millones y medio, sin embargo, en el fin de esta lucha ante impuestos, la casa fue reportada con un valor catastral de dos millones y medio de lempri- piada e indemnizar a los dueños, pero, no por la vía judicial ya que nos llevaríamos mu- chos años peleando el caso y mientras tanto el edificio desaparecería por completo, por tanto la municipalidad en vez de luchar por su demoli- ción debe aplicar el procedimiento administrativo de expropiación en forma expedi- ta, como lo manda la ley; puntuativo y funcionalmente.

Comité Pro-salvación de la casa Midence

★ Fundación Museo del Hombre
★ Colegio de Arquitectos
★ Colegio de Ingenieros
★ Fundación Cultura
★ Escuela Nacional de Bellos Artes
★ Instituto de Conservación de Monumentos a Nivel Mundial (ICOMOS).

Propietarios y 
autoridades violan con frecuencia la Ley de Protección del Patrimonio Cultural de la Nación.
INFORME SOBRE LA CASA UBICADA FRENTE AL PARQUE VALLE

CATALOGACIÓN COMO BIEN CULTURAL

La casa ubicada frente al Parque Valle con Clave Catastral No. 01-74-04 propiedad de la Familia Midence Lainez está considerada como Monumento Cultural de la Nación por diversos organismos nacionales:

- El Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia (Inventario 1989, Ficha No. 14).

- La Alcaldía Municipal del Distrito Central en su Inventario de Bienes Culturales de 1993, Código No. 13.

### INSTITUTO HONDUREÑO DE ANTROPOLOGÍA E HISTORIA

## INVENTARIO DE BIENES INMUEBLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTAMENTO DE RESTAURACIÓN</th>
<th>DEPARTAMENTO DE PROTECCIÓN Y DEFENSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCALIZACIÓN: DEPARTAMENTO</th>
<th>Fco. MOSAZAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPIO</td>
<td>ALDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenida</td>
<td>BARRIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CENTRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLE entre 4ta y 5ta calle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CARACTERÍSTICAS ESenciales
- Edificio de dos plantas, neoclásico.
- Patio interior y alquiler.
- Mz. 12, Pz. 12, Col. 12, Cx. 12.
- Patio de crujías.
- Hidratación.

### FECHA DE CONSTRUCCIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>XVII</th>
<th>XVIII</th>
<th>XIX</th>
<th>XX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ESTADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNO</th>
<th>INTERNO</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTRUCTURA</td>
<td>TECHO</td>
<td>ARQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.I.N.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VALOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIST.</th>
<th>AMB.</th>
<th>TÉCNICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CONSTRUCTOR

### PROPIETARIO ORIGINAL

### USO ACTUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USO ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varios; restaurantes, tiendas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODIGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTILO ARQUITECTÓNICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETALLES SOBRESALIENTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPIETARIA**

**EDIFICIO CON GRAN VALOR PARA SER REVITALIZADO RESTAURANDO TODA SU ESTRUCTURA.**

**CLASIFICACIÓN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIPO</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CONSERVAR TODO EL EDIFICIO.**

**INVENTARIO, DELIMITACIÓN Y PROPIETARIA DE CONSERVACIÓN DEL CENTRO HISTÓRICO DEL DISTRITO CENTRAL**

**HOJA 40**
## ESTUDIOS EFECTUADOS NUEVO AEROPUERTO TEGUCIGALPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AÑO</th>
<th>ORGANISMO/INSTITUCION</th>
<th>OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Mc Creary Koretsky Constructora de USA</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y selecciona LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>FAA Aeronáutica de USA</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín e indica necesidad de Nuevo Aeropuerto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Gobierno de México</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y selecciona Cerro de Hule y segundo lugar LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Gobierno de España</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y selecciona LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Estudio Centroamericano de Transportes ECAT del BCIE</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y recomienda selección nuevo sitio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>OACI (Naciones Unidas)</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y selecciona LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Gobierno del Japón</td>
<td>Descarta Toncontín y selecciona VALLE DE TALANGA y en segundo lugar LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Colegio Ingenieros Civiles de Honduras</td>
<td>Recomienda descontinuar operaciones Aéreas en TONCONTIN y se finalicen Estudios LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>CONSUPLANE</td>
<td>Concluye que la ubicación del Aeropuerto desde el punto Urbano – Regional es la LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recomienda seriamente un Nuevo Aeropuerto en Sitio LAGUNA EL PEDREGAL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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