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Urban planning and heritage management have often been positioned as opposing powers in the management of historic urban landscapes. To reconcile them, the trend is to recommend a holistic, integrated and multidisciplinary management of resources, by means of a new approach in heritage management: the landscape approach. In this context, landscape is defined as an inclusive and comprehensive platform that cannot be understood or managed except through an approach that embraces all its components. The landscape approach is not about allowing (or disallowing) transformation in itself, but about establishing and guiding the nature of the transformation. It addresses the future quality of the urban landscape and the relationships forming it. It positions heritage as an active change agent in the process of urban management. However, implementation in urban management proves to be a great challenge.

The lack of systematic methods for comparative policy research in the field of cultural heritage hinders an understanding of policy transfer on a scale that goes beyond the case study, which then interferes with the feedback loop back into the supranational policies. The main aim of this thesis is to raise understanding of the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance, and in particular to explore ways to best reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy. A method of cross-referencing heritage taxonomy is developed and tested. It has successfully been tested with governance stakeholders in Amsterdam. While further research is needed to refine and optimize the taxonomy and its application, it already promises to have applications beyond its initial aims.
HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES
Framing the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof.dr.ir. F.P.T. Baaijens voor een commissie aangewezen door het College voor Promoties in het openbaar te verdedigen op maandag 28 september 2015 om 16.00 uur

door

Loes Veldpaus

geboren te Weert
To family

Dit proefschrift is goedgekeurd door de promotoren en de samenstelling van de promotiecommissie is als volgt

voorzitter: prof. ir. E.S.M. Nelissen
1e promotor: prof. dr. B.J.F. Colenbrander
copromotor(en): dr. A.R. Gomes Mendes M. Pereira Roders
leden: prof. ir. F. Bandarin (University IUAV of Venice)
       prof. dr. ir. J. Janssen (WUR)
       dr. R.F. Mason (University of Pennsylvania)
       prof. dr. R.D. Pickard (Northumbria University)
       prof. dr. ir. P.J.V. Van Wesemael
       dr. R. Van Oers (Tongji University) †
To family
List of acronyms

BMA  Bureau of Monuments and Archaeology
Burra Charter  Charter for Places of Cultural Significance
BWE  Bureau Wereld Erfgoed / Bureau of World Heritage
CoE  Council of Europe
DRO  Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening / Planning Department
EH  English Heritage / Historic England
Faro Convention  The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society
HUL  Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation
HUL approach  Historic urban landscape approach
ICOMOS  The International Council on Monuments and Sites
IHC  Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
IUCN  The International Union for Conservation of Nature
Large-N  Large number
OWHC  Organisation of World Heritage Cities
RCE  Rijksdienst Cultureel Erfgoed / Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands
UNEP  The United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO  The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNESCO WHC  UNESCO World Heritage Centre
UNHABITAT  The United Nations Human Settlements Programme
Valletta Principles  The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas
Venice Charter  International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites
Washington Charter  Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas
WHC  Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
List of figures

Figure 01a–b: The successive interventions in Edinburgh’s Old Town. 41
Figure 02: Amsterdam Herengracht in winter. 44
Figure 03: Percentage of object versus urban-related terms in international cultural heritage policy documents. 46
Figure 04: Percentage of trend-related terms in international cultural heritage policy documents. 46
Figure 05: Comparative analysis of theoretical frameworks to analyse supranational heritage policy. 61
Figure 06: Selected set of supra national policy guidelines analysed for taxonomy. 61
Figure 07: Analysis of selected charters and conventions since the 1964 Venice Charter. 65
Figure 08: Taxonomy of attributes (WHAT) tangible above and intangible below. 73
Figure 09: Taxonomy stakeholders (WHO). 74
Figure 10: Taxonomy values (WHY) adapted from (Tarrafa and Pereira Roders, 2012). 74
Figure 11: Process steps (HOW). 75
Figure 12: The Policy Analysis Tool, which cross-references the process steps of the how, with the taxonomy of what, why, and who. 84
Figure 13: Range of answers. 84
Figure 14: Sampling grid participants Workshop; (x) = number of participants per group, workshop 1 & 2. 84
Figure 15: Results per category taken over all steps as a percentage of the total number of answers given in that matrix. 84
Figure 16: Results per category per step for the WHAT TANGIBLE matrix. 89
Figure 17: Results per category per step for the WHAT INTANGIBLE matrix. 89
Figure 18: Results per category per step for the WHY matrix. 92
Figure 19: Results per category per step for the WHO matrix. 93
Figure 20: Results per stakeholder group, taken over all steps of the WHO matrix. 93
Figure 21: ‘Quickscan’, results per person (n=10) per definition, per step (1–5) for the WHAT TANGIBLE matrix. 96
Figure 22: Cross-relating taxonomy matrix. 109
Figure 23: Revealing and relating attributes and values. 108
Figure 24: Results of the example part of an attribute and value analysis done on the Durham
Castle and Cathedral description (Figure 25).

Figure 25: Example part of an attribute and value analysis done on the Durham Castle and
Cathedral description (UNESCO WHC, 2015c).

Figure 26: Taxonomy development scheme

Figure 27: Horizontal and vertical tracing of taxonomy. In black the possible relations; in blue
the research in Amsterdam as presented in Chapter 3; in green the testing of taxonomy among
academic disciplines.

Figure 28: Summary matrix, comparing definitions as used in the policy analysis tool to the
definitions given by academic heritage experts (N=12).

Figure 29: Process steps in HUL Action Plan (UNESCO, 2015) versus the process steps found in
supranational policies between 1964 and 2011.

Figure 30: SWOT analysis historic urban landscape recommendation (UNESCO, 2011)

Figure 31 a–b: Results per step taken over all matrices as % of the total amount of answers
given in relation to that step – specified for City and District participants, and as indicated by
the sampling grid.

Figure 32 a–b: Results in Figure 31 a and b further detailed, for YA and YH answers.

Figure 33 a–b: Results per step taken over all matrices as % of the total amount of answers
given in relation to that step – specified for participants from Urban Departments and Heritage
Departments as indicated by the sampling grid.

Figure 34 a–b: Results in Figure 33 a and b further detailed, for YA and YH answers.
Contents

List of acronyms ........................................... 6
List of Figures ............................................... 7
PREFACE .................................................... 13
PROLOGUE .................................................. 17
INTEGRATING URBAN AND HERITAGE PLANNING ........ 19
Heritage management in an urban age – an outline ......... 19
   An urban age for heritage management .................. 20
   The landscape approach .................................. 21
   The historic urban landscape approach ................. 22
   Heritage policy – multilevel governance ................ 24
Research aims ............................................. 25
   Problem statement ....................................... 26
   Research questions ...................................... 27
   Research setting ........................................ 28
Research approach and roadmap ......................... 29
Scientific and societal relevance ......................... 30
CHAPTER 1 ................................................ 35
URBAN HERITAGE: PUTTING THE PAST INTO THE FUTURE .... 37
Towards a landscape approach ............................. 37
A short history of urban heritage theory .................... 38
   John Ruskin (1819–1900) ................................ 38
   Camillo Sitte (1843–1903) ................................. 39
   Patrick Geddes (1854–1932) ............................. 39
   Gustavo Giovannoni (1873–1947) ....................... 42
Integrating heritage, planning and development .............. 43
Changing terms, changing concepts ......................... 45
   Object versus urban ...................................... 47
   Trends .................................................... 48
A landscape approach ...................................... 48
The historic urban landscape approach ...................... 50
Putting the past into the future ............................ 51
CHAPTER 2 ................................................ 53
ANALYSING POLICY, BUILDING TAXONOMY .............. 55
Changing principles on and approaches to heritage .......... 55
Taxonomy .................................................. 56
Methodological approach .................................. 58
A comparative analysis from Venice to Valletta .............. 62
   What is heritage and why is it important? .......... 62
   How is the heritage management process organized? 66
   Who is, or should be, involved in heritage management? 68
Conclusion and discussion ................................ 70
CHAPTER 3

A TAXONOMY-BASED POLICY ANALYSIS TOOL

Introduction
Multilevel governance
The policy analysis tool
  Workshops: a method for analysing policy
  Series of three workshops: setup
The process in Amsterdam
  HOW: trends on the process steps
Taxonomy categories in Amsterdam
  WHAT: Tangible attributes
  WHAT: Intangible attributes
  WHY: Values
  WHO: Actors
  Quick scan
Conclusion
  Workshops
  Taxonomy
  Amsterdam
  A taxonomy-based framework as a method
Discussion

CHAPTER 4

TAXONOMY: EXPLORING AND IMPROVING

Introduction
Taxonomy related
Taxonomy applied
Taxonomy developed
Taxonomy improved
  Method
    Academic definitions
Taxonomy discussed

CHAPTER 5

WHAT'S NEW IN HERITAGE PLANNING?

The landscape approach: a future for heritage planning?
  Landscape: the new discourse in heritage management
Contributions of the landscape approach
  Attributes and values
  Process and actors
The historic urban landscape approach: a critical review
  A historic urban landscape of integration
  A historic urban landscape of attributes and values
  A historic urban landscape management process
  A historic urban landscape of and its actors
Is the future in the landscape?
# EPILOGUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflections and Recommendations</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on the research</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research statement</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research relevance</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Limitations</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the research questions</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research recommendations: a future agenda</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# REFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendixes</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nederlandsen samenvatting</th>
<th>193</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae Loes Veldpaus</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

It is done! This is it, my PhD thesis. It contains the result of my research undertaken at the chair of Architectural History and Theory, at the Department of the Built Environment, Eindhoven University of Technology. In it, I explore the concept of 'historic urban landscapes', in theory and policy. The research was realised within the framework of the Programme: OUV, WH CITIES & SUSTAINABILITY led by dr. Ana Pereira Roders and dr. Ron van Oers.

Any city – or urban settlement– to me is a historic urban landscape. It is a document of history, created and recreated by many. It is also living lab, to experiment and explore in. Cities never cease to amaze, intrigue, excite, and stimulate me to understand their genesis, their creators, and their workings. Cities make me want to explore new territories.

My love for the urban and its history, led me to explore many historic urban landscapes. My fascination for this concept emerged during my graduation project on post war heritage (2006 - 2007). I slowly became aware of the growing body of theories and ideas being developed around it. During this project I also learned how enthusiastic I am about doing research, how I can push the boundaries of my own mind, and travel into new fields without moving my feet. I guess it was somewhere around that time, that a wish to continue with research and doing a PhD emerged. In 2011 that wish became reality, and now, four years later, this step in my academic journey is complete.

In my research I trace the evolution of heritage as a concept, and how it developed in international policy over the past 50 years. This allowed me to travel into the realms of various other disciplines, such as cultural policy research, impact assessment, urban geography, landscape studies, sustainability studies to name a few. I also got to explore many new territories in reality, by travelling to new cities for all the fieldwork trips, conferences, workshops, and meetings I had the privilege to attend. Traveling to a new city to meet old and new friends, to present and discuss ideas, is still one of my favourite aspects of being an academic. I had the best of times with a glass of wine at a kitchen table, or beer at a pub, somewhere in Hildesheim, Calgary, Porto, Helsinki, Philadelphia, Durham, Oslo, Edinburgh, Montreal, Bonn, and many other cities, enjoying the perks of the academic life.

Although I like wandering the streets of a new city alone, sharing the experience is as valuable as it is fun. I would like to thank everyone who has joined me on this trip in some small or grand way. I would like to highlight a few, as they deserve a mention for all their dedication, support, or their sheer presence.
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Prologue
Integrating urban and heritage planning

The following two papers formed the basis for this introduction:

This thesis is based on a collection of previously published and presented papers and articles. As such, each chapter has its own section dedicated to an introduction and the methodology. This chapter introduces the context of the research, by presenting the main topics, the problem statement, the significance and approach of the research, and a short roadmap of the organisation of the thesis.

Heritage management in an urban age – an outline

Urban development and the protection of heritage are often positioned as opposing powers in the management of cities, while one can just as well argue that they are two sides of the same coin (Araoz, 2013; Pereira Roders and Van Oers, 2014; Van Oers and Pereira Roders, 2014). Heritage gets accused of being one of the ‘usual suspects’ of local grass-roots opposition to urban development, while development pressures are perceived as threatening, for endangering the continuation of cultural heritage resources (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012; Fairclough et al., 2008; Getty Conservation Institute, 2010). This precarious and ever-changing balance between conservation and development has kept academics and professionals in the heritage field busy since the beginning (Araoz, 2013). It has been recognized in both theory and supranational policies. To close this gap, the integration of heritage management and urban development has been recommended in both theory and policy.

In this context, a new approach to heritage management has been developed in supranational policy over recent decades: the landscape approach. When it comes to the urban context, this landscape approach is promoted by the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. It provides the principles as well as guidance on implementing a landscape approach in local urban management. The integration of urban and heritage planning on
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In this context, a new approach to heritage management has been developed in supranational policy over recent decades: the landscape approach. When it comes to the urban context, this landscape approach is promoted by the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. It provides the principles as well as guidance on implementing a landscape approach in local urban management. The integration of urban and heritage planning on
a subnational level proves to be a great challenge (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012; Getty Conservation Institute, 2010). This has its roots in the separation of the disciplines as well as the complexity of the multilevel governance setting. The main aim of this thesis is to raise understanding of the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance, and in particular, reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy. In doing so, the research facilitates the analysis of how concepts of heritage transfer into subnational policy. Such knowledge is intended to contribute to the discussion on the historic urban landscape approach and its global implementation.

As the title of this thesis – Historic urban landscapes framing the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance – indicates, the presented research is about heritage policy and planning in an urban context. This chapter further introduces the context of the research, and presents the problem statement and the significance of the research. First, those topics of heritage in an urban age, heritage management and multilevel governance are introduced. Then the methods and the approach are addressed. Finally, a short roadmap of the organization of the thesis is provided.

An urban age for heritage management

Cities have gained a central place in cultural, economic, environmental and social policymaking and there is wide and transdisciplinary interest in regional and urban cultures (Soja, 2003; 2011). This age has therefore already been coined the urban age. Since the second half of the 19th century, large parts of the world have seen rapid urbanization, urban growth and urban renewal. This urban and urbanizing environment is expected to become more important for humankind in the decades ahead. In the 1980s, cities became a lens into the larger economic and political shifts of the emergent new global era, which increased the urge to rebuild entire urban centres and prepare them to become platforms for the current urban century (Sassen, 2011). During this process, cities became strategic and their management increasingly complex in nature. There is growing interest in the increasingly urban condition of the planet, if only for the increasing interest in labelling cities as smart, sustainable or resilient (De Jong et al., 2015).

However, the urban can no longer be understood (if it ever was) as a bounded, enclosed site of social relations (Brenner and Schmid, 2014; De Meyer et al., 1999). Urbanization processes are not bounded by municipal or even national boundaries: they take place simultaneously on various levels and at multiple locations, and are thus to be managed accordingly. The urban ‘condition’ is now understood as a historic dynamic process, in which larger urban areas magnify the opportunity for social and cultural interaction (Bettencourt, 2013; Orman et al., 2014). At the same time, the presence of culture and heritage increases the attractiveness of an
At the same time, the presence of culture and heritage increases the attractiveness of an urban area (Florida, 2014; Lazrak et al., 2013; Van Duijn and Rouwendal, 2012) and thus likely stimulates sustainable growth. This implies a cycle that can be both virtuous and vicious, but will always entail the creation or reuse of urban resources while others disappear or are destroyed. This process will likely be accompanied by accumulating development pressures and needs for transformation, particularly in areas that constitute a high level of cultural value.

Heritage management in the urban context regularly focuses on conserving the fabric of the past for future generations (Pendlebury et al., 2009). While this might often still be the case, a definite change in thinking can be observed. During the second half of the 20th century, the focus was on a ‘site’, while it is now on the processes that create a site. Therefore, the focus is now the integral management of urban resources and their values, generally called heritage policy and planning in an urban context. This chapter further introduces the context of heritage management and multilevel governance – indicates, the presented research is about the research facilitates the analysis of how concepts of heritage transfer into subnational and in particular, reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy. In doing so, the research refers to both the vertical integration of heritage and non-heritage sectors, and the horizontal integration of the various levels of policy involved.

The landscape approach

The landscape approach was developed by and within several adjoining disciplines, such as rural, cultural, urban and natural landscape management (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2012; Brown, 2015; Brown et al., 2005; CoE, 2000; Goetcheus and Mitchell, 2014; Moylan et al., 2009; Taylor and Lennon, 2011) and territorial governance (Rega, 2014; Thuessen and Nielsen, 2014). ‘Landscape’ can be a slippery notion (Phillips, 2015), and as such landscape, and a subsequent ‘landscape approach’, needs to be further defined. Landscape is a crucial concept for many academic and professional disciplines (Turner, 2006). The development of a landscape approach slowly shifted from conserving historic fabric to managing resourceful urban areas. In this perspective, first of all ‘fabric’ has been replaced by ‘resource’. Second, change is no longer used as a binary concept with (0) no for protected resources and (1) yes for all other resources. The level of change is gradual and related to the, also gradual level of value. Third, the focus is now the processes that create a site. Therefore, the focus is now the integral management of urban resources and their values, generally called heritage management and multilevel governance – indicates, the presented research is about the research facilitates the analysis of how concepts of heritage transfer into subnational and in particular, reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy. In doing so, the research refers to both the vertical integration of heritage and non-heritage sectors, and the horizontal integration of the various levels of policy involved.
about guiding the nature of the transformation. It addresses the quality of the resources and relationships that form a landscape over time (Cortina, 2011; Dalglish, 2012). This goes hand in hand with a shift in thinking in culture- and heritage-led studies. The focus of those fields has traditionally been on materiality, and on aiming to decipher embodied meaning and social expectations (Latham and McCormack, 2004). More recently, however, the focus has been on understanding the material and immaterial as resources of a more performative, constitutive nature. Following actor-network theory, heritage theory is moving towards defining objects as actors or agents, creators of value, rather than as symbols that represent value (Albena, 2013; Pendlebury, 2013; Veldpaus and Pereira Rodgers, 2014a). Heritage is seen as the ever-present interplay of resources, standards and values, cross-linking past, present and future societies (Avrami et al., 2000; De la Torre, 2014; Winter, 2012). To manage such interplay in a more integral and ethical way, heritage is conditionally framed by a conceptual landscape that incorporates social, economic and environmental factors, through space and time (Agnoletti, 2014; Axelsson et al., 2012; Stobbelaar and Pedrolí, 2011; Taylor et al., 2015). Such a landscape easily crosses policies, nations, disciplines and scales, and thus also the boundaries that would traditionally be defined to manage heritage in an urban context.

The historic urban landscape approach

Landscape as a notion was introduced in supranational policy on heritage in 1962 in the Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites (UNESCO). ‘Cultural landscape’ has been used in the Operational Guidelines to the World Heritage Convention (WHC) since 1992 (Rössler, 2006). In 2000 the ‘European Landscape Convention’ (CoE, 2000) established the concept in supranational policy. The ideas that come together in a landscape approach, however, can be found in many more supranational policies. Promoting and stimulating the implementation of more integrated approaches in heritage management has been the aim of many initiatives globally for at least four decades on the supranational level by, for example, the IUCN, ICOMOS, CoE, OWHC and UNESCO, as well as by local and national organizations (Brown et al., 2005; CoE, 1975, 1985, 2005; Dumas et al., 2013; Dupagne and EC, 2004; ICOMOS, 1987, 2005b, 2011; Janssen et al., 2012; Pickard, 2010; Scheffler et al., 2010; UNESCO, 1976, 2003, 2005; Van Oers, 2013; Yang and Pharès, 2004).

HUL builds upon those to provide guidelines on applying a landscape approach in the urban context. It strives to protect or enhance the quality of the human environment, while acknowledging this environment is dynamic and needs changes to allow communities to continue to prosper. As a landscape approach, HUL recommends a holistic and integrated management that is part of a larger socioeconomic development framework. It has been developed as an approach that governs how and by and for whom the urban landscape is used,
developed as an approach that governs how and by and for whom the urban landscape is used, management that is part of a larger socioeconomic development framework. It has been continue to prosper. As a landscape approach, HUL recommends a holistic and integrated acknowledging this environment is dynamic and needs changes to allow communities to urban context. It strives to protect or enhance the quality of the human environment, while HUL builds upon those to provide guidelines on applying a landscape approach in the supranational level by, for example, the IUCN, ICOMOS, CoE, OWHC and UNESCO, as well as management has been the aim of many initiatives globally for at least four decades on the together in a landscape approach, however, can be found in many more supranational policies. Promoting and stimulating the implementation of more integrated approaches in heritage to manage such interplay in a landscape incorporating social, economic and environmental factors, through space and time (Agnoletti, 2013; Pendlebury, 2013; Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a). Heritage is seen as the ever- cultural constructs of urban resources that echo cultural identity and create cultural value. Such definition makes the application of strict territorial boundaries or the prevention of change questionable. What is needed is strategic multi-scalar and thus multilevel planning and management of the development of urban resources. This is underlined by the rise in culture- or heritage-led development concepts, the subsequent recommendations to integrate cultural, heritage and urban policies, and the increased research on multilevel governance (Turner, 2006).

UNESCO’s HUL approach has been established over the last decade. A first version can be found in the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape. This memorandum was the main outcome of a conference in Vienna in May 2005, where the issue discussed was how contemporary development could go hand in hand with the conservation of the heritage values of historic areas. Vienna itself acted as a case study. The Vienna memorandum sought a more formal instrument to tackle the problem of contemporary development in historic cities. It asked the General Conference of UNESCO to ‘adopt a new recommendation to complement and update the existing ones on the subject of conservation of historic urban landscapes [...].’ The UNESCO legal framework on urban conservation until then consisted of the Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites (UNESCO, 1962), the Recommendation concerning the conservation of Cultural Property Endangered by Public or Private Works (UNESCO, 1968), the Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO, 1972), and the Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (UNESCO, 1976). Even the most recent one was thus over 30 years old. To address the new challenges facing policymaking and managing urban heritage, in 2006 the World Heritage centre, in cooperation with the UNESCO Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM), created a working group on historic urban landscapes. This was the beginning of an extensive discussion on the concept, resulting in the
Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, which was officially adopted at the 36th General Conference of UNESCO in November 2011.

Heritage policy – multilevel governance

Heritage management is often subject to a complex and multilevel governance system. Since the birth of intergovernmental organizations, such as the UN, UNESCO and the Council of Europe (CoE), heritage management has been suspended vertically between supra- to subnational levels of governance. Horizontally, various disciplines of policymaking, involving urban and environmental policies, as well as social and cultural policies, also cover heritage management. A substantial body of binding and nonbinding guidelines and policies adopted locally, nationally and internationally, apply to heritage, or have a direct or indirect impact on what is happening with heritage (O’Donnell, 2014).

On the international level, UNESCO’s 1972 WHC is probably the most influential convention (Nafziger and Paterson, 2014). As it evolves, the WHC fosters the development of declarations and recommendations to supplement the WHC and other conventions in the UNESCO treaty framework (Nafziger and Paterson, 2014; Vadi, 2014), such as the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. States that are party to the WHC accept the obligations, towards the community of states as a whole, to pass on World Heritage sites in good condition to future generations, by means of their own legal system of policy and protective measures. So far, 191 (98%) of the 195 countries that are members of UNESCO have ratified the WHC. Judging by the high ratification rate and existing research on heritage policy in various global regions – for example on Europe (Pickard, 2001), on Europe and the Americas (Stubbs and Makaš, 2011) and on Asia (Silva and Chapagain, 2013) – it is safe to assume that most of the world’s countries have some legal protective measures in place for heritage management. As such, new conceptualizations of heritage (or other concepts) will have to be implemented into a wide variety of existing policy contexts. The definitions of cultural heritage and the legal consequences of designation, however, vary greatly among legal systems (Nafziger and Paterson, 2014; Vadi, 2014). It is thus expected that local governments that want to implement new ideas and concepts of heritage in their local policies, need to find a fitting way to do so. Every subnational policy context requires a tailored approach, which assesses the existing national and subnational policies on compatibility to better determine whether to revise them and, if so, how.

This is easier said than done. There is, for example, a substantial lack of research on the impact and usability of earlier global recommendations on cultural heritage (e.g. UNESCO 1962; 1968; 1976). While they all required reflective reporting, this was never established in an official reporting and evaluation process. Also for HUL, the intention is to set up a review
cycle, although it remains unclear whether and, if so, how such a cycle is to be established. Only the WHC requires official periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located in its territories (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2015c). For the WHC, monitoring reports are available. However, the policy implementation chapters are not very extensive and are mainly based on self-assessment by the nation states (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2011, 2012, 2013). Those assessments are not supported by a comparative policy analysis.

The effects and impacts of neither the WHC nor the abovementioned recommendations are inventoried, let alone monitored in a systematic way that allows for a better understanding of local context as well as comparison on larger scale. Moreover, methods to undertake such systematic analysis are scarce. Consequently, information on the application of even the WHC, let alone the recommendations, is not readily or widely available. For the recommendations, for example HUL, the only feedback is a loop of incidental local experience back into supranational policy (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2010; WHITRAP, 2015). However, also here no data or methods have been found that support statements on what their impact is, or how they contributed to policy changes. This means that while many support or criticize the WHC and other recommendations, more generalizing evidence-based statements criticizing or supporting the effectiveness or usefulness of supranational guidelines are yet to be developed.

This increasingly complex context of multilevel governance makes the comparison of policy and impact through time, place (or case) and governance level both more necessary and more difficult, not in the least because there is an entrenched empiricism that dominates contemporary urban policy discourse and precludes a better understanding of the bigger frameworks underpinning our current assumptions (Brenner et al., 2011; Brenner and Schmid, 2014). New methods, such as large number (large-N) comparative research in the field of multilevel governance, to better understand the vertical nesting of urban policies in the subnational, national and supranational context could be very useful to, for example, monitor the implementation of HUL globally and its impact locally (Kübler and Pagano, 2012).

**Research aims**

The hypothesis of this thesis, and the research programme this doctoral thesis is part of, is that making policies and practices comparable through the application of a comparative analysis framework, will deepen understanding, support practice and reveal trends. A systematic comparison would provide a more methodical understanding of how current ideals and assumptions in heritage management are embedded in the various policies and practices, and vice versa. In this thesis, I chose to focus on urban and heritage policies in a subnational governance context and their relation to supranational policies. I purposely aimed
for research that could have an impact on both practice and theory. My aim is to stimulate and renew the debates and developments in both the application and the theoretical meaning of the landscape approach in the urban context.

Problem statement
National and subnational governments are invited to adapt and implement supranational policies such as HUL, and monitor their impact. On the other hand, the development of supranational policies depends on local feedback and input. To understand the possible and actual relations between the levels of governance, there is a need to compare them and identify and monitor the various feedback loops. Current research on historic urban landscapes, and their management, is mostly case study-driven. An underlying framework that allows comparison in time or place is often missing (Pereira Roders, 2014). This reflects the fact that contemporary urban policy discourse is dominated by empiricism (Brenner and Schmid, 2014). This empiricism, while revealing very relevant and necessary knowledge, largely precludes the wider comparison to reveal regional and global trends. Also, the rethinking of underlying assumptions and frameworks of heritage management can be complemented by such wider comparison. The assumed Eurocentric core of heritage management, for example, can be addressed by means of case studies, but what if we want to reveal and prove that this is a trend on a more global scale? And how is it possible to begin to have an understanding of how heritage practice has an impact on contemporary society, when we are unable to go beyond case studies? All those discussions can be enriched by rethinking the way heritage management is framed and what its impact is.

This research identifies a gap in research on heritage management when it comes to evaluation research and monitoring. By focusing on developing a more in-depth understanding of professional heritage practice and taxonomy to build a common language, this research aims starts filling this gap. The great variation in cultural diversity within and among heritage management practices provides a seemingly logical argument for dismissing even the possibility to compare them on a global level. This research however, explores a method that has the potential to go beyond case-based research: a method that enables a large-N comparison of heritage policies and projects to reveal trends and differences in time, place and scale. As the developed method could only be tested in one case study, this potential is only theorized here and is still to be further tested.

The research aims presented above go beyond what is feasible for one PhD project. Ideally, the taxonomy would be developed based on an analysis of supranational, national and subnational policies, as well as on ethnographic research in several case studies and among various stakeholder groups. Subsequently, this taxonomy, and its application in a
among various stakeholder groups. Subsequently, this taxonomy, and its application in a subnational policies, as well as on ethnographic research in several case studies and the taxonomy would be developed based on an analysis of supranational, national and the possibility to compare them on a global level. This research however, explores a method that enables a large-N comparison of heritage policies and projects to reveal trends and differences in time, place and scale. As the developed method could only be tested in one case study, this potential is that has the potential to go beyond case-based research: a method that enables a large-N comparison. The assumed Eurocentric core of heritage management, for example, can be assumptions and frameworks of heritage management can be complemented by such wider comparative analysis framework, would then be tested in a range of case studies, by means of workshops and document analysis, to validate the method and test whether the results are indeed comparable. Comparability between cities could be tested, as could that between stakeholders, documents, or document and reality. This research had to make a selection of those options. It focuses on the understanding of concepts and management of heritage as used in subnational context, in comparison to what supranational policies are recommending in this respect. The results are to support the understanding of discrepancies, similarities and complementarities between the levels of governance, and allow a more tailored implementation of landscape approach in urban resource management, once governments decide to adopt this approach. The task I set myself was to design a method that could be applied in a policy analysis tool for revealing and reflecting on the differences between supra- and subnational levels of governance. This method also had to have the potential to be applied in other tools, to understand a bigger picture: to compare cases throughout temporal and spatial dimensions, cultural patterns and governance levels, to reveal the underlying structures and discover dissonant discourses.

Research questions

I am not the first to theorize that the landscape approach represents a shift in thinking about heritage. This research, however, goes beyond theorizing this shift and evidences its presence, or lack thereof, throughout the various levels of policy involved in heritage management. The aim was to define a method to prove its existence in and impact on urban and heritage policy on the global and the local level. The assumption is that a method of cross-referencing domain-dependent taxonomy by means of an assessment tool will support the linking of multiple individual cases, documents and approaches. This research has taken a step towards such a comparison, by developing and testing a domain-dependent taxonomy used as a method to assess how subnational policies compare to supranational policies. A next step would be to see whether this method could also be used to compare knowledge derived from various forms of empirical and case-based research to develop a more fundamental understanding of the heritage discipline. As such, the aim was to develop and test a method that would enable the comparison between levels of governance. This method had to show potential for large-N comparative analysis of heritage management practices, policies and processes in general. The particular aim of this research was to develop a method that could assist in indicating which differences between the various levels of governance really exist. The results of such a method could be used as the basis for discussing dissonance, complementary or comparability between governance levels. Subsequently, the range of possible changes this implies for either of those levels and their possible impacts can be explored. While many researchers see
a landscape approach as the future for heritage management, there is no way to be sure that it is an approach that will work in every particular case or setting. When a government considers it appropriate and chooses to implement it, the question is how this can take place in a manner that is tailored to the specific context, considering the implications and expected impacts.

This research started with the question:

“What is the contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscape approach, to existing subnational heritage policy and practices in the management of urban resources?”

To answer this main question, the following sub-questions were formulated.

» What is the contribution of the (historic urban) landscapes approach to current supranational heritage management policy and heritage theory?
» How are landscape approaches already used in in heritage management?
» How did the recommendations in the supranational policy and reference documents in heritage management evolve over the past 50 years?
» How can supranational recommendations on the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscapes approach, be compared to subnational policy?
» What are the assessment criteria for comparison, and why?
» How can we design a comparative assessment method for a multilevel governance setting?
» How can we apply, test and validate such an assessment method?

What is the contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscapes approach, to subnational urban and heritage management practices in Amsterdam?

» In terms of content: results of testing the method in Amsterdam
» In terms of method: reflecting on testing the method in Amsterdam

Research setting

This thesis is based on a collection of previously published and presented papers and articles. Two papers have been published in international peer-reviewed journals (Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013; Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a). A third paper is currently under review, and a fourth will be published in a book on HUL. The work has also been presented at conferences and, where possible, published in proceedings. A full list of the publications and presentations is presented in Appendix A. Due to this, Chapters 1 to 4 have an introduction and a section on methodology. As such, this introduction covers only some of the main lines and the general approach, to be specified per paper. Another result of this choice is that in between the lines, one can also detect the evolution of my thinking, my perspective on the topic, throughout the chapters.
This research was undertaken in the context of a research programme on sustainable heritage management, called World Heritage Cities, Outstanding Universal Values and Sustainability. This is an international research programme that was established in 2009 and is led by Eindhoven University of Technology (Ana Pereira Roders) in cooperation with UNESCO World Heritage Centre (Ron van Oers). The research conducted under the umbrella of the programme is intended to lead to a deeper understanding of the sustainable management and development of historic urban landscapes. The aim is to use and develop methods that enable global data recording, comparison and assessment. Such methods – in particular, methods that provide data in a format that allows for large-N comparisons – are expected to stimulate the comparison of and thus knowledge exchange on historic urban landscapes, cultural significance and environmental impact, in both policy and practice. We aim to develop a deeper understanding of the global urban condition, trends and developments by building upon, and going beyond, case-based research.

Research approach and roadmap

To reveal the contribution of landscape approach, and specifically HUL, to current supranational heritage management policy and theory, a literature review and a content analysis of a large set of supranational heritage management policies were conducted. This history of urban heritage is presented in Chapter 1 (Urban heritage: putting the past into the future), which was first published as a paper in The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice (4:1) (Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013). This chapter addresses research question 1. It presents the current state of the landscape approach in heritage management and shows how terminology in supranational policy and reference documents in heritage management evolved over the past 50 years. As such, it shows the position of the HUL approach in current supranational heritage management policy and heritage theory.

Chapter 2 (Analysing policy, building taxonomy) addresses research question 2. The chapter is based on a paper published in Change over Time, 4(2) (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a) and a paper published in the Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Heritage and Sustainable Development – Heritage 2014 (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014b). Together, the two papers show the evolution of the concepts used to define heritage. The evolution was revealed by means of a systematic document analysis of supranational policy on four dimensions: what and why (2014a) and, who and how (2014b). The analysis resulted in a domain-dependent taxonomy, to make large-N comparative research possible. This formed the basis for a method of cross-referencing domain-dependent taxonomy by means of a policy analysis tool. The method, applied in the tool, enables the systematic identification of heritage concepts in policy, and thus supports structured comparative analyses. In this research, the focus was on comparing supranational and subnational governance levels.
Chapter 3 (A Taxonomy-based policy analysis tool) concerns the testing of the taxonomy and policy analysis tool. The chapter is based on a conference paper presented at the 8th International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014c) and on a journal paper titled ‘Testing a Policy Analysis Tool: a method for comparing cultural heritage policies’ (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, forthcoming). It presents the process, results and reflection on testing the framework developed in the city of Amsterdam. The framework reveals how the local urban and heritage policy relates to what is recommended in supranational heritage policies. As such, it reveals the contribution of the landscape approach to the subnational urban and heritage management practices in Amsterdam. However, the results on Amsterdam itself are secondary: they are used for validating the framework rather than analysing the policies in Amsterdam in themselves. The chapter presents the results of testing the method of cross-referencing a domain-dependent taxonomy by means of a policy analysis tool in a series of three focus group interviews, held to introduce, apply and validate the tool. This study was purposefully set up as a longitudinal valorisation in a single case study to test and reflect on the method as applied in the policy analysis tool.

Chapter 4 (Taxonomy: exploring and improving) is partly based upon a chapter in an upcoming book (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, forthcoming). It discusses the taxonomy, and the developed method as applied in the policy analysis tool, as well as its applicability beyond this thesis.

Chapter 5 (What’s new in heritage planning?) presents a critical review of the guidelines underpinning the assessment framework: the historic urban landscape approach. This review is based on a thorough analysis of the concepts put forward in HUL in relation to the general landscape discourse, and the lessons learned by applying the policy analysis tool in Amsterdam. It evolves from a paper presented at the conference Culture(s) in sustainable futures conference organized by the European Research Network COST Action Investigating Cultural Sustainability (Veldpaus, 2015)

Finally, the epilogue (Reflections and recommendations) addresses the research questions and summarizes the added value of the research. It also addresses a future agenda for research, to stimulate the continuation of the discussion and to open future perspectives.

Scientific and societal relevance
Over the past 50 years, a substantial part of the heritage discourse developed in an ongoing dialogue between or with experts from organizations such as UNESCO, CoE, IUCN and ICOMOS. By means of supranational policy guidelines, the concepts on heritage are being formalized. Those are intended as guidelines for national and subnational levels. This research aimed
at revealing what those institutionalized concepts are and how they developed over time, in order to deepen our understanding of their contribution to heritage management, globally and locally. This was done by developing a domain specific taxonomy of heritage management. This taxonomy was expected to be applicable in a comparative framework, which could be used to set out a first stage of comparison between policies or horizontally and/or vertically. Such a comparison can highlight or indicate overlaps or discrepancies, to be further discussed by the relevant stakeholder(s) or city/cities. It is expected that such a comparison could also help on monitoring on a larger scale and make a larger set of case studies comparable.

Concepts of heritage are being contested and questioned as much as they are being confirmed and applied in the academic and practical context of heritage management. No matter how high the level of institutionalization, discourse and conceptualization on heritage will most likely continue to exist in parallel and keep changing over time, and in turn will again influence the institutionalized concepts. As such, the proposed taxonomy is never fixed or completed, and is to be continuously developed with the understanding of heritage as a concept.

Although institutionalized and authorized concepts of heritage are often criticized (Smith, 2006), they play a substantial role in research on and the management and development of heritage around the world. We should continue to question them and theorize different approaches and conceptualizations. However, a deeper understanding of the impacts of the current discourse on practice is also needed to advance the field. This research therefore intentionally started by analysing the policies as they are, instead of what they are not. Therefore, the research did not, as has already been done, critically reflect on policies – by for example a critical discourse analysis. This research systematically reveals the evolution of intentions and concepts of the supranational policies, and develops a method for analysis to establish the state-of-the-policy, as well as structured and reproducible comparison between policies. The methods used and developed to analyse policies, such as coding, categorizing and cross-referencing, were aimed at excluding disciplinary bias as much as possible, to support the aim of reproducibility and large-N comparison. As such, the scientific relevance is that the developed method can be explored further for comparison, which will provide a substantial foundation for revealing global trends and critical reflection that feeds into the discourse and the policies on heritage and urban management.

The societal relevance is that the application of this method in the policy analysis tool supported a process to gain a deeper and wider understanding of the current state of the subnational policy and of the practice in relation to what is recommended on supranational levels. As such, it provided input for discussion on the current state of such policies, which changes would be desirable to both supra- and subnational policies, and what their effect could be, especially in the case of Amsterdam, where the developed method was tested. While
adapting and implementing such new ideas can be challenging, monitoring their impact is probably even harder, because the interpretations of the recommendation may vary per city or country, and the results of such monitoring can easily be perceived as criticism. Therefore, this research aimed at developing a method that would enable comparison of the observance of heritage concepts and recommended ideas – which is a softer approach to comparison in place and time (monitoring).
adapting and implementing such new ideas can be challenging, monitoring their impact is probably even harder, because the interpretations of the recommendation may vary per city or country, and the results of such monitoring can easily be perceived as criticism. Therefore, this research aimed at developing a method that would enable comparison of the observance of heritage concepts and recommended ideas – which is a softer approach to comparison in place and time (monitoring).
Chapter 1
What is the contribution of UNESCO's historic urban landscape approach to the theory of urban heritage management? This chapter presents a literature review and analyses trends and patterns in supranational policy. It shows that the historic urban landscape approach reflects a century of evolution of theories related to urban heritage management, and discusses the challenges and possible contributions of the landscape approach to urban heritage management.

Towards a landscape approach

The protection of cultural heritage assets – 'cultural heritage management' or, in the USA, 'cultural resource management' – has long been primarily about the conservation or restoration of monuments, even when attributed cultural significance occurs throughout an urban area (Fairclough et al., 2008; Jokilehto, 1998; Whitehand, 2012). This object-based approach was more focused on the conservation of the tangible dimension of cultural heritage assets, for example building materials, façades and structures, and building ensembles. As such, it mainly dealt with the protection of remains that represent significance, helping to preserve many historic buildings and sites. Such an approach made it difficult to attribute value to the intangible, the larger scale, or the process or production for instance urban concepts, structures, evolutionary processes, or local traditions and practices. In addition, it was about what to keep, to protect, so this approach almost automatically positioned itself in opposition to development. This situation has been changing and cultural heritage management has been growing towards a more all-inclusive approach that also includes notions such as the intangible, setting and context, and urban and sustainable development, accompanied by a greater consideration of the social and economic function of cities (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012; Fairclough et al., 2008; Jokilehto, 2007; Mason, 2008; UNESCO, 2011a). This approach is known as a 'landscape approach'. It redefines conservation as the careful management of the
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adverse impacts of socioeconomic development on heritage, and aims for the integration of urban development and heritage management (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012; UNESCO, 2011b).

Theory on such a landscape approach is to be found more readily ever since the 1990s, and is reflected in several works (Bloemers et al., 2011; Choay, 2001; Gonçalves, 2007; Hayden, 1997, Jokilehto, 2007, 2009; la Torre, 2002; Rodwell, 2007; Stubbs and Makalä, 2011; Turnpenny, 2004; Van Oers et al., 2010). This literature also indicates that the landscape approach is the expected future path. Moreover, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations have been reflecting and defining strategies to address it, for example the European Landscape Convention (CoE, 2000) the Faro Convention (CoE, 2005), Vienna Memorandum (UNESCO, 2005) and Xi’an Declaration (ICOMOS, 2005b), and more recently the Valletta Principles (ICOMOS, 2011). Literature also refers to the use of a long-term and holistic planning process, such as a landscape-based approach, as one of the key principles for sustainable development (Landorf, 2009). The discussions leading to such documents contributed to the 2011 adoption of HUL as a standard-setting instrument targeting the global level (UNESCO, 2011b). HUL provides guidance on implementing a landscape approach; however, it is now up to national and local governments to adapt, disseminate and facilitate the implementation of the HUL approach, as well as to monitor its impact on the conservation and management of historic cities under their safeguard. To understand the challenges, it is necessary to understand the history of the concept of urban heritage and its importance for the integration of heritage management and urban development, as it is hardly a new invention.

A short history of urban heritage theory

John Ruskin (1819–1900)

Although a landscape approach has been mentioned more regularly since the 1990s, an urban approach to heritage is not that recent. Already during the 19th century there were suggestions of a wider scope of looking at the meaning and management of heritage. John Ruskin – pioneer in the protection of historic monuments, and influential at an international level when it comes to heritage protection – noted the importance of a wider scope in heritage protection by introducing the possibility of attributing value to more than just the ‘isolated richness of palaces’ (Hall, 2011). ‘To this day,’ Ruskin states in his Lamp of Memory ((Ruskin, 1889), ‘the interest of their fairest cities depends, not on the isolated richness of palaces, but on the cherished and exquisite decoration of even the smallest tenements of their proud periods’(Ruskin, 1889). He argues that the ‘inhabitation’ itself is a valued element, but his focus is on the individual character of buildings, not on the whole city; however, by arguing that the smallest tenements can be just as important as the palaces, he considers domestic
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Camillo Sitte (1843–1903)
One who does introduce an urban approach is Camillo Sitte. He clearly expressed his belief in the
importance of the urban fabric as a whole for the understanding of the city. He published his
ground-breaking book Der Städtebau nach seinen künstlerischen Grundsätzen (City Planning
According to Artistic Principles) in 1889 and many practitioners have used his theory to guide
planning practice (Sitte, 1901). Sitte’s book starts with a chapter on the relationship between
buildings, monuments and places, where he argues that beautiful buildings and monuments
and a good/correct arrangement of those belong together. For Sitte, ‘the modern disease of
isolated construction’ is to be condemned and monuments are actually to be built within the
urban fabric (Choay, 1969). At around the same time, Otto Schlüter coined the term ‘cultural
landscape’ (1899), which was further defined by Carl O. Sauer (Larkham, 2002; Sauer, 1925).
In the 1990s, this concept of cultural landscape became the first globally acknowledged basic
figure of landscape heritage management (Rössler, 2006).

While Ruskin argues for the conservation of the individual elements that convey memorial and
social values, Sitte mostly argues for their sum in historic and esthetical values. Francoise
Choay declares Sitte to be the first of a generation of urban morphologists who really focused
on the existing city and its essential (tangible) elements (Choay, 2001). Sitte’s theories also
apply to the conservation of pre-industrial cities for their picturesque and historic qualities.
Charles Buls, a contemporary supporter of Sitte’s ideas, additionally argues that the
demolishing of smaller structures has to be placed within the bigger picture of the city, the
immediate context and in relation to each other, as together they might comprise value that is
not understood when dealt with separately (Buls, 1899). Sitte and Buls together provided us
with a new objective in urban planning: the conservation of urban structure and fabric (Choay,
1969).

Patrick Geddes (1854–1932)
Some years later, this approach became further established by the works and theory of Patrick
Geddes. He argues, in his famous book Cities in Evolution (1915), how urban heritage underpins
urban development: ‘If town planning is to meet the needs of the city’s life, to aid its growth
and advance its progress, it must surely know and understand its city. To mitigate its evils, it needs diagnosis before treatment.’ When looking at HUL (UNESCO, 2011), it is obvious Geddes must have been an inspiration, as it aims to integrate the goals of urban heritage conservation and those of social and economic development. It is rooted in a balanced and sustainable relationship between the urban and the natural environment, between the needs of present and future generations and the legacy from the past. The historic urban landscape approach may assist in managing and mitigating impacts (UNESCO, 2011b).

Geddes’s famous concept of survey — to know and understand a city — is based upon the idea of finding, by dissecting, the essential character of a historic city, as this conditions both its environment and its occupation. When Geddes analyses the evolution of a city, he analyses its behaviour both of and in the landscape. By that he introduced methods to survey urban settlements and their inhabitants in relation to their heritage, the beginning of an evidence-based planning process, leading to the observational model of survey to diagnosis and plan. This again is very much related to the HUL approach, where the first step in implementing such an approach is ‘to undertake comprehensive surveys and mapping of the city’s natural, cultural and human resources’ (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2010). Before any demolition could take place, Geddes insisted on a detailed survey of past, present and future alternatives — very similar to what is nowadays called ‘cultural significance assessment’ or ‘heritage impact assessment’, so, even though these words might be new, the practices are surely not (Pereira Roders and Van Oers, 2012). Geddes would meticulously log a building’s condition, but also set it contextually within its historical significance and cultural meaning within local traditions and customs (Law, 2005). Geddes was truly aiming for more holistic research on the city, conceptualized in his ‘thinking machine’ triad of place, work and folk (Thomson and Geddes, 1931), indicating a direct relationship between spatial form, economic activity and sociocultural processes. Geddes also called for the participation of many actors and stimulated the local community to get to know their city (Siravo, 2011). A direct relation to heritage management is apparent here, as stakeholder consultation has, since its beginnings, been a very important part of it. As early as 1972, UNESCO stated that the public should be closely associated with the actions undertaken to protect cultural heritage, be informed of what they can do and ‘should be called on for suggestions and help’ (UNESCO, 1972). This injunction is taken up in HUL where organizations are stimulated to ‘reach consensus using participatory planning and stakeholder consultations’ (UNESCO, 2011b). Geddes preferred to establish a process of locally rooted interventions, postponing concrete design proposals, as he valued the process over a final image (Colenbrander, 1999). All in all, Geddes provided us with the basis for an integrated, process-oriented approach to urban development that is now being explored and further developed in the field of cultural heritage management. Geddes approached the city from a development point of view, not focusing on heritage as
Figure 01 a–b: The successive interventions in Edinburgh’s Old Town, particularly those carried out by Edinburgh-based Sir Patrick Geddes, are an exemplar of early urban conservation. These views of Edinburgh seen from the National Museum of Scotland (a–above) and the Scottish Parliament Building (b–below) show that interventions are continuing long after Geddes. Edinburgh is a historic urban landscape that keeps evolving. © Loes Veldpaus
Gustavo Giovannoni (1873–1947)

Gustavo Giovannoni did something similar to Geddes, but coming from the other side of the spectrum. He is credited with the invention of the actual term ‘urban heritage’, a definition that previously existed only in concept and later gained a name (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012). He first used it in the publication Vecchie città ed edilizia nuova of 1913 (Giovannoni, 1931). Giovannoni argued and promoted the protection of heritage on an urban scale, without excluding the importance of urban development as he defined a historic city as a monument and a living fabric at the same time. Giovannoni, one of the most important theoreticians and practitioners in the first half of the 20th century, introduced the concept of ‘mutually supportive, harmonious coexistence: avoiding conflict and allowing the distinctive characteristics of both to be respected and given the freedom to evolve creatively’ (Rodwell, 2010). He considered recognized monuments and the modest vernacular architecture in their surroundings to be inseparable parts of a whole; both not being contextually or functionally complete without the other. As such, there should not be any differences in the criteria for decision making while planning, designing or constructing the different scales of interventions. After all, they would together represent the social values of their local communities.

Regarding change, Giovannoni suggested intervention should be combined with respect for the interconnectedness of the elements of the urban fabric, the historical spirit of a place, materialized in spatial configurations (Choay, 2001). Giovannoni was also involved in the creation of the 1931 Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, which argues for a site-specific, tailor-made approach to the built environment (Stubbs and Makaš, 2011).

Giovannoni’s ideas were rather remarkable at a time when the influence of the Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM) modernists, working on their notion of the functional city, which was the theme of the Fourth CIAM Congress in 1933 (Mumford, 2002), was substantial. Giovannoni’s ideas on integrating urban heritage within planning and design have long been overruled by the ideas of modernists of the CIAM, who rejected the notion of the historic city. Le Corbusier’s Plan Voisin (Paris, 1925), for example, is emblematic of these ideas. It proposed demolishing the old neighbourhoods of Paris to make space for new buildings, and preserving only a few monuments such as Notre Dame. This is the moment when urban development and urban heritage theory really took separate paths, with one mainly concerned with the general need for expansion due to population growth and hygiene, and the other emphasized the listing of monuments. The 1931 and 1933 Athens Charters can be seen as enshrining this division (Gonçalves, 2007).
However, from a heritage management perspective, it is not only that the listing of buildings or the acknowledgment that every building within a city can convey significance and value, but also, as Giovannoni stresses, that the urban ensemble, the structure as such, and the human activities within such structure, can be of cultural significance. Both Geddes and Giovannoni integrated ‘heritage management’ into the general conception of territorial planning and urban development, and both saw people as part of the city. The importance of integrating heritage management into larger policies of planning was first promoted about a century ago, and the concept has been reflected in cultural policy since the earliest recommendations by UNESCO in the 1960s.

Integrating heritage, planning and development

The notion of an integral and holistic approach towards heritage and urban development has been highlighted in almost every heritage-related international cultural policy document since the 1960s. It starts with the Venice charter (ICOMOS, 1964) stating that a historic monument can also be an urban or rural setting in which evidence of a particular civilization is found, or a significant development or a historic event. And the Recommendation concerning the Preservation of Cultural Property Endangered by Public or Private works (UNESCO, 1968) stresses the importance of balancing the benefits of socioeconomic and urban development with the conservation of cultural heritage. The WHC (UNESCO, 1972) wants states parties to adopt ‘general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes’ because cultural heritage ‘is increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction.’ Then, in 1976, UNESCO adopted the Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (UNESCO, 1976) and, somewhat later, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) adopted the Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (ICOMOS, 1987). The widening of the heritage concept continued and the focus on integration increased. In 2000, the Landscape Convention (CoE, 2000) was adopted, and 2005, the Faro Convention (CoE, 2005) stated that cultural heritage ‘is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time.’ At that moment, UNESCO also developed the Vienna Memorandum (UNESCO, 2005) and ICOMOS its Xi’an declaration (ICOMOS, 2005b). In 2011, ICOMOS adopted the Valletta Principles and UNESCO adopted HUL (ICOMOS, 2011; UNESCO, 2011b).
Heritage, for example, stressed a new, integrated approach to managing the historic environment, for instance through the concept of ‘understanding place’ as developed in ‘Conservation Principles and Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Development of the Historic Environment’ (2008). France aimed for a better integration with tourism and regional development and introduced the system of ZPPAUPs (zones of architectural, urban and landscape importance). In Germany, the main discussion was about how to make national policy on heritage more dynamic and decentralized (Janssen et al., 2012). In Denmark, the SAVE system (Survey of Architectural Values in the Environment) was introduced as part of national commitments to the concept of integrated conservation. Based on the proposals for the Landscape Convention, the Netherlands implemented the Belvedere programme (Feddes, 1999) to stimulate the integration and use of cultural significance in spatial development and redevelopment. Actively stimulating such landscape approach in heritage management led to the redevelopment of Dutch heritage policies (Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2015). In its World Heritage nomination, Amsterdam went a step further and included the HUL approach, even before its adoption, to show its willingness to adopt a landscape approach (De Jong et al., 2009; Swart et al., 2012) (Figure 02). As such, the trend in theory is followed by application in policy. HUL does not introduce an entirely new conceptualisation of heritage, but capitalizes a set of emerging ideas. However, the HUL approach does not necessarily aim to reflect all those previous policies and practices; rather, it aims to provide an overarching framework that could help to structure and improve policies involved in urban heritage management.

Even though the theory has been developing since the beginning of the 20th century, and global policy concepts had been developed, heritage scholars such as Jokilehto (2007), Fairclough et al. (2008), Pendlebury (2009) and Taylor and Lennon (2012) observe a trend of heritage management moving towards an urban scale in reality only by the end of the 20th century. Jokilehto (2007) indicates that in addition to ‘historic monuments, which had been the main conservation focus, increasing concern was given to traditional habitat, the built environment as such, and what came to be defined as cultural landscape’. Indicating a shift from object to landscape, they not only notice a change of scale, from the singular object to the collection of objects, structures and areas, but also an inclusion of intangible heritage such as traditions, rituals and events, and a move from aesthetic to ecological value (Smith, 2015). ‘The spatial dimension of heritage has grown from “monument” to the slightly larger concepts of site, thence to “setting”, areas and “landscapes” and cities, and finally to the landscape [...] The various successive enlargements of “heritage” have created an all-inclusive concept of the “historic environment”’ (Fairclough et al., 2008). This is considered to be a landscape way of looking at heritage and spatial planning in general.

The evolving theory on integrated heritage management has been reflected in discussions and in application since the 1990s in many countries (Stubbs and Makaš, 2011). English
Heritage, for example, stressed a new, integrated approach to managing the historic environment, for instance through the concept of ‘understanding place’ as developed in ‘Conservation Principles and Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Development of the Historic Environment’ (2008). France aimed for a better integration with tourism and regional development and introduced the system of ZPPAUPs (zones of architectural, urban and landscape importance). In Germany, the main discussion was about how to make national policy on heritage more dynamic and decentralized (Janssen et al., 2012). In Denmark, the SAVE system (Survey of Architectural Values in the Environment) was introduced as part of national commitments to the concept of integrated conservation. Based on the proposals for the Landscape Convention, the Netherlands implemented the Belvedere programme (Feddes, 1999) to stimulate the integration and use of cultural significance in spatial development and redevelopment. Actively stimulating such landscape approach in heritage management led to the redevelopment of Dutch heritage policies (Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2015). In its World Heritage nomination, Amsterdam went a step further and included the HUL approach, even before its adoption, to show its willingness to adopt a landscape approach (De Jong et al., 2009; Swart et al., 2012) (Figure 02). As such, the trend in theory is followed by application in policy. HUL does not introduce an entirely new conceptualisation of heritage, but capitalizes a set of emerging ideas. However, the HUL approach does not necessarily aim to reflect all those previous policies and practices; rather, it aims to provide an overarching framework that could help to structure and improve policies involved in urban heritage management.

Changing terms, changing concepts

The trend towards broadening the concept of heritage is commonly addressed, but seldom evidenced. An analysis of the list of cultural heritage policy documents gathered for the Getty Conservation Institute shows this change very clearly (Steele and Getty Conservation Institute, 2009). For this research, the part of the list covering the period 1950–2008 was used (76 of the 82 documents). The documents specifically referring to natural heritage, movable heritage and underwater heritage (14 in total) were excluded, leaving a set of 62 documents. To analyse trends and patterns in documents, content analysis was used (Stemler, 2001). The documents were pre-coded by registering every reference on both theme and specific terminology. This regarded urban-related terms (specified by terminology: town, urban, city, landscape, district, ensemble, place, settlement, fabric, site, area and complex or equivalences (i.e. city/cities, district/districts etc.)) and object-related terms (specified by terminology: building, monument, architecture, object and artifact or equivalences (i.e. artefact(s)/artifact(s)). The number of references per decade was compared to documents per decade to understand the ratio between the terms and the amount of text. Finally, HUL was added to the comparison to
reveal whether the trends evidenced in the previous documents were continued within this recommendation. Although this gave an imbalanced image – as now only one document was analysed, instead of the multiple documents over previous decades – it could still be used to reveal whether the observed trends continued.

Object versus urban

The content analysis of the documents revealed that the charters, conventions and recommendations, when organized per decade since the 1950s, show a clear increase in the use and number of words related to the urban scale from the 1960s onwards. Also, the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century show a rapid decrease in the use of object-related terms, as well as a growing difference between urban- and object-related terms (Figure 03). In addition, the many new words found related to urban scale have been introduced over the past 60 years. This contrasts with the number of terms used for the object scale, which has remained the same since the beginning. As Steele places this document on his list of international cultural heritage policy documents, its influence is considered to be global (Steele and Getty Conservation Institute, 2009). This is confirmed when analysing HUL, which even has the word ‘urban’ in its title. Indeed, more conclusive results would need a qualitative study of how the words are used in context, since they could have different meanings in different documents. For this reason, words such as site, structure, complex and property were excluded, as they could relate to both urban and object scales.

Further analysis of the urban scale-related terminology showed it to be slowly evolving from being about explicitly appointed sites, such as historic towns and settlements (1970s and 1980s), towards more general and less defined names, for example historic urban areas in the 1980s and places and landscapes in the 1990s. At the turn of this century, the concern for landscapes as a cultural heritage re-emerged with a bigger role for the European Landscape Convention. Later, this was confirmed by the various documents on HUL issued by UNESCO, ICOMOS and the International Committee on Historic Towns and Villages, which had been discussing the need for an updated or new charter for historic cities since 2005, to replace the 1987 Washington Charter. These documents show the use of a wider range of urban-related terms, as well as a shift in the type of terms towards a more general and inclusive terminology. This comes at the same time that the documents clearly start to mention, and distinguish between, the words ‘tangible’ and ‘intangible’, especially after the establishment of the Nara document on authenticity (UNESCO et al., 1994). Authenticity is no longer merely rooted in its material context as it was before; it now also includes the social, cultural and economic processes linked to the specific context of the heritage. This shift towards valuing processes and practices in addition to material context also adds to the widening of the concept of heritage.

---

**Figure 03:** Percentage of object versus urban-related terms in international cultural heritage policy documents.

**Figure 04:** Percentage of trend-related terms in international cultural heritage policy documents.
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Trends

The content analysis evidences the trend towards a landscape approach as referred to in the literature. In addition, it was interesting to see whether it also underpins the other mentioned next ‘steps’ within heritage conservation policy (Figure 04). When the general concept of sustainable development is traced, it shows that the word ‘sustainable’ starts to appear in documents in the 1990s, in more than half of the cases in direct combination with ‘development’, which itself is used rather steadily over the decades. In addition, a large increase in management-related terms occurred in the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century. This could very well be related to the halving in the usage of terms such as ‘conserve’ (or ‘conservation’) and ‘preserve’ (or ‘preservation’) during the past decade. HUL shows an increase in the use of such words as conserve/conservation. This could be explained by the fact that conservation has now been defined as managing ‘thoughtful change’ (Getty Conservation Institute, 2010). In addition, HUL shows a continued increase in management-related terms. The other trends regarding the high percentage of urban-related terms and increase in management and sustainable development-related terms were confirmed in HUL. In conclusion, there is a clear turn towards a sustainable landscape approach to the management of heritage and its context in the global scope of UNESCO and its theory. But the question remains how can this be implemented in a tailored way in national and local policies, and what is needed to facilitate it? In other words, how can the recommendations on HUL really contribute to current policy and, as such, to urban theory?

A landscape approach

Urban areas are composed of layers, developed and to be developed over time. ‘Each of these layers has implications for the extent to which new layers can be successfully added’ (Bontje and Musterd, 2008). New layers will be added and, from that perspective, heritage protection can no longer be the opposite of development: it is inherent to development and part of a larger, continuous, evolutionary process. As such, the wish to integrate urban development and heritage management has been the catalyst for the development of landscape concepts within heritage research and practice, applied all over the world (Prangnell et al., 2010; Roberto Cervelló–Royo et al., 2012; Van Oers and Pereira Roders, 2012). Landscape becomes an interdisciplinary forum that is multiple in meanings, significance, and collective and individual relevance of the past, the present and the future (Taylor and Lennon, 2012). In other words, it is a very inclusive, holistic way in which to consider heritage, where the site itself is no longer an end; it is placed in a social, economic, ecological and cultural context, whereby the process becomes emphasized, in addition to or even instead of the site itself. This means that, even when targeting the protection of individual buildings, the emphasis should be
on the whole, on the scale of the urban and the individual building, both including spatial, operational and narrative qualities. Not only should the protection of historical monuments be integrated in a larger strategy of sustainable urban management (Bond et al., 2004; Bond and Teller, 2002; Dupagne and EC, 2004), but it should also be more aware of how individual buildings, monuments and special areas relate to one another and are part of a process of change, for example, as pointed out by Whitehand and Gu (2010). Such an approach enables the protection of urban landscapes through the protection of their vital social and economic mechanisms in history (Dupagne and EC, 2004). Indeed, the future of heritage management is expected to become increasingly more about ‘thoughtful change’ rather than solely about the protection of historic buildings and ensembles (Scheffler et al., 2010). This requires a change of policy mostly at the local level, facilitated by national policy, with a policy framework to support the notion of urban heritage that has been developed over the last century. To accomplish this, several concepts, strategies, methods and management tools have been developed over the past decade, and the process of assessing their value has started. As mentioned, the literature indicates a landscape approach to be the future trend, as well as a key indicator for sustainable development; however, it is a great challenge for the management practices of historic cities to implement it. This can be concluded not only from the fact that the concept is already a century old and has been referenced in global theory since the 1960s: recent research also shows that ‘conflicts between heritage needs and development needs’ is ranked as being the issue of greatest concern among practitioners, from the fields of both conservation and urban management (Getty Conservation Institute, 2010) Heritage is often experienced as an obstruction to the development of cities and local communities as, accordingly, changes are required to allow those cities to evolve and little can be changed in these urban areas (Fairclough et al., 2008; Pendlebury, 2013). On the other hand, development pressures and management deficits are commonly found factors affecting cultural heritage (ICOMOS, 2005a; Turner and Pereira Roders, 2012). From both the urban development and conservation perspectives, there is an urgent call for the development of tools and instruments to stimulate integrating these fields and implementing a landscape approach on a national and a local level (EC, 2011; Turnpenny, 2004). The turn towards integrating heritage management with sustainable urban development is thus urgently needed. Although previous paragraphs show that theory is available, and that the global policy documents also set, or follow, a trend towards management and development, in practice it is much more difficult to establish such integration. This implies that the separate paths heritage management and urban development took in the 1930s, in practice, have not yet merged into a common path, despite attempts and positive results over the years.
The historic urban landscape approach

The HUL approach is a heritage management tool providing guidelines for urban development for all cities with heritage, and not necessarily only those that have World Heritage properties. It was established as a management approach in the Vienna Memorandum (UNESCO, 2005), and was officially adopted at the 36th General Conference of UNESCO in November 2011. A historic urban landscape is an urban area ‘understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of ‘historic centre’ or ‘ensemble’ to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting’ (UNESCO, 2011b). It builds upon the assumption that, when an urban settlement is properly managed, initiatives, opportunities and development can contribute to both the quality of life and the conservation of cultural heritage, while ensuring a social diversity and justness. To implement this, it is recommended that the following critical steps be used within the specific context:

- Comprehensive surveys and mapping of the city’s natural, cultural, and human resources;
- Reach consensus by participatory planning and stakeholder consultations on values and attributes conveying those values;
- Assess their vulnerability to socioeconomic pressures and impacts of climate change;
- Integrate the outcomes of 1, 2, and 3 into a wider framework of city development;
- Prioritize actions for conservation and development;
- Establish the appropriate partnerships and local management frameworks for each of the identified projects and activities (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2015b).

When surveying theory on urban heritage it became clear that some of the main ideas featured in HUL have long been extant. Especially Geddes’s principles have proven to be truly rooted, for example the need for comprehensive surveys (1), although there is also the integration of heritage into a wider urban development framework (4), recommended by both Geddes and Giovannoni. Actors and community (2 and 6) are already involved in Geddes’s thinking machine triad of place, work and folk. As Geddes preferred to establish a process of locally rooted interventions, instead of a final image, he is also close to the current definition of landscape where site in itself is no longer the end, but is placed in a social, economic, ecological and cultural context, by which the process, rather than the site itself, becomes emphasized. It has been concluded before by Colenbrander (1999) that the Geddesian perspective remains valid and apparent when it comes to urban theory. This article shows that his ideas are also echoed in current heritage theory, which hopefully can bring both paths closer.
Putting the past into the future

The future agenda for cultural heritage management relies on an all-inclusive approach that embraces transition and change. On the one hand, heritage in the urban context comprises objects and processes that are valued by people, and therefore the management of such heritage should cover objects and processes as well as the human factor (Zanchetti and Hidaka, 2011). On the other hand, the future of heritage management is expected to become increasingly more about transition management: integrative, and gradually working towards common ambitions through innovation, integration and co-evolution (Frantzeskaki et al., 2012). When conservation is defined as transition management, it is put in a wider perspective of current and future needs of socioeconomic and urban management, and common objectives can be strived for, which will be likely to benefit both the redevelopment and the heritage property (Bond and Teller, 2002; Hampton, 2005; Historic England, 2009; Nijkamp and Riganti, 2008; Palmer, 2009; Scheffler et al., 2010; Tweed and Sutherland, 2007). By providing a road map for implementing a holistic approach, the HUL approach tries to assist local and national governments to become better equipped to address contemporary socioeconomic transformations, while benefiting from their cultural significance. Some were already starting to assess their current management practices in relation to the HUL approach (Van Oers and Pereira Roders, 2012); however, those experiences are still too limited in number, time and depth to sustain reliable conclusions on its application. Moreover, no framework was used, or found so far, to evaluate the adequacy of current policy and management practices in relation to the HUL approach. This then is a challenge, because when Landorf (2009) recently used a framework to examine how far sustainable development principles had been incorporated into World Heritage Site management plans, the results showed they were generally far from fully integrated into the planning process.

In conclusion, the century-old ideas still inspire but the challenge lies in practice. What is needed is an assessment of the management policies and practices, and this becomes even more relevant in light of the anticipated impacts of climate change and urban population growth foreseen for this century (Brenner and Schmid, 2014; UN-HABITAT, 2011). These pressures call on governments to ensure ‘robust, dynamic and well managed protected areas’ (Bertzky et al., 2012). As such, the management of the ‘resource’ of cultural heritage should be dealt with just as professionally as any other vital resource, such as energy or the European Union’s ‘20-20-20’ targets. This can only be done when the assessment and further implementation of such management practices is taken seriously. To enhance the design and testing of the necessary assessment tools and frameworks is a future aim, although this should be supported by long-term collaboration with the stakeholders involved in policies and practices, and by making existing monitoring and historic data on the urban environment open source so that it is available to use when assessing the impact of the evolution in policies and practices.
Analysing policy, building taxonomy
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Experts have been gathering for decades to discuss their ideals and experiences in regard to heritage management. One of their objectives is to find common ground and clarify best practice guidelines, to be endorsed and applied in a regional or global context. A systematic comparative analysis of seven key doctrinal documents reveals the evolution of what is considered heritage and why, how the process is organized and who is, or should be, involved. It untangles the dynamics of what is valued and why, which can then be related to time, scale and place.

Changing principles on and approaches to heritage

In the past, what is now called ‘cultural heritage management’ primarily focused on the protection of monuments and areas designated as cultural heritage (Pendlebury et al., 2009; Smith, 2006; Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013). Cultural heritage has seen a shift in theory, leading to changed principles and approaches. From an approach that avoided changes at all costs, protection is now defined as an approach in which changes are managed, rather than prevented, preferably in relation to the connected communities and their sustainable future (Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, 2013). As a result, cultural heritage management has been moving towards a more inclusive approach, especially when it comes to managing heritage located in urban areas, which are constantly evolving and changing to meet the needs of their communities. The earlier approach was focused on the protection of the tangible dimension of cultural heritage assets, for example building materials, facades or of buildings. Although this approach unquestionably helped to retain the cultural significance conveyed by those tangible remains, cultural heritage management was mostly defined by an intolerance to change. This positioned protection opposite development, given that one of the few constants in urban management is that cities will change over time. To overcome this dichotomic relation
between urban (or even human) development and heritage management, the global discourse on heritage management has evolved considerably over the past decades. Notions such as the intangible, setting and context, and urban and sustainable development are included in current theory, as is a greater consideration of the socioeconomic needs of historic cities and their communities (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2012; Jokilehto, 2007; Mason, 2008; UNESCO, 2011a). This so-called landscape approach aims to manage change and integrates heritage management into the larger framework of urban development.

Taxonomy

Over the past 50 years, the international discourse on cultural heritage management has been strongly influenced by organizations such as the CoE, UNESCO and ICOMOS. They organize global and regional events and adopt concepts and best practice guidelines in the form of conventions, recommendations and charters. These guidelines are to be adopted by national authorities, and adapted by local governments, as they are the ones dealing with a heritage city on a daily basis. In the past 50 years, the reality of and the ideals concerning the protection of the cultural heritage have shifted significantly. The landscape approach is a recent attempt at reconciliation between conservation and development. Its purpose is to position conservation as the management of change, by integrating heritage management into the larger planning and development frameworks. The historic urban landscape approach is officially defined as a ‘comprehensive and integrated approach for the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework’ (UNESCO, 2011). The underlying idea is that when thoughtfully and carefully managed, heritage can be a means of development, and it can be used as a driver to build sustainable and resilient cities (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015; Kourtit et al., 2014; Landorf, 2009; Pereira Roders, 2014).

The origins of such a landscape approach can be traced back in theories to at least the beginning of the 20th century, when the link between urban development and urban heritage was first discussed (Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013). It was only some 30 years ago that urban management started to be intentionally explored in parallel with heritage theory and practices (Taylor and Lennon, 2012; UNESCO, 1972). The time line is very much related to the development of the discipline of urban planning in general. In the 1980s cities became strategic in their management of urban resources (Hall, 2002; Sassen, 2011). This resulted in a widening of expertise and a more inter- and even transdisciplinary interest in the city, culminating in the promotion of an independent field of urban sciences (Anheier and Isar, 2012; EC, 2011; Soja, 2003; Taverne et al., 2012). Sassen (2011) argues that cities in the 1980s became ‘a lens into the larger economic and political struggles of an emergent new global epoch’ and relates this...
tendency to the increased urge to rebuild entire urban centres, and prepare them to become platforms for the current urban century. The subsequent development pressures in urban areas reinvigorated the need to understand and protect the urban landscape as a physical and sociocultural construct that is an important part of international, national, regional and/or local identity, as well as morphology, history and memory (Choay, 2001; Corboz, 1983; Hayden, 1997; Whitehand, 1993). In short, this is what experts would now call a landscape approach, an approach that reconsiders, reuses and retains heritage not only from an object perspective, but also from an inclusive, cultural, socioeconomic, ecological and urban perspective. In this process, conservation became a driver for sustainable development (Pereira Roders, 2013).

While earlier approaches show a strong intolerance to change (Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, 2013), the landscape approach does not reject change. It proposes careful change management and a reasoned definition of the limits of acceptable change in relation to the heritage significance. It positions heritage as a change agent and a driver for sustainable urban development. A common way to further develop this approach in subnational policy is to stimulate the integration of heritage management into the larger framework of urban development through its socioeconomic and urban policies. The landscape approach is expected to be positioned even more centrally in cultural heritage management, as a key approach that fosters sustainable development (Kourtit et al., 2014; Landorf, 2009; Van Oers, 2013). This has already proven to be successful in a few case studies (Anheier and Isar, 2012; Dupagne and EC, 2004; Nijkamp and Riganti, 2008; Pickard, 2001; Scholz et al., 2012; URBACT, 2014). As addressed in the previous chapter, initiatives have been undertaken also on a national level to effectuate an integrated approach. Moreover, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations have recently defined strategies to address it, for example the CoE, UNESCO and ICOMOS (e.g. CoE, 2000, 2005; ICOMOS, 2005b, 2011; UNESCO, 2005, 2009, 2013). Nonetheless, the implementation of the landscape approach remains challenging. The steps to be taken to introduce the approach into policy is a process of adapting existing policy or developing new policy. It is therefore important to know where the specific policy currently stands.

Happaerts and Van Den Brande (2011) show that the international discourse plays a significant role in triggering sustainable development policies at the subnational level. Global summits and events in particular are important, although their influence is not uniform. In addition, Waterton et al. (2006) state that heritage policy documents developed at subnational, national and transnational levels are often related in a significant, though complex way. For the purpose of this research, it is assumed that the influence of international discourse on subnational heritage policy is indeed significant and traceable in subnational policy. As such, local policies are expected to reflect fragments of one or more international documents and potentially reveal the rationale for such relations. The reverse is probably also true.
The aim of this chapter is to systematically reveal and discuss differences in concepts and definitions, as used throughout the last 50 years in such documents, and classify them as a first attempt to build a domain-dependent descriptive taxonomy for heritage management. Such specification of conceptualizations can be used to help programmes and humans share knowledge (Gruber, 1993). In layman’s terms, this means a classification is created through which local demands can be made comparable to global demands, as well as other local ones. The developed taxonomy can help make existing and future significance assessments comparable. This is currently often challenging due to the rich and heterogeneous character of the various information sources. To compare global guidance and subnational policy, a policy analysis tool is being developed based upon this taxonomy. The tool is to reveal the disparities, similarities and complementarities between supra- and subnational policies and agendas, and monitor changes in urban policy. This will allow cities to compare and discuss their management approaches and, if considered necessary, review policies. It might also reveal gaps in the doctrinal approaches, for example when specific concepts of heritage are not easily reflected on or positioned within the taxonomy.

Several authors have discussed the shift in principles and approaches in heritage management theory, especially in relation to the last 50 years. However, most studies compare the ‘old concept’ to the ‘new concept’ or even propose to highlight one over the other (De Rosa and Di Palma, 2013; Fairclough et al., 2008; Labadi, 2013; Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, 2013; Smith, 2006). In this perspective, new ideas may seem revolutionary and rootless. In this research, the assumption is that there is an evolution, and thus a relation, between old and new concepts. This relation is seldom discussed, let alone revealed in a systematic way. There are some instructive topical studies, for example on values, on the tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage, or on specific approaches such as urban conservation, cultural landscape and cultural diversity (Ahmad, 2006; Avrami et al., 2000; Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015; De la Torre et al., 2005; Labadi, 2013; la Torre, 2002; Smith and Akagawa, 2008; Tarrafa Silva and Pereira Roders, 2012; Taylor and Lennon, 2012). It was only in the work of Van Oers and Pereira Roders that more encompassing attempts were made to understand and discuss the evolution of concepts in heritage management (Pereira Roders, 2007; Van Oers, 2007). This research evolves from their work.

Methodological approach

As Chapter 1 showed, the integration of heritage and urban management is not a new idea. A growing complexity of the urban condition of the world and the reactive nature of integration gives the process of integration an infinite character. To gain a better understanding of this integration, and in particular its influence on heritage policy, a selection of supranational
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Several analytical frameworks from Van Oers, Pereira Roders and Landorf were found relevant (Landorf, 2009; Pereira Roders, 2007; Van Oers, 2007). Van Oers (2007) suggests a template that determines (1) the definition of heritage, (2) the general principles, (3) the identified threats and (4) the strategies and tools. This analysis was set up as more an indicative overview than a comprehensive analysis; it is a template for analysis with little actual application. Pereira Roders (2007) built a framework for analysis that reveals the relation between eight fundamental factors: (1) objects (of cult), (2) values, (3) tools, (4) aims, (5) actors, actions, (7) time and (8) site. A systematic analysis on international policy between 1877 and 2005 was performed on the factors of objects (of cult), values and actions. Landorf (2009) built a theoretical framework to assess management plans for world heritage, based on theory and doctrinal documents. However, she presents the results of that assessment without detailing or discussing the methods behind the policy analysis tool itself. She uses the following subdivisions: (1) situation analysis, with sub-questions relating to ‘what is heritage?; (2) strategic orientation, with sub-questions relating to the identification of the goals and objectives; (3) community values and attitudes, with sub-questions relating
to the identification of local values; and (4) stakeholder participation, with sub-questions relating to who is involved.

Common denominators are summarized in the following four main questions:

» What is to be defined as heritage?
» Why is something to be defined as heritage?
» How is heritage to be managed?
» Who is to be involved in heritage definition and management?

Those four questions led to the systematic analysis of the doctrinal documents (Appendix C, D). Therefore, the results presented in this article are a contribution to raise understanding of the application of the fundamental factors, going one step further towards the development of a policy analysis tool to enable an overview of where sub national policies stand in their implementation of the landscape approach.

Analysing and comparing a set of seven international policy documents (Figure 06) using the analytical framework (Figure 05), this study synthesized the evolution of the answers to the four main questions (Figure 07). This analysis focuses on seven of the most relevant supranational documents on heritage. They were selected as follows: first, the two most recent documents were selected in order to include the most recent concepts and develop as far as possible the evolution on theory on heritage in an urban context. Those documents comprise UNESCO's Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape and ICOMOS' The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (ICOMOS, 2011; UNESCO, 2011). In addition, the analysis included each decade's most representative standard-setting document on cultural heritage management in an urban context. For this, only Conventions by UNESCO and Charters by ICOMOS were considered. The UNESCO Conventions are legally binding, and as such, are expected to exert greater influence on subnational policy than other standard-setting documents (UNESCO, 2015). The two relevant conventions in this case are the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, which is also the most ratified global treaty for cultural and natural heritage protection (UNESCO, 1972, 2003). In addition, three ICOMOS charters were selected: the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter), the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (the Washington Charter) and the Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter) (ICOMOS, 1964, 1987; ICOMOS Australia, 1999). The Venice Charter is considered a very, if not the most influential charter on heritage conservation. The Washington Charter holds influence as a document drafted by ICOMOS and as the first international charter that specifically addresses the value of
The analysis of the documents was conducted in two steps. First, the doctrinal documents were analysed individually by pre-coding using the four questions, leading to a summary addressing the four questions for each document (Appendix C). Second, those summaries were combined into the analytical framework (Figure 07) using the leading questions; building a set of categories and subcategories as found in the analysis, led to a classification (Figure 8-11). The synthesis of the doctrinal documents into the matrix facilitates a comparative analysis between the doctrinal documents. This chapter compares and discusses the results.

### Figure 05: Comparative analysis of theoretical frameworks to analyse supranational heritage policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Venice Charter</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Common denominators: What (and where) is something considered heritage, and Why is it so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WHC UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Situational analyses: Values, attitudes, objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Washington Charter</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Definition of heritage, and Principles, Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Burra Charter</td>
<td>ICOMOS (AU)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Strategic orientation and Setting, Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ICH UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Tools, Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Valletta Principles</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Actions, Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 HUL UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Who is involved in heritage management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 06: Selected set of supranational policy guidelines analysed for taxonomy.

1. Venice Charter: UNESCO 1964
2. WHC: UNESCO 1972
4. Burra Charter: ICOMOS (AU) 1999
5. ICH: UNESCO 2003
7. HUL: UNESCO 2011

## Common denominators

1. **What (and where) is heritage?**
   - What is to be defined as heritage?
   - Why is something to be defined as heritage?
   - How is heritage to be managed?
   - Who is to be involved in heritage definition and management?

2. **Definition**
   - What is heritage?

3. **Tools, Strategies**
   - How is heritage managed?

4. **Actions, Time**
   - When and with what tools is heritage managed?
   - Who is involved in heritage management?

5. **Objectives**
   - What are the values and attitudes towards heritage?

6. **Situational analyses**
   - What is the current state of heritage?

7. **Setting, Strategies**
   - What is the strategic orientation of heritage management?

8. **Process & tools**
   - What are the processes and tools used in heritage management?

9. **Participation**
   - Who is involved in heritage management?

10. **Process**
    - How is the process of heritage management managed?
A comparative analysis from Venice to Valletta

What is heritage and why is it important?

ICOMOS and UNESCO use similar terminology when defining what heritage is, and the evolution of such terminology over time is intertwined. In its general definition, ICOMOS moves from ‘historic monument’ to ‘cultural property’ to ‘place of cultural significance’ to ‘historic area’, while remarkably, all are described in terms of a historic area and its setting. Differences are related only to the addressed scale of such a historic area, ranging from a single building to ‘any scale’ of development. UNESCO, on the other hand, uses ‘cultural heritage’, ‘heritage’ and ‘historic urban landscape’ as general definitions while stating four clear types: monument, groups of buildings, site and cultural landscape. These still exist, although they have been complemented by the notion of ‘attributes’, which can be either tangible or intangible. ICOMOS also uses this notion in its most recent documents (ICOMOS, 2011). This shift to defining heritage in terms of tangible and intangible attributes represents another important change. It is the reason for addressing the ‘what’ and ‘why’ questions simultaneously in this paper. While earlier documents acknowledge only the tangible dimension of heritage when it comes to protection, those tangible assets could also include what we now call intangible attributes. However, in those cases, those references to intangible attributes are seen as the reason why the tangible result should be considered heritage. Addressing intangible attributes as a separate ‘what’, rather than a connected ‘why’, changed this dynamic of protection, as part of what was previously considered a ‘why’ (values) became a ‘what’ (attributes).

Tangible and intangible attributes and cultural values are currently three independent ‘notions’, while previously the emphasis was on tangible attributes and cultural values (which thus included the intangible attributes). Both tangible and intangible attributes are now considered heritage because of the cultural values attached to them. Thus, intangible attributes can now be of value by themselves (e.g. a traditional dance), although they can also still be linked to a tangible asset (e.g. the building where people meet for dancing). Many intangible attributes have interconnected tangible dimensions, for example the instruments and tools used, spaces used, products produced or urban form produced. As such, tangible attributes can either directly represent a cultural value, or represent an intangible attribute that, in its turn, is the reason that value is attached to the tangible attribute. Such values are attached to those attributes by us, as a community, as experts, as residents, as tourists, and as individuals or groups. They may be contested or contradictory, and they may change over time and with each generation. In this line, some scholars even argue that heritage is only about values (values-based heritage management), making the attributes redundant (Labadi, 2013; Pereira Roders and Veldpaus, 2013; Smith, 2006). However, a clear distinction between what is valued
and why it is valued is often not made, which makes it unclear whether the approach really only takes the values as a starting point, or also considers the attributes valued without clear distinction (Ioannis Poulios, 2014; McClelland et al., 2013). For the categories found regarding the ‘what’, it is necessary to distinguish between tangible and intangible attributes. The categories for tangible attributes are object, area and landscape. The categories found within the intangible attributes are asset, society and process. The analysis revealed that once a category existed, it remained. None of the categories disappeared over time; if anything, their descriptions became more detailed. The six specific categories have structured the taxonomy and are further subdivided into more detailed subcategories of attributes (Figure 07).

When looking at the ‘why’ question, the reasons for protection vary considerably between the different documents and decades. The main change is in the previously discussed relation between the attribute and the value. It starts with the basic idea that ‘heritage has value for mankind’, which implies that heritage contains value, which is then endogenous. This corroborates the objective that such value has to be transmitted to future generations. Later, heritage is defined as representing humankind’s memory and cultural diversity; in other words, heritage conveys value, which is still endogenous, although with an acknowledgement of the wider range of options, as everyone can find something else conveyed. The Intangible Heritage Convention completely turns this idea of value around: heritage is now important because it is a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee for sustainable development. This is the moment the difference between what and why starts to really show. The relation between heritage and value is moving towards the idea that heritage creates values, which change over time and with each person. Values are defined by the present generation. There can also be value in the fact that values are re-created or confirmed by each new generation. This can be seen, for example, in the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation, which considers heritage to be a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas, although it also refers to the importance of heritage as a key testimony to humankind’s past endeavours and aspirations. It is an evolution from a main focus on valuing the ‘result’ to an emphasis on valuing result aligned with process.

More and more rationales for valuing heritage are included in the various value systems established over the past decades; as a result, the number of mentioned values grew. However, they can all be categorized under the eight cultural values defined by Pereira Roders (2007). Earlier documents focused on the aesthetic, historic and scientific values. In relation to historic values, Pereira Roders distinguishes the age value, which has been implicitly mentioned since the first documents on heritage and refers to heritage valued for its survival, maturation or evolution over a period of time (Tarrafa Silva and Pereira Roders, 2012). Those four cultural values can be considered more traditional values (Figure 10) (Marta de la Torre et al., 2002). Soon, community-related values are also introduced, for example by suggesting an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic monument</td>
<td>cultural heritage</td>
<td>cultural property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single architectural work; urban or rural setting</td>
<td>monuments; groups of buildings; sites</td>
<td>(historic) urban area; setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT - specific *</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic</td>
<td>aesthetic</td>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(asset)</td>
<td>(social)</td>
<td>(area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY - main</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it has acquired cultural significance over time; imbedded with a message from the past.</td>
<td>to single out those heritage properties that are most representative, unique and irreplaceable (OUV)</td>
<td>it constitutes memory of mankind, expresses historic character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY - specific **</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic</td>
<td>aesthetic</td>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(asset)</td>
<td>(social)</td>
<td>(ecological)</td>
<td>(economic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW - process</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inventory and analyse</td>
<td>define significance</td>
<td>inventory and analyse</td>
<td>define significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>define affecting factors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>define affecting factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>develop strategy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>develop strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>integrate strategy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>integrate strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>prioritize</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW - when taking action</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new construction should: not detract value from significant elements, be harmonious, be distinguishable from original</td>
<td>Don’t take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>change should improve the current situation, guided by significance, not damaging heritage or setting and be in harmony with surroundings &amp; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO - stakeholders + role ***</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politicians (d)</td>
<td>Policy makers (d)</td>
<td>Policy makers (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers (d)</td>
<td>Officers (e)</td>
<td>Officers (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific exp. (d)</td>
<td>Scientific exp. (e)</td>
<td>Scientific exp. (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional exp. (d)</td>
<td>Professional exp. (e)</td>
<td>Professional exp. (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Non-professional exp. (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indirect community (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Tangible; I = Intangible
** Underlined font = mentioned explicitly in text; Normal font = mentioned implicitly in text
*** (i) informed / educated; (c) consulted /dialogue; (e) enrolled /executory; (d) decision making

Figure 07: Analysis of selected charters and conventions since the 1964 Venice Charter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>place of cultural significance</td>
<td>heritage</td>
<td>historic areas and surroundings</td>
<td>historic urban landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical record of any scale; setting</td>
<td>tangible support for intangible attributes</td>
<td>tangible attributes; intangible attributes</td>
<td>tangible attributes; intangible attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and analyse</td>
<td>define significance</td>
<td>define affecting factors</td>
<td>define affecting factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>define affecting factors</td>
<td>develop strategy</td>
<td>develop strategy</td>
<td>develop strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrate strategy</td>
<td>prioritize</td>
<td>prioritize</td>
<td>prioritize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships</td>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change if needed, guided by cultural significance</td>
<td>ensure continuity</td>
<td>change if needed, balanced. Guided by cultural significance</td>
<td>Manage change, to maintain a balance between growth and quality of life. Change guided by cultural significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians (d)</td>
<td>Policy makers (e)</td>
<td>Policy makers (e /d)</td>
<td>Politicians (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific exp. (e)</td>
<td>Officers (e)</td>
<td>Officers (e)</td>
<td>Policy makers (e /d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional exp. (e)</td>
<td>Scientific exp. (e)</td>
<td>Scientific exp. (e)</td>
<td>Officers (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional exp. (e)</td>
<td>Professional exp. (e)</td>
<td>Professional exp. (e)</td>
<td>Scientific exp. (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector (c)</td>
<td>Non-professional exp. (c)</td>
<td>Non-professional exp. (c)</td>
<td>Professional exp. (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td>Private sector (c)</td>
<td>Private sector (c)</td>
<td>Private sector (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect community (c)</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect community (c)</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td>Direct community (c)</td>
<td>Indirect community (c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 07: Analysis of selected charters and conventions since the 1964 Venice Charter.
How is the heritage management process organized?

The process of heritage management is only implicitly provided by the documents analysed, and even when it becomes a bit more explicit, the process is always considered iterative. The Venice Charter (1964) describes a very limited process, only focused on the experts involved leading to a direct connection between determining the significance and taking the conservation action. The Convention (1972) takes a much wider approach, involving more stakeholders and their subsequent management tools. Since that moment there is a rather large consensus among documents on the main steps needed for heritage management. However, only the Burra Charter (1999) provides a direct sequence on how to set up the general process of heritage management. Burra distinguishes three phases, namely 1) understanding the significance of a place, 2) developing policy and 3) managing the place. When comparing other documents, these categories are indeed the main ones mentioned. Based upon the documents, eight steps were defined within those three main categories (Figure 11).

As can be seen in Figure 07, most steps have been there since the Convention (1972). It is mostly by differentiating and detailing what the step entails that the meaning of some steps widens, shifts focus or gets divided into two steps. For example, the prioritizing step gets detailed; first it is mainly focused on singling out heritage at risk. Later on, the focus is more on the general process of prioritizing and balancing actions for conservation and development.

Ethnological or anthropological point of view, stressing the importance of cultural diversity, the relation between humans and the environment, or spiritual values that are considered social values (ICOMOS, 1987; UNESCO, 1972). In the build-up to the explicit inclusion of the ‘cultural landscape’, ecological values are also distinguished within cultural heritage. These ecological values are considered a community value because within a cultural landscape, the relation between humans and nature is essential. Such ecological values are often related to the community making use of the natural qualities in and of their environment, as confirmed by the Burra Charter. Moreover, the ‘associative cultural landscape’ is crucial in the recognition of the heritage of local communities their emotional or spiritual connection to the cultural and natural environment (Taylor and Lennon, 2012). In the documents that are more explicitly directed towards the urban scale, including the Washington Charter, Valletta Principles and Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation, it is emphasized that a city is a dynamic and living environment. This introduces values that relate to the development process and management strategies, which are often argued to be economic or political values. It accompanies the general shift towards heritage as a strategic asset and a resource for sustainable urban development. Heritage management’s role is to facilitate and value change as evidence of a significant development process and of how communities interact with their environments.
Typically none of the documents really commits to a specific sequence in the process. There is logic to this freedom, as global guidance needs to be adaptable to local needs. However, as this analysis reveals, a specific set of steps that are most likely to be taken are implicitly present throughout the documents.

One of the most emphasized steps in theory on the landscape approach is that the heritage management should be integrated into larger planning and policy frameworks. However, the recommendation to integrate heritage policy into a larger framework of urban planning is not new at all: it has been recommended constantly in one form or another since the WHC, and even long before that in other heritage theory (Veldpaus et al., 2013). The level of integration recommended changes, though, and reflects the state of the relation between conservation and development. The WHC makes a general statement on states parties having to facilitate the process of implementing the WHC and integrating it into comprehensive planning programmes. This integration is directly linked to giving ‘heritage a function in the life of the community’, because cultural heritage is ‘increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction’ (UNESCO, 1972).

Thus, the integration is suggested for the benefit of protection and for the benefit of the community. This attitude slowly developed over the course of the 1970s (CoE, 1975; UNEP, 1972; UNESCO, 1976; UN-HABITAT, 1976), and in the 1980s and 1990s heritage becomes presented even more as being ‘of service’ to a social planning scheme, creating places according to the current and assumed future needs of the inhabitants. This encourages the plea to ensure that urban development is socially just and sustainable, reflecting the concern for the negative impact of urban development on both the environment and the quality of life. Planning remains the tool to both prevent negative impact on the environment, and obtain maximum benefits for all communities in economic, social and environmental respects. The respective integration suggested is no longer just into ‘planning programmes’, as the Washington charter suggests making heritage an integral part of socioeconomic development and planning at every level.

Building on this concept, later documents put even more emphasis on this integration of both and the focus shifts from protecting heritage to improving the quality of life. Heritage should be managed by a sustainable and just approach (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) and should be at the heart of socioeconomic development (UNESCO, 2011b). So it seems that the integration of heritage policy into socioeconomic development has been recommended for a long time, and it is still at the core of the most recent recommendations and approached. This indicates that such integration in practice is far from established.

The documents describe the process of heritage management in three phases: understand context, develop strategy and manage action. The last-mentioned guides the actual action taken. This action is case-specific and according to the developed strategy, based upon a
thorough understanding of the historic urban landscape. However, there are also guidelines defined in relation to change action, setting general limits of acceptable change. These are much stronger in the ICOMOS documents than in the ones drafted by UNESCO. The general tolerance of change has been changing. The documents differentiate between the types of intervention, their acceptability, and/or determining what should or should not be done in case of intervention.

Change has always been an option, but the tolerance of it grew significantly over the decades. The aim in the first decades was to preserve and, if possible, very carefully reuse heritage (ICOMOS, 1964), without loss of significance, and to take measures to support the protection, conservation, presentation and transmission of cultural (and natural) heritage (UNESCO, 1972). In the 1980s and 1990s, the approach slowly moved towards more tolerance of change. ICOMOS (1987) takes the perspective that change can happen but only if it improves the current situation and does not harm the significance. Change should support the development and harmonious adaptation of heritage into contemporary life and the wellbeing of its residents, emphasizing the importance of the wider urban context. Burra rephrases this to ‘change as much as necessary but as little as possible’ and acknowledges it is possible that change is needed to retain the significance. The Burra definition of heritage management is ‘to facilitate the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance, while providing a sense of connection to community and landscape’. This idea of significance-led change has evolved through the years that followed, and in HUL (2011) the aim became to preserve and enhance the quality of the human environment. Transformation is now accepted as unavoidable. As such, conservation gets redefined as the management of change, as protection is a challenging form of transformation (Pereira Rodgers, 2013). This does not mean that the destruction or waste of heritage resources is condoned all of a sudden. It means that the limits of acceptable change can be tailored to the context. Heritage becomes a means to an end: to maintain a sustainable balance between urban growth and quality of life.

If change is inevitable, it needs to be managed to maintain this balance. As such, change is to be guided by what is left by previous generations (cultural significance), and by the needs of the present and future generations. Urban resources are considered crucial in this approach to sustainable transformation as material and cultural resource.

Who is, or should be, involved in heritage management?

The list of stakeholders seems to be getting longer by the decade. The type of stakeholders to be involved and their responsibilities are made more specific over the years (Figure 09) for example ‘community’ is divided into external community (e.g. wider public, local or national, and even tourists) and the direct community (e.g. inhabitants, users and developers). As for experts,
the tendency is to differentiate between experts from academia and those from practice. They can come from international, national or subnational levels, from policy, practice or academia, and from various disciplines, for instance urban development, conservation, socioeconomic development, transition management, archaeology, anthropology or architecture. Thus, there are many stakeholders in such processes that could play a role. The question is, to what extent?

What is their influence and responsibility? Several roles can be distinguished over the years:

- Stakeholders can be informed or educated
- Consulted (dialogue)
- Actively enrolled (executory)
- Decision-making.

The Venice Charter is focused on experts and practitioners, it is directly addressed to technicians and architects. They are expected to be taking the decisions. In the documents that follow, policymakers, politicians and public services are also ascribed roles and responsibilities. Experts are still expected to take an active role, preferably being the decision-makers, although it can also be the national or local authorities that are taking the final decision, based on the advice of experts. The WHC does recognize the interest of local communities in the process, though not with a specific responsibility. They should be informed and educated to respect and appreciate the appointed World Heritage.

Over the years, the documents seem to suggest a wider and wider range of possible stakeholders. Over the course of the 1970s, the emphasis started to be on participation and the inclusion of the local community as a stakeholder. First terminology changes from ‘informing’ to ‘requesting voluntary participation’, and later participation is even presented as a right and a duty for all (UN-HABITAT, 1976). Participation is linked to local identity and cultural diversity, because heritage first of all concerns the local community and the actual changes often directly impact their lives (ICOMOS, 1987). The shift from conflict to consensus models for environmental decision making gained rapid momentum during the late 1980s, accelerated by the rise of the concept of sustainable development (Peterson et al., 2005; World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). When looking at the responsibilities attributed to the various stakeholders, it seems that most stakeholders are given more responsibility. There is, however, still a hierarchy between governmental stakeholders (deciding), experts (enrolled) and community stakeholders (consulted). However, HUL is the first to advocate an equal role for expert and community stakeholders, while the governmental stakeholders are to take a decision based on all the consultations provided by experts and community.

Ever since, participation of the local community has been expected to bring about a more sustainable and culturally suitable approach to issues of environment and development. Local
practices and participation are considered a mainspring of sustainable development, and stimulating them is expected to be beneficial for the socioeconomic development of the local community. Doing so would mean that the local community has to be involved in all stages of the process. Subsequently, all stakeholder groups should get a bigger say in the whole process. Although this is suggested, especially the ICOMOS documents are rather reticent in this respect, holding back on recommending strong involvement and definitely no final power of decision.

Conclusion and discussion

The assumption is that there is an evolution, and thus a relation, between old and new concepts can be confirmed. A first concluding remark in this respect is that the understanding of heritage did not just evolve, but very much grew in complexity. The relation between values and attributes, tangible and intangible, became much more dynamic, and re-theorizing and demystifying these relations is important for a full understanding of the discourse until now. Attributes, whether tangible or intangible, are the actual objects of protection, conveying or creating value as a reason for protection. However, what may seem to be a value related to a tangible attribute can actually be an intangible attribute, or the other way round. In terms of heritage management, this distinction between what and why is very important, and in many cases it could be made much more clear. The management of an intangible attribute is likely to involve measures and actions that are distinct from the management of a tangible attribute, even when the protection of the attributes is based on the same values. For example, if the ‘evolution of an area’ is what is of value, this would mean that the tangible result of this evolution is less important (or not important at all) to keep. The management should be focused on keeping the evolutionary process going. On the other hand, if the ‘tangible result of a certain evolution’ is valued, management practices would focus on illustrating this past evolution. In most cases, tangible and intangible attributes coexist in the same heritage asset, representing the same or different values. Values disappear, evolve, or differ in time and between people or communities, as do attributes; it is yet to be discovered to what extent and at what pace an asset’s attributes and values change. The involvement of the various actors and the impact of governance on which attributes and values are recognized remains another question to be resolved; as is the variation in attributes and values acknowledged or prioritized based on the local or global perspectives (Labadi, 2013).

Secondly, the analysis confirms earlier studies on the increasing scale of attributes, from single object to landscape. This upscaling of attributes seems to be also related to the scale of the tools used, which range from, for example, listed buildings to protected areas and cultural landscapes. Locating attributes and values can be a difficult exercise, and a larger scale of
Locating attributes and values can be a difficult exercise, and a larger scale of the tools used, which range from, for example, listed buildings to protected areas and cultural single object to landscape. This upscaling of attributes seems to be also related to the scale of prioritized based on the local or global perspectives (Labadi, 2013).

Another question to be resolved; as is the variation in attributes and values acknowledged or and at what pace an asset's attributes and values change. The involvement of the various and between people or communities, as do attributes; it is yet to be discovered to what extent asset, representing the same or different values. Values disappear, evolve, or differ in time evolution. In most cases, tangible and intangible attributes coexist in the same heritage of a certain evolution' is valued, management practices would focus on illustrating this past if the 'evolution of an area' is what is of value, this would mean that the tangible result of attribute, even when the protection of the attributes is based on the same values. For example, many cases it could be made much more clear. The management of an intangible attribute is likely to involve measures and actions that are distinct from the management of a tangible attribute.

Thirdly, as theory evolved from an understanding of heritage as something that contains value, to something that conveys value, and most recently something that constitutes or creates value, the importance of the 'who' also grew. Value is no longer seen as something inherent to an attribute, which can be understood by experts, but as something that is created in every instance between object and subject. Acknowledging this wide variety of value creations, and thus local identity and diversity, has become a main focus in the heritage concept. In relation to this, the local practices in heritage management are increasingly recognized as more durable and sustainable to continue those attributes and values, not only because local practices are likely to have contributed to heritage as it is found today, but also because of their socioeconomic durability. The main aim is to address the full range of cultural diversity and identity in terms of attributes and values, and in terms of heritage management. This closely relates to the growing tolerance towards the level of involvement of stakeholders as revealed by the analysis. Heritage is increasingly seen as something that could make a very relevant contribution to the economic and social development of communities. Heritage management then becomes about social and spatial improvements while sustaining the existing qualities of the environment. From that point of view, a system of comprehensive participation is imperative and essential for succeeding in balancing conservation and development efforts. However, while in theory this may make the process more just and sustainable, citizen participation has also significantly complicated the whole heritage management process over the decades. Participation by no means necessarily produces consensus (Mouffe, 2000) and its outcomes may conflict with expert knowledge and approaches (Miciukiewicz and Vigar, 2012). Dealing with all those stakeholders, their roles and responsibilities, and the variety of outcomes and approaches, remains a challenge.
Finally, the analysis of the process shows that the documents shift from describing actions and what can and cannot be accepted in relation to heritage, to providing a process of steps to determine what would be acceptable in the specific case, in relation to the specific attributes and values. This again relates to the acknowledgement of the wide range of variations in cultural identity and the different choices that come with it.

By untangling the evolution of concepts and building a taxonomy based on it, we take an important step towards a better understanding of the theoretical framework underlying the definition of heritage in the supranational context. It starts to reveal the dynamics of what is valued and why, which can then be related to time, scale and cultural diversity. The analysis enables a discussion on the comprehensiveness of heritage management’s seminal international documents. The classification also serves as the foundation of the taxonomy-based policy analysis tool to set up comparative analysis. It can be used to further explore whether the influence of international discourse on subnational heritage policy is indeed significant and traceable in subnational policy. Analysing current subnational policies using the revealed categories is expected to reveal where and how sub- and supranational levels of governance relate.

This framework is to be further explored, not only to establish whether the categories and subcategories are applicable and comprehensive, but also to compare different categorization models, such as divergent evolution (as in the attribute categories) and parallel evolution (values). This would raise further understanding, continuing to build on the taxonomy for heritage management. Such taxonomy can also enable a global assessment of state of conservation practices, allowing for a comparative analysis between cities, countries and regions. This is only a small step towards the future, enabling the research community to support governments and communities in truly managing their heritage as a resource for sustainable development.
support governments and communities in truly managing their heritage as a resource for regions. This is only a small step towards the future, enabling the research community to conserve practices, allowing for a comparative analysis between cities, countries and values. This would raise further understanding, continuing to build on the taxonomy subcategories are applicable and comprehensive, but also to compare different categorization This framework is to be further explored, not only to establish whether the categories and governance relate.

The revealed categories is expected to reveal where and how sub- and supranational levels of significance and traceable in subnational policy. Analysing current subnational policies using international documents. The classification also serves as the foundation of the taxonomy-analysis enables a discussion on the comprehensiveness of heritage management's seminal what is valued and why, which can then be related to time, scale and cultural diversity. The definition of heritage in the supranational context. It starts to reveal the dynamics of cultural identity and the different choices that come with it.

Finally, the analysis of the process shows that the documents shift from describing actions and values. This again relates to the acknowledgement of the wide range of variations in determine what would be acceptable in the specific case, in relation to the specific attributes

### Figure 08: Taxonomy of attributes (WHAT) tangible above and intangible below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Experts Community</th>
<th>Politicians</th>
<th>National, regional local politicians, the administration, governors, aldermen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers</td>
<td>Those developing the plans and tools to manage the local resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Those carrying out the policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Scientific experts</td>
<td>Researchers, academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional experts</td>
<td>Consultancy, advice; e.g. technicians, advice, designers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-professional experts</td>
<td>Volunteer / amateur experts e.g. local experts, pressure groups, knowledge groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developers / private sector</td>
<td>Private parties with an (economic) stake in the place, to sell, develop, exploit, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly involved</td>
<td>Those in direct contact with the heritage, e.g. owners, residents, users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirectly involved</td>
<td>Community in general, e.g. the local, regional or national population, tourists, educators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 09: Taxonomy stakeholders (WHO).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Values</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Artistic, original product of creativity and imagination; product of a creator, conceptual, authentic exemplar of a decade, part of the History of Art or Architecture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Value oriented towards the production period; maturity, a piece of memory, reflecting the passage/lives of past generations; the marks of the time passage (patina) present on the attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>A potential to gain knowledge about the past; a testimonial of historic stylistic or artistic movements, or to concepts which are now part of history; related to an important event in the past; archaeological connection with ancient civilizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>An original result of human labour or craftsmanship; technical or traditional skills and/or connected materials; integral materialization or knowledge of conceptual intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Values</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Spiritual, beliefs, myths, religions, legends, stories, testimonial of past generations; collective and/or personal memory or experience; cultural identity; motivation and pride; sense of place; communal value. Representation of social hierarchy/status; Anthropological or ethnological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>The (spiritual or ecological) harmony between the building and its environment (natural and man-made); Identification of ecological concepts on practices, design and construction; manufactured resources to be reused, reprocessed or recycled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Values</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Educational role for political targets (e.g. birth-nations myths, glorification of political leaders); Part of management or strategies and policies (past or present) or for the dissemination of cultural awareness explored for political targets; Representing emblematic, power, authority and prosperous perceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The function and utility of the heritage, expired, original or attributed; The option to use it and/or bequest value for future generations; The role it might have (had) for market or industry; Property value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 Taxonomy values (WHY) adapted from (Tarrafa and Pereira Roders, 2012).
Figure 11: Process steps (HOW).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand context</th>
<th>Inventory and analyze</th>
<th>Inventory and analyse all human, natural and cultural resources within a historic urban landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define significance</td>
<td>Define threats, and/or the resources that are vulnerable to threats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategy</td>
<td>Decide which of those resources will be taken into account by developing supporting strategies (using existing or new policy / plans / actions / tools).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>Integrate those strategies in a wider framework of socio-economic and urban development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize</td>
<td>Prioritize the strategies as developed to protect or develop local resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build partnerships</td>
<td>Establish partnerships between different actors in relation to developed strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor change</td>
<td>Monitor, and thus re-inventory, the human, natural and cultural resources within a historic urban landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Taxonomy values (WHY) adapted from (Tarrafa and Pereira Roders, 2012).
Chapter 3
This chapter is a combination of the following two papers:


There is a lack of large-N comparative policy review in the field of cultural heritage. This impedes comparison between various levels of policy, and their evaluation and monitoring. It also largely precludes an effective feedback loop based on a wider comparative analysis. This chapter presents the results of testing a policy analysis tool developed to support comparative policy review.

Introduction

Heritage is a multidisciplinary field of study and practice, and to grapple with the complexities of heritage, we need to move beyond the traditional disciplines and the fragmentation of knowledge practices, which typically create isolated and competing investigations of heritage (Winter, 2012). This requires a common language. As for example Redford shows for the approaches to the landscape (Redford et al., 2003), and others for the landscape as concept (Printsmann et al., 2012; Stephenson, 2008; Stobbelaar and Pedroli, 2011), or for heritage as a concept (During, 2010), there is a need to further define and classify the landscape terminology as a platform of human engagement. This could also enable comparison between studies, disciplines, policies, places and people. One of the problems they all stress is confusion over terminology.

Multilevel governance

Heritage is not only multidisciplinary, but also subject to multilevel governance. A substantial body of laws, principles and policy guidelines ranging from supra- to subnational levels, has been developed in this context. These laws, principles and guidelines influence each other, and are also influenced by the evolving understanding of the nature of cultural heritage...
A taxonomy-based policy analysis tool

This chapter is a combination of the following two papers:

There is a lack of large-N comparative policy review in the field of cultural heritage. This impedes comparison between various levels of policy, and their evaluation and monitoring. It also largely precludes an effective feedback loop based on a wider comparative analysis. This chapter presents the results of testing a policy analysis tool developed to support comparative policy review.

Introduction

Heritage is multidisciplinary field of study and practice, and to grapple with the complexities of heritage, we need to move beyond the traditional disciplines and the fragmentation of knowledge practices, which typically create isolated and competing investigations of heritage (Winter, 2012). This requires a common language. As for example Redford shows for the approaches to the landscape (Redford et al., 2003), and others for the landscape as concept (Printsmann et al., 2012; Stephenson, 2008; Stobbelaar and Pedrol, 2011), or for heritage as a concept (During, 2010), there is a need to further define and classify the landscape terminology as a platform of human engagement. This could also enable comparison between studies, disciplines, policies, places and people. One of the problems they all stress is confusion over terminology.

Multilevel governance

Heritage is not only multidisciplinary, but also subject to multilevel governance. A substantial body of laws, principles and policy guidelines ranging from supra- to subnational levels, has been developed in this context. These laws, principles and guidelines influence each other, and are also influenced by the evolving understanding of the nature of cultural heritage
The main contributions of a landscape approach, specifically HUL, to the existing body of supranational policies were discussed in Chapter 2. The resulting taxonomy was applied in...
The main contributions of a landscape approach, specifically HUL, to the existing body of research, the hypothesis that a systematic method for vertical comparative policy analysis would be a valid way to obtain and analyse such data was tested. In addition to this lack of data, there is a substantial lack of data revealing impacts of previous supranational policies on subnational policy, and vice versa. While for example the 1962, the 1968, the 1976 and the 2011 UNESCO recommendations on heritage management all require reflective reporting, no official feedback on the supranational policies. The challenge of establishing the presence of heritage concepts in a subnational policy, and vice versa, is an important step towards developing a comparative framework to analyse the similarities between supranational and subnational levels of governance. The taxonomy was developed by charting the evolution of heritage concepts and subsequent management approaches in supranational policy over the past 50 years. While a comparison between policies could be made by standard document analysis, using the taxonomy, and specifically a policy analysis tool based on the taxonomy, was expected to make the analyses more systematic and reproducible. It would probably also make the results more comparable across case studies in a later stage. This chapter presents the application of this policy analysis tool (Figure 12) to test its workings as a method of comparative policy analysis.

As presented in Chapter 2, the taxonomy consists of 35 definitions. The tool (Figure 12) is divided into three main parts: WHAT, WHY, WHO. There are 18 taxonomy definitions in the WHAT part, making up six attribute categories; eight taxonomy definitions that make up the three value categories in the WHY part, and nine actor groups divided into three stakeholder categories in the WHO part. These three main parts are related to the eight process steps that define the HOW (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014b; Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a). The policy analysis tool builds upon the principle of multicriteria analysis. It relates the developed taxonomy to the process steps.

This chapter presents the results of testing the tool by means of three workshops in the form of focus group interviews. To get an integrated idea of the way the policies in Amsterdam are being applied and used, it was decided to not do a document analysis on the policy documents, but discuss them with the people developing and working with that policy on a daily basis. The aim of the workshops was to introduce governmental stakeholders from the case study city to the policy analysis tool, and to apply and validate it with them. Amsterdam was selected for several reasons. First of all, its urban areas range in cultural significance from non-designated to World Heritage, and the local government is actively involved in the heritage debate on multiple levels of governance. Next, in the nomination written for the inscription of Amsterdam’s 17th-century canal ring area on the UNESCO WH-list, the city positioned itself as historic urban landscape (De Jong et al., 2009), anticipating the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Doing so positions Amsterdam among the selective list of early adopters (Pereira Roders, 2013). Thirdly, cooperation with the governmental stakeholders in recent years has created an environment that is open for honest discussion on the various topics and results. Amsterdam claims to incorporate the most recent concepts of heritage, especially those recommended by HUL. While the aim of the workshop was to test the policy analysis tool, the participants obviously also explored this claim by means of the tool. The results were openly discussed with the participants. The tool was not developed to be able to judge the appropriateness of subnational policies or rate their successfulness. The aim is to understand how subnational policies are composed, and which concepts of cultural heritage are applied and how.
Workshops: a method for analysing policy

The application of the tool was tested by means of three workshops with policymakers and officers from both urban and heritage departments in Amsterdam. The workshop was chosen as a method for its participatory nature. Workshop as method creates a setting that approximates the normal context the participants work in (Ritchie et al., 2013). The interviewer also has less influence than in individual interviews (Sutherland et al., 2011). Moreover, a preliminary test with individual interviews in Amsterdam and Edinburgh revealed some disadvantages (Bennink et al., 2013; Bruin et al., 2013): the results were more detailed than necessary, and obtaining them was highly time-consuming. The results did suggest, though, that also comparison between cities is possible by this method. This, however, was not further explored in this research.

A set of workshops held in three cities on the Swahili coast led by Ron Van Oers and Ana Pereira Rodgers in 2011-2012 (Van Oers, 2013), and the knowledge developed in those workshops, was another reason for developing this method further. At those workshops, also community and expert stakeholder groups were represented. In the Amsterdam workshop, only governmental stakeholders were invited because the aim was to analyse policy as currently used in Amsterdam. Moreover, in the Swahili Coast Workshops a less complex method was used: the workshops were guided by the six process steps that accompany HUL. This was one of the case studies that led to the assumption that the results could be made more comparable by using a more systematic method, as was thus done in the Amsterdam workshops.

Series of three workshops: setup

A series of three workshops were designed to create a feedback loop in testing the tool, by introducing the tool (workshop 1), applying it (workshop 2) and validating the results (workshop 3). The first two workshops were afternoon sessions held two days apart in the spring of 2014. The third workshop was held in the autumn of 2014 to present and discuss the results of the first two sessions. All three meetings were formal, controlled and had a pre-arranged time and place. The data were processed anonymously. All discussions were audi-taped in order to capture qualitative data, complementary to the quantitative data from workshop 2.

For the first two workshops, a carefully selected group of 10 participants was invited. To determine the composition of the group, a sampling grid (Figure 14) was designed. This grid defines the focus group. It includes policy officers in the fields of heritage (H) and urban planning (U), from the (D) district/conservation area (Central Borough) or the city (C). This was done to enable an overview of, as well as, a comparison between groups. The participants came from a variety of departments within Amsterdam: the Planning Department (DRO); Bureau of Monuments and Archaeology (BMA); the Central Borough District; and Bureau...
of World Heritage (BWE). Participants were selected and invited by the main researcher, in
cooporation with the director of BWE.
During the first workshop, the participants were introduced to the topic of the research by
the main researcher. Two other researchers were present to support, observe, take notes,
and video- and audiotape the meeting. The participants were then asked to introduce their
work and affiliation. Thus, all participants were introduced to each other, the research and the
researchers.

The second workshop was dedicated to completing the framework by means of two parallel
focus group interviews, individually led by the two authors. Each group consisted of five
participants, covering the sampling grid. The afternoon was guided by the framework structure.
First, the process steps were addressed. Next, participants were asked to individually fill in the
tool (15 minutes), using the answers provided (Figure 13). This was followed by an open group
discussion on the tool (30 minutes). To fill in the tool, the participants were asked to indicate
whether the specific step was being taken in relation to each of the taxonomy definitions.
They were also asked to specify whether it is being applied only to designated heritage, or in
relation to all urban resources.

The third workshop was divided into two parts: presenting the results of the framework, and
discussing them. The workshop was designed for a larger group of participants (18 invited, 12
participated) including as many of the participants from the first two workshops as possible
(6/10). The results were presented in a plenary setting, while two parallel group sessions were
organized to discuss the results. The two groups comprised both original participants and new
participants. The semi-structured focus group interview was guided by the questions: ‘How do
the results represent the state of the policy in Amsterdam according to you, why?’ and ‘What
would you recommend for Amsterdam?’

Both the quantitative and qualitative data from the workshops have been analysed and
combined. The quantitative results per taxonomy definition have been merged into results per
category or per process step, using SPSS. Resulting cross-tables were translated into the line
and bar charts below. The qualitative data were transcribed from audio files. The document
was then rearranged to follow the process steps, stating what was said per category. Those
data were used to contextualize the quantitative results.

The process in Amsterdam
The outcomes are first discussed in general terms, after which they are detailed to highlight
the most notable results and correlations per category or matrix. The differences between
the subgroups as defined by the sampling grid (Figure 14) are also revealed. The results of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actors</td>
<td>values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly involved community</td>
<td>indirectly involved community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12:** The Policy Analysis Tool, which cross-references the process steps of the how, with the taxonomy of what, why, and who.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES for Heritage Resources (designated)</td>
<td>YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES for All Urban Resources</td>
<td>YA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13:** Range of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>URBAN DEPARTMENTS (U)</th>
<th>HERITAGE DEPARTMENTS (H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY (C)</td>
<td>2 to 3 participants (3)</td>
<td>2 to 3 participants (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT (D)</td>
<td>2 to 3 participants (2)</td>
<td>2 to 3 participants (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14:** Sampling grid participants Workshop; (x) = number of participants per group, workshop 1 & 2.

**Figure 15:** Results per category taken over all steps as a percentage of the total number of answers given in that matrix. »
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intangible attributes</th>
<th>Tangible attributes</th>
<th>Intangible attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asset attributes</td>
<td>asset attributes</td>
<td>asset attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area attributes</td>
<td>area attributes</td>
<td>area attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape attributes</td>
<td>landscape attributes</td>
<td>landscape attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asset related attributes</td>
<td>asset related attributes</td>
<td>asset related attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal attributes</td>
<td>societal attributes</td>
<td>societal attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process attributes</td>
<td>process attributes</td>
<td>process attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional values</td>
<td>traditional values</td>
<td>traditional values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal values</td>
<td>societal values</td>
<td>societal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process values</td>
<td>process values</td>
<td>process values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental stakeholders</td>
<td>governmental stakeholders</td>
<td>governmental stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert stakeholders</td>
<td>expert stakeholders</td>
<td>expert stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community stakeholders</td>
<td>community stakeholders</td>
<td>community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intangibles: categories**
- Process steps
  - step 1: inventory/resources
  - step 2: prioritize
  - step 3: define strategy
  - step 4: develop strategy
  - step 5: integrate strategies
  - step 6: build partnerships
  - step 7: monitor resources
  - step 8: monitor processes

**Tangibles: asset, area**
- Intangible attributes
- Asset related attributes
- Societal attributes
- Process attributes
- Traditional values
- Societal values
- Process values
- Governmental stakeholders
- Expert stakeholders
- Community stakeholders

**Process steps (HOW)**

**Trends/Variables (WHOA)**
- Processes
  - process
  - temporal

**Taxonomy definitions**
- Asset-related attributes
  - Landscape attributes
  - Asset-related attributes
  - Societal attributes
  - Process attributes
  - Traditional values
  - Societal values
  - Process values
  - Governmental stakeholders
  - Expert stakeholders
  - Community stakeholders

**Figure 15: Results per category taken over all steps as a percentage of the total number of answers given in that matrix.**
the first two workshops are put into perspective by the discussions of those results during third workshop. As the comments between the two groups in workshop 3 (original and new participants) were not significantly different in most cases, they are used in general terms – unless there is a reason to do otherwise.

HOW: trends on the process steps

The process steps were first discussed, and then related to the taxonomy. The participants agreed that while the eight process steps were familiar and ideal, they do not necessarily reflect reality. The selection and order of steps taken is tailored per project. In addition, the discussion on the steps showed that the participants felt that “defining vulnerability” (step 3) was the least common part of the process. Moreover, a few participants wondered whether they had much influence on what was being prioritized (step 6) and if they questioned whether the integration of heritage management strategies in larger sustainable urban development frameworks (step 5) was already happening enough.

An analysis of the quantitative results derived from the matrix, however, shows a more nuanced image (Appendix E: Results of Workshop). When all answers are combined per step, it shows that steps 1–2 and 4–5 are best known, followed by steps 3 and 7. Steps 6 (prioritizing) and 8 (monitoring) are much less well established. The results indicate that the better-known steps are also the ones that have significantly more “Yes for All” answers, and are thus the ones taken for all resources. None of the steps is focused on heritage resources only.

The different sampling grid groups (Figure 14) all follow the same pattern when it comes to the overall knowledge of the steps. Their main difference was that the participants from urban departments (vs. heritage departments) or who work on the city scale (vs. district scale) tend to answer in the affirmative more often for all steps. During the third workshop this was discussed by the participants, and confirmed for those groups who work on larger areas, which include heritage. Some participants from the heritage departments emphasized that the amount of resources inventoried by other urban departments that they were unaware of, especially on the city level, surprised them. The results from the steps that did not match the expected results (3, 5, 6, 7, 8) are discussed below.

Vulnerability (step 3) turns out to be a concept that is seldom dealt with by especially the heritage departments. Instead, the idea of proactively defining the vulnerabilities of a certain area was considered a rather common step by the urban departments. The focus of heritage is on defining value and to develop policy that protects those values against all possible threats, the principle being that everything of value is vulnerable. All participants agreed that imminent threats are a motive for changes in the approach to heritage. It was therefore mentioned that value and vulnerability should probably both be defined and analysed more consciously and
in relation to each other. It could especially be useful in proving a firmer foundation for large transformation projects.

When it comes to the integration (step 5) into wider development policies, the participants explained that for a few years now, there has been a legal obligation to integrate heritage policy within larger urban development frameworks. This more territorial way of working seems to comply with the idea of landscape approach. The implementation is ongoing, and the participants were cautiously positive about the process. On average, the step on integration scored relatively high. The hesitance on this step at the beginning of workshop 2 could thus very well be related to the fact that they are in the middle of a transition with regards to this step.

The participants said that they lack knowledge of prioritising (step 6) because the process tends to follow political priorities rather than any specific pre-set attribute or value. The socioeconomic development of the local community is a main priority, and with changing needs come changing priorities. Also, those priorities are often defined per district, so an overview is lacking. In addition, the participants saw selection via defining value or vulnerability as ways of prioritizing. A critical note from the participants was that the long-term agenda for Amsterdam focuses mostly on the perspective of economic development; the historic perspective is not really part of it. However, such development can and should preferably be done without dismissing the values of the historic environment.

Building partnerships as a process step (7) was immediately associated with the involvement of the local community and much less with other forms of partnerships, for example with developers, universities or advisory bodies. The participants were convinced that there are associations and pressure groups for almost everything – from gable stones and plaques, to local parks and beyond. The data show they are mostly formed around the attributes in the object and area categories, for instance buildings, building elements, or ensembles. Indeed, there are probably many of those ‘partnerships’, just not within all categories. The third workshop added the perspective that the partnerships are usually created bottom-up, and are temporary and reactive by default. As such, their focus is mostly out of the control of the policymakers.

Monitoring (step 8) seems to be focused mostly on the assets category, which is by far the only category with high scores in other steps. Many of the taxonomy definitions are being inventoried though not monitored, which indicates a gap between collecting and comparing data over time. When presented with these results, participants confirmed that monitoring is often not undertaken in a comprehensive way even when data are collected that could inform such monitoring, mostly due to lack of time and/or resources. There is awareness of the current lack of monitoring, and the added value of doing it – especially on a wider scale. However, there
is also a critical note: it has to be done in a transparent way, with impartiality and accuracy, as the selection of data could easily bias outcomes.

Taxonomy categories in Amsterdam

When the analysis is turned around, by looking at the taxonomy, combining all steps, one gains a better understanding of the presence of the concepts in policy according to the participants. Figure 15 shows the average answer of all steps combined, per category, for all participants combined. It reveals that especially dealing with the category ‘landscape attributes’ and especially the ‘process attributes’ are not commonly used. This was confirmed in the discussions. Some participants stated they did not ever consider process attributes to be heritage. What stands out is the significant difference between the ‘Yes for All’ resources (YA) and ‘Yes for Heritage’ resources (YH) in the WHY part. Especially social and process values are not found in heritage policy. This could indicate a very good integration, or a bias for certain values over others. To give a more nuanced overview, the following paragraphs present the results in more detail (per category per step), highlighting the most notable results and their interpretation.

WHAT: Tangible attributes

First, the tangible attributes are discussed, comparing the asset, area and landscape categories (Figure 08, Figure 16) In general, knowledge is highest for the asset category, a bit lower for the area category, and much lower for the landscape category. This indicates that most of the policy known and used by the participants is directed at assets and areas, and less so at the entire urban landscape. The landscape category also seems to have a stronger link to vulnerability (step 3) while the other two categories are more present when it comes to defining values (step 2). Next, in contrast to the other two, the landscape category is mostly considered in relation to all resources (YA), and does not indicate a strong relation with heritage policies. For the asset and area categories, the positive answers are more equally divided between the two answer options (YH, YA). Together, the results indicate a divide between the landscape category and the other two. When made specific for the participant groups from the sampling grid, those from the urban departments and those working on the city scale more often acknowledged the landscape category, whereas there is no significant difference in answers in the other two categories. This indicates that urban and heritage policies when it comes to asset and area categories are well integrated, in contrast to the landscape category. The difference between participants working on the district level and the city level follows the general trend presented above: city-scale participants are more likely to know about all the categories.
In summary, urban-scale participants are more likely to know about all categories, whereas heritage policies are more often acknowledged for the landscape category. The integration of asset and area categories is considered in relation to all resources. The landscape category is mostly considered in relation to vulnerability, and does not indicate a strong relation with heritage. The results show a divide between the participants, with heritage policies considered more often by urban-scale participants and asset and area categories considered more often by urban departments and city-scale participants.
In the third workshop, although the participants said they recognized the results, there was a discussion on definitions. Most participants said they would consider the ‘landscape’ category an important part of the local policy, based on their own definition of the word – which actually corresponded with the definitions that are part of the asset and area categories in the taxonomy.

A last notable finding is the emphasis on the asset category when it comes to monitoring (step 8) and a lack of monitoring in the other two categories. This was also mentioned during the discussion: a system combining indicators to monitor entire areas or even entire urban landscapes, especially in relation to heritage, even if considered useful, is not the standard. A ‘territorial monitor’ was said to be emerging as a tool in heritage management, for the Canal Zone (as a World Heritage area). However, this is still a focus on a specific area and does not aim for an overview of the entire historic urban landscape.

Summary: The taxonomy definitions represent an evolution of definitions in international guidelines; the definitions that make up the landscape category are the ‘newest’ when it comes to heritage management. Indeed, Amsterdam follows this pattern: whereas the landscape category is not entirely lacking, it is not commonly acknowledged. Next, the asset and area categories are more heritage and value driven and fairly well integrated. The landscape category is more urban and vulnerability driven, and for this category integration seems less well established. Finally, the gap between inventory and monitoring is significant for the area and landscape categories.

WHAT: Intangible attributes

The intangible categories are defined as asset-related attributes, societal attributes and process attributes (Figure 08, Figure 17). Both the quantitative data and the outcomes of the discussions show that the Amsterdam participants are, on average, less familiar with the intangible categories. The most familiar category is the asset-related attributes category. In addition, the participants are less, but still reasonably familiar with the societal category, but much less so with the process category. However, even though the better-known categories score high on the first couple of steps, they are not perceived as well embedded in the second half of the process. This trend is even stronger for the process attributes. In addition, most of the positive answers in all three categories came from participants from urban departments (vs. heritage departments). Typically they would answer ‘Yes for Heritage’, indicating they think (assume?) that some of the steps are being taken for the intangible categories when it comes to heritage. On the other hand, the participants from the heritage departments were not even sure whether it was being done at all. It can be questioned how well the intangible categories are really part of the process, and in addition how well they are integrated when it comes to heritage. On the other hand, the participants from the heritage departments were not even sure whether it was being done at all. It can be questioned how well the intangible categories are really part of the process, and in addition how well they are integrated when it comes to heritage management.

The intangible categories are defined as asset-related attributes, societal attributes and process attributes (Figure 08, Figure 17). Both the quantitative data and the outcomes of the discussions show that the Amsterdam participants are, on average, less familiar with the intangible categories. The most familiar category is the asset-related attributes category. In addition, the participants are less, but still reasonably familiar with the societal category, but much less so with the process category. However, even though the better-known categories score high on the first couple of steps, they are not perceived as well embedded in the second half of the process. This trend is even stronger for the process attributes. In addition, most of the positive answers in all three categories came from participants from urban departments (vs. heritage departments). Typically they would answer ‘Yes for Heritage’, indicating they think (assume?) that some of the steps are being taken for the intangible categories when it comes to heritage. On the other hand, the participants from the heritage departments were not even sure whether it was being done at all. It can be questioned how well the intangible categories are really part of the process, and in addition how well they are integrated when it comes to heritage management.
comes to heritage and urban policies. A comparison between the city and district level shows that both the societal and the process category are more common among participants working on a city scale. Most partnerships in intangible categories, if they exist, seem to be formed on a district level, however.

Summary: Significant differences between the sampling grid groups indicate that especially the societal and process categories, if they exist, are operated on the city level, and it is questionable whether they are well embedded in any urban or heritage policy. The asset-related category was familiar to all participants.

In the third workshop, it became clear that the definition of intangible heritage as used by the participants was often interchangeable with ‘what society considers valuable’ as opposed to ‘expert’ values. The intangible is rather directly linked it to participation and the co-creation of values. The participants perceived the difference between tangible and intangible as theoretical. They said they found it hard to separate the two. It is often the tangible and material that they have to work with and decide upon. One of the participants even said that the intangible is a bonus that follows the tangible. This is a confirmation of the very low scores on steps 5–8. However, the participants did say that they felt that intangible heritage has been growing in importance in recent years. They expressed a clear interest in better understanding how to define, manage and monitor those categories, and in better understanding the relation between tangible and intangible categories.

WHY: Values

Figure 18 presents the results of the matrix on values (WHY) for the traditional, societal and process value categories (Figure 10). What immediately stands out in relation to the previous two graphs is that the number of positive answers in the categories is evenly distributed. No category was found less understood than another. With an average of around 80% positive answers, the values seem particularly important in the inventory (1), definition of value (2), strategy (4) and integration (5) steps. Interestingly, for the societal and process value categories, the ratio between YA and YH answers is circa 80/20. In contrast, the traditional values category is much stronger related to heritage resources (YH). This indicates that heritage policy applied to Amsterdam generally focuses more on the traditional value category, whereas policies that apply to all resources focus more on the societal and process value categories. During the third workshop, the participants confirmed that Amsterdam policy and people aim to use a value-driven management. This is especially true for those from the heritage departments.

Although values are important in various steps, the gap between inventory and monitoring is rather large in this matrix. When there are monitoring systems in place, the focus is very much
on changes to the attributes, and much less on value loss. The same goes for the territorial
monitors that are being developed, and some thematic monitors (e.g. tourism pressure).

Summary: The traditional value categories are more easily associated with heritage resources
by all participants, while the societal and process value categories are associated more with
urban resources.

WHO: Actors

The results concerning the three actor categories (Figure 09), namely governmental, expert
and community can be found in Figure 19. In this case, the specific role of the stakeholder
category was asked for, differentiating between decision making, enrolled, consulted,
informed or no role. The results first of all show that the level of the participants’ knowledge of
stakeholder involvement is relatively high. Steps that had rather high rates of ‘NO/?’ answers
in the other three matrices do not follow the same pattern here, except for the monitoring step
(8). In all steps, the governmental stakeholders are most likely to be present, and they are also
In all steps, the governmental stakeholders are most likely to be present, and they are also informed or no role. The results first of all show that the level of the participants' knowledge of category was asked for, differentiating between decision making, enrolled, consulted, and community can be found in Figure 19. In this case, the specific role of the stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Consulted</th>
<th>Informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Results per category per step for the WHO matrix.

Figure 20: Results per stakeholder group, taken over all steps of the WHO matrix.

Results per taxonomy definition | who

- NO/?
- decision making
- enrolled
- consulted
- informed
Applying such approach to the entire city is still considered a long way from becoming reality.

rather controlled environment, with a community known to treasure their historic environment.

the value (step 2) of their direct environment. This is new in Amsterdam and is done only in a

the exercise in the future, in order to monitor changes. It is unclear whether there are also plans

measure this, a baseline measurement is been undertaken to inventory the community’s

community participation. Their own suggestion is to develop community awareness. To

obligated to do according to their current policy, they concluded that they should strengthen

Even though the participants said that they do more regarding participation than they are legally

expected big differences between the three taxonomy definitions (politicians, policymakers and officers), as decisive power would lie with politicians, whereas the policymakers were ‘only’ expected to be enrolled. The expectation is indeed reflected in the results. Participants also said that policymakers and officers are actually also subject experts. As such, they perceive it as logical that fewer external experts are involved. Community stakeholders are mostly informed, while this is confirmed by the participants, it is also a somewhat disturbing result for some participants. They consider themselves to have a highly participatory approach. According to the participants, the community has power because politicians tend to listen to some of the concerns and ideas they voice. However, they also said that there is no standard procedure to get the community involved throughout the process.

In the third workshop, participants said that, especially regarding the role of the governmental stakeholders; they expected big differences between the three taxonomy definitions (politicians, policymakers and officers), as decisive power would lie with politicians, whereas the policymakers were ‘only’ expected to be enrolled. The expectation is indeed reflected in the results. Participants also said that policymakers and officers are actually also subject experts. As such, they perceive it as logical that fewer external experts are involved. Community stakeholders are mostly informed, while this is confirmed by the participants, it is also a somewhat disturbing result for some participants. They consider themselves to have a highly participatory approach. According to the participants, the community has power because politicians tend to listen to some of the concerns and ideas they voice. However, they also said that there is no standard procedure to get the community involved throughout the process.

Even though the participants said that they do more regarding participation than they are legally obligated to do according to their current policy, they concluded that they should strengthen community participation. Their own suggestion is to develop community awareness. To measure this, a baseline measurement is been undertaken to inventory the community’s general knowledge of the cultural significance of the World Heritage site. They intend to repeat the exercise in the future, in order to monitor changes. It is unclear whether there are also plans to do so in relation to other designated urban areas in Amsterdam or the entire historic urban landscape. The most common perception of co-creation among the Amsterdam participants is that they work with owners of designated heritage as ‘temporary stewards’. One pilot project was mentioned in which the inhabitants are the decision makers when it comes to defining the value (step 2) of their direct environment. This is new in Amsterdam and is done only in a rather controlled environment, with a community known to treasure their historic environment. Applying such approach to the entire city is still considered a long way from becoming reality.
Quick scan
The matrix tool was developed to review or compare subnational policies in relation to supranational policy (and vice versa) by means of an evolutionary taxonomy. While analysing the quantitative results and their relation to the qualitative ones takes time, they revealed a wide range of insights, as presented above. However, the completed matrices of all participants combined gave an immediate overview. Figure 21 shows steps 1–5 (columns) of the WHAT Tangible matrix for all 10 participants (rows). Within each step, the newer terminology has more white (NO) blocks, and is thus less well known. Also steps 3 and 5 have a larger number of white blocks in general, indicating that they are less well known than steps 1, 2 and 4. Moreover, when looking at the background of the participants as presented in the first two columns, it can be seen that those with a heritage background who work for the borough are more inclined to give a ‘No/don’t know’ answer. A more detailed version of these results was presented above as they were also found in the full analysis. As such, the matrix also works as a quick scan.

Conclusion
The taxonomy-based policy analysis tool is a multidimensional coding system (e.g. the taxonomy definition, per step, for all resources/heritage resources). The taxonomy can be understood as a way to ‘break down’ the concept of heritage, specifying attributes, values and stakeholders. It allows for the policy to be analysed and discussed in a fragmented manner. The overview is temporarily taken away from the participants, and is returned when merging and analysing the complete set of answers per category or matrix.

Workshops
Overall, the participants found completing the matrices tough but also elaborate. In addition to the time needed to become more familiar with some of the taxonomy, every question required careful consideration and discussion. Consequently, completing the matrices during workshop 2 took almost twice as long as initially foreseen. The participant groups took a different approach to deal with this lack of time. One group mainly focused on discussing all the questions, and completed the frameworks parts during those discussions. This precluded having individual results. However, the results per participant still differed, so even in discussion, there was not necessarily consensus. The other group focused on completing the framework on an individual basis. They therefore had hardly any time to discuss the outcomes, leading to a lack of qualitative data. In both cases, it is hard to compare the individual to the group outcomes. For future application of the policy analysis tool, the intensity of the
### Figure 21: 'Quickscan', results per person (n=10) per definition, per step (1–5) for the WHAT TANGIBLE matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Content or setting</th>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>Natural element</th>
<th>Urban element</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Building element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes for Heritage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>Yes for All resources</td>
<td>Yes for Heritage</td>
<td>No / Don't know</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Urban element</td>
<td>Natural element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the three workshops, it became clear that the participants found some of the taxonomy difficult to apply. In some cases, the participants were unclear about the definitions and their application. Points of discussion regarding the policy analysis were also found. Both anticipated and surprising outcome results from workshop 2 were confirmed by workshop 3, the group of new participants seemed to be a little wary of (or alienated from) the tool were also found. Discussions of the Amsterdam government. Points of discussion regarding the policy analysis were also found. Both anticipated and surprising outcome results from workshop 2 were confirmed by workshop 3, the group of new participants seemed to be a little wary of (or alienated from) the tool were also found. Both anticipated and surprising outcome results from workshop 2 were confirmed by workshop 3, the group of new participants seemed to be a little wary of (or alienated from) the tool were also found.
programme should be considered and at least one hour per matrix is advisable, along with a
general introduction and discussion of the steps. The workshops only included governmental
stakeholders as participants. Future workshops could include a wider range of stakeholders –
for example decision makers, or representatives of all stakeholder categories – as this would
allow a comparison of perceptions.

The set-up of the workshops – introduce, apply and discuss the tool – was generally perceived
as a good way to foster communication and increase cooperation. As participants came from
both urban and heritage departments within the city, the discussions also contributed the
integration of those departments’ management processes. Together, the workshops allowed
for a well-grounded and informed discussion on the current practices with and between the
participants.

Taxonomy

During the three workshops, it became clear that the participants found some of the taxonomy
hard to grasp. The confusion over terminology as introduced is thus confirmed. Sometimes the
taxonomy was not clear, sometimes also the language may have been a problem, translating
from English to Dutch and vice versa. Some definitions in the taxonomy were unknown, or
not considered in the context of heritage. Also, distinguishing between the answer options
given (YH ‘yes for heritage’ and YA ‘yes for all urban resources’) needed some discussion to
determine what was supposed to be considered as heritage (everything subject to specific
heritage policy). In this context, it also seemed difficult to think of heritage from a holistic
perspective, namely as a landscape, including all its tangible, intangible, cultural, natural,
movable and immovable elements. Those dimensions of heritage are not unknown, but they
are often applied to a specific property or ensemble rather than to the landscape as a whole.

Although the participants were given a list of definitions (as also given in Figure 08–11),
throughout the workshops the importance of clarity on the definitions used in the taxonomy
was a recurring issue. The daily use of especially the definitions in the ‘landscape’ and
‘intangible’ categories did not match the definitions as used in this taxonomy. Particularly in
workshop 3, the group of new participants seemed to be a little wary of (or alienated from) the
results due to the difference in terminology.

Both anticipated and surprising outcome results from workshop 2 were confirmed by workshop
3. The tool seems to correctly reveal the themes that need work within the Amsterdam policy
context. This does not mean the results are representative, but they definitely provide points of
discussion for the Amsterdam government. Points of discussion regarding the policy analysis
tool were also found.
Amsterdam

As expected, due to its pioneer role in heritage management, it can be confirmed that Amsterdam has a heritage management system that follows the patterns in supranational policy. As such, the results also begin to confirm the evolutionary logic of the framework. As most of the newer categories are borrowed from the urban disciplines, it was expected that those categories would be more common among the urban participants, and more likely to be done for ‘all resources’.

Based on the results presented above, the policymakers in Amsterdam can now reconsider their policies and processes. Even in Amsterdam – a city that is considered a forerunner and that is a self-proclaimed historic urban landscape – the new approach has not been fully implemented. The disparities, similarities and complementarities between urban and heritage policies, processes and departments can now be debated. Especially the disparities are food for thought, as they seem to preclude the holistic approach HUL aims for. For example, the integration by means of further developing a common language addressing the differences in meaning of the concepts such as area and landscape as applied in the different departments; and the focus (or lack thereof) on certain attributes and values, such as the limited use and perception of intangible heritage, could be part of the discussion. The further inclusion of various stakeholders in all steps of the process could be improved. Departmental silos still exist, as does the separation between governmental and other stakeholder groups. In addition, the varying role and involvement of community stakeholders per process step could be reviewed. Moreover, the less established steps in the process, such as ‘defining vulnerability’ and ‘monitoring’, could be addressed to increase integration.

All points of discussion show the need for further integration, co-creation and cooperation by, for example, matching taxonomies between departments. A next step would be to tackle the question ‘How can this be done?’ The analysis by means of the policy analysis tool is a first step, as a method to reveal the discussion points, and also to indicate possible paths. This analysis, however, does not indicate which tools and strategies could be used to strengthen or establish integration. By revealing the gaps, a much more tailored strategy can be developed to fill those gaps, if that is considered needed by the stakeholders.

A taxonomy-based framework as a method

In this research, a policy analysis tool was used to analyse subnational urban and heritage policies. The results revealed the discrepancies and similarities with supranational policy. This supports a more tailored implementation of the concepts from supranational guidelines in heritage management into the subnational policy context. The results in Amsterdam confirm this, as the policy analysis tool allowed the interviewees to assess, reflect, and decide whether
or not to review their policies in relation to what is being recommended. Breaking down the heritage concept and discussing the smaller pieces per process step seems to break down the main narrative as carried out by the local representatives. Putting the narrative back together reveals known and unknown gaps in policy, such as a focus on tangible attribute categories and the traditional value category, but also a lack of monitoring and the relatively low involvement of community in certain process steps. The sample grid also allows an understanding of the differences in focus between urban and heritage policies. To really understand and validate the working of the policy analysis tool, further research is needed – not only on a wider range of case studies and stakeholders, but also on defining the heritage concepts that make up the taxonomy.

While further research is needed to refine and optimize the tool and taxonomy, the testing also confirmed that such a taxonomy-based tool is promising for the analysis of urban and heritage policies. It offers a way to produce structured and comparative results on a qualitative and a quantitative level. The method is more complicated but also more comprehensive and multidimensional than the method used in the previously mentioned workshops on the Swahili coast. Those workshops were directed towards the HOW (process), taking the attribute, value and stakeholder categories as used locally. The results of those workshops are still very valuable, but they largely preclude comparison between policies in terms of attributes, values and stakeholders. Moreover, the taxonomy seemed to challenge the participants in Amsterdam to reflect on their definition of heritage and revealed differences in definition between departments.

Discussion

As stated, the policy analysis tool was not developed to judge the appropriateness of subnational policies or rate their success. The aim is to understand how subnational policies are composed in relation to supranational recommendations, by understanding which concepts of cultural heritage are used and how. Amsterdam is only a start; more case studies should follow to further confirm the validity of the tool. Moreover, more stakeholder groups could be involved, and a sequence of workshops in one city would also give more insights into the value of the tool as a policy-monitoring tool. The tool is only one application of the taxonomy. The taxonomy as a theoretical framework for a comparative analysis tool is also to be tested further, possibly even an automated version.

The taxonomy underpinning this framework was derived from supranational reference texts. However, when this taxonomy is used by the various stakeholders for the analysis of existing policies or other heritage management practices, it might very well prove to be incomplete. A periodic inventory of suggested additions can provide evidence-based arguments as to the
revision or development of future supranational reference texts. By using a pre-set taxonomy as a point of reference, it is possible to reveal changes in policies throughout time and/or in place, and stakeholders gain a common ground. Ideas and values differ and evolve, as should this taxonomy, as then it will continue to reflect its time and actors and to create insights into the rationale behind heritage management. In this way, the process of reconsidering and redirecting the involved policies can be informed, to continue protecting what society values, reflecting their cultural identity.
revision or development of future supranational reference texts. By using a pre-set taxonomy as a point of reference, it is possible to reveal changes in policies throughout time and/or in place, and stakeholders gain a common ground. Ideas and values differ and evolve, as should this taxonomy, as then it will continue to reflect its time and actors and to create insights into the rationale behind heritage management. In this way, the process of reconsidering and redirecting the involved policies can be informed, to continue protecting what society values, reflecting their cultural identity.
Chapter 4

This thesis is based upon the assumption that to work interdisciplinarily or even transdisciplinarily, a common language is needed. However, the developed taxonomy and its application are to be tested and explored much further. This chapter presents an exploration of applications of the taxonomy, and an improved list of definitions to be used for its future use.

Introduction

The assumption in this research is that a method of cross-referencing domain-dependent taxonomy applied by means of an analysis tool will support the comparison, and thus linking, of levels of governance. The underlying agenda was to see whether this method could also be used to compare knowledge from other forms of empirical and case-based research to develop a more fundamental understanding of the heritage discipline by means of large-N comparative analysis of heritage management practices, policies and processes.

Heritage management is a cultural practice. As such, an inclusive and ongoing debate – a process of reconsideration, redevelopment and reiteration of the concepts and idea(l)s behind heritage management – is indispensable. The presented research traced part of this debate, as solidified in policy, in the recent history of heritage management to reveal the embedded taxonomy. This was led by the questions: What is heritage? Why is heritage heritage? Who is involved in the process of heritage management? And how is heritage being managed? However, the process between revealing, developing and applying taxonomy is reciprocal.

This chapter presents the further development of the taxonomy and its applications, in the context of this reciprocal process.

To understand the relation and impact of the approaches that are to be integrated, comparative analysis between studies, disciplines, policies, places and perspectives of people can be useful. One of the problems that preclude such a comparison in the context of the landscape
This thesis is based upon the assumption that to work interdisciplinarily or even transdisciplinarily, a common language is needed. However, the developed taxonomy and its application are to be tested and explored much further. This chapter presents an exploration of applications of the taxonomy, and an improved list of definitions to be used for its future use.

Introduction

The assumption in this research is that a method of cross-referencing domain-dependent taxonomy applied by means of an analysis tool will support the comparison, and thus linking, of levels of governance. The underlying agenda was to see whether this method could also be used to compare knowledge from other forms of empirical and case-based research to develop a more fundamental understanding of the heritage discipline by means of large-N comparative analysis of heritage management practices, policies and processes.

Heritage management is a cultural practice. As such, an inclusive and ongoing debate — a process of reconsideration, redevelopment and reiteration of the concepts and idea(l)s behind heritage management — is indispensable. The presented research traced part of this debate, as solidified in policy, in the recent history of heritage management to reveal the embedded taxonomy. This was led by the questions: What is heritage? Why is heritage heritage? Who is involved in the process of heritage management? And how is heritage being managed? However, the process between revealing, developing and applying taxonomy is reciprocal. This chapter presents the further development of the taxonomy and its applications, in the context of this reciprocal process.

To understand the relation and impact of the approaches that are to be integrated, comparative analysis between studies, disciplines, policies, places and perspectives of people can be useful. One of the problems that precludes such a comparison in the context of the landscape
approach is the confusion over terminology (During, 2010; Printsmann et al., 2012; Redford et al., 2003; Stephenson, 2008; Stobbelaar and Pedroli, 2011). In addition, neither landscape nor heritage is a static concept. There is a general consensus on the idea that what society values, and why, is constantly changing, and as such the approaches society develops to deal with heritage will probably keep changing too (Harvey, 2001; Holtorf, 2012; Logan, 2012). Therefore, both clarity and flexibility are needed when it comes to developing common language. The developed taxonomy and its application are to be tested and explored much further than the one case in Amsterdam. This chapter presents an exploration of applications of the taxonomy, and an improved list of definitions for its future use.

Taxonomy related

The aim of the research was not to find the absolute answers to the what, why, how and who questions, but to make their answers comparable. The questions, together with the taxonomy, can be used to analyse and categorize the content of existing documents on and practices in heritage management. Taxonomy can be used to analyse and categorize the what, why, who and how separately. As shown in Figure 22, they can also be related to each other in different ways (black): what is heritage and why; what is heritage and who manages it; what is heritage and how is it managed; as well as why – who; why – how; who – how, and the reverse (grey). To add another dimension, instead of just understanding whether there is a relation, the relation could be differentiated, as is done in the policy analysis tool by adding dimensions of integration (‘yes for all’, ‘yes for heritage’) or dimensions of responsibility (decision making, enrolled, consulted, informed). This way, various multidimensional coding systems could be designed on the basis of the developed taxonomy.

The policy analysis tool was used to analyse and compare urban and heritage policy in Amsterdam, and the framework was used to structure interviews and workshops with stakeholders. Another application would be to analyse various documents by means of text analysis, as tested by MSc students (Bennink et al., 2013; Bruin et al., 2013). While they all proved relevant, the policy analysis tool is just one way the taxonomy could be used. Although the validity of the application of the framework as presented in Figure 12 (and Figure 22), still needs further validation, it is expected that the taxonomy can support comparison of policies horizontally (e.g. various national policies), vertically (e.g. supranational vs. national policies) or in time (e.g. heritage policies since the 1950s). The tool could possibly also be used to analyse and compare other types of documents and practices, such as nomination files, management plans and practices, or impact assessments. Chapter 3 showed that the taxonomy can be used to ‘break down’ the concepts underpinning heritage management, specifying on process steps, attributes, values and actors.
Taxonomy applied

An example of a further application of the taxonomy is a tool to analyse the attributes and values of a heritage landscape as mentioned by, for example, a nomination file, the local community or a management plan. Following the HUL approach, heritage management should be based on the attributes and values mentioned in a nomination file (e.g. in a Statement of Significance). Revealing the attributes and values in such documents in a systematic way can be done by means of an analysis tool, such as the one presented in Figure 23. The researcher can first identify the attributes and values in the document by asking ‘What is heritage and why?’ and then categorising all individual attributes and values and their relations by means of the taxonomy. An earlier version of this tool was successfully applied in case studies on Mozambique Island and Singapore Botanic Gardens (Caballero, 2014; Damen et al., 2013).

This version of the tool was used to identify attributes and their respective values in the case studies’ World Heritage nomination files, and relate them to the attributes and values found in local management plan documents. The comparison indicated differences between what was nominated to be heritage and what was being protected by means of the heritage management framework that was in place. The differences were then further researched by means of fieldwork. Ongoing research in Durham shows how such an analysis is executed (Figure 25) on a nomination text (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2015a) and its tentative results (Figure 24).

A list of site-specific attributes and values could be taken further and related to each other. The categorization can provide an understanding of the focus of the document in terms of attributes (Figure 23, 24 1–18) and values (A-I). It will also allow relating the types of attributes and values in the document (Figure 23, 24 A1 – I18). As described above, such a categorization can assist in the comparison between the types of attributes and values, and their relations, mentioned in different documents, such as a nomination file and a management plan. Such a comparison could indicate a difference or shift in focus between the documents or in time, which in turn could suggest effective management, or the lack thereof. Moreover, an attribute and value analysis could also help when comparing different heritage sites, or the attributes and values ascribed by different stakeholder groups, and support peer learning. If the answers to ‘What is heritage and why?’ for two sites are comparable in taxonomy, then perhaps their management is also comparable. Or perhaps the stakeholders can learn from each other’s approaches. The outcomes can stimulate discussion based on the revealed similarities and differences. They will provide feedback on the documents and practices as they are now, and provide input for future plans.
### Table: Revealing and relating attributes and values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>Intangible Attributes</th>
<th>Tangible Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Element (Knowledge, traditions, practices)</td>
<td>C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7 C8 C9 C10 C11 C12 C13 C14 C15 C16 C17 C18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Community (People)</td>
<td>D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 D6 D7 D8 D9 D10 D11 D12 D13 D14 D15 D16 D17 D18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Use (Function)</td>
<td>E1 E2 E3 E4 E5 E6 E7 E8 E9 E10 E11 E12 E13 E14 E15 E16 E17 E18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>F1 F2 F3 F4 F5 F6 F7 F8 F9 F10 F11 F12 F13 F14 F15 F16 F17 F18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Relation(s) to meaning (Association)</td>
<td>G1 G2 G3 G4 G5 G6 G7 G8 G9 G10 G11 G12 G13 G14 G15 G16 G17 G18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Conceptual (Artistic, artistic, cultural)</td>
<td>H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12 H13 H14 H15 H16 H17 H18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The result of (Laying)</td>
<td>I1 I2 I3 I4 I5 I6 I7 I8 I9 I10 I11 I12 I13 I14 I15 I16 I17 I18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>K1 K2 K3 K4 K5 K6 K7 K8 K9 K10 K11 K12 K13 K14 K15 K16 K17 K18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Context or setting</td>
<td>L1 L2 L3 L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9 L10 L11 L12 L13 L14 L15 L16 L17 L18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>M1 M2 M3 M4 M5 M6 M7 M8 M9 M10 M11 M12 M13 M14 M15 M16 M17 M18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Natural Element</td>
<td>N1 N2 N3 N4 N5 N6 N7 N8 N9 N10 N11 N12 N13 N14 N15 N16 N17 N18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Urban Element</td>
<td>O1 O2 O3 O4 O5 O6 O7 O8 O9 O10 O11 O12 O13 O14 O15 O16 O17 O18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building Element</td>
<td>P1 P2 P3 P4 P5 P6 P7 P8 P9 P10 P11 P12 P13 P14 P15 P16 P17 P18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Context or setting</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total count per value</td>
<td>R1 R2 R3 R4 R5 R6 R7 R8 R9 R10 R11 R12 R13 R14 R15 R16 R17 R18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Values

- **Total count per attribute**
- **Intangible Attributes:** Aesthetic, Age, Historic, Scientific, Social, Ecological, Political, Economic, Other cultural
- **Tangible Attributes:** Total, Aesthetic, Age, Historic, Scientific, Social, Ecological, Political, Economic, Other cultural

---

**Figure 23:** Revealing and relating attributes and values.
Figure 22: Cross-relating taxonomy matrix.

Figure 24: Results of the example part of an attribute and value analysis done on the Durham Castle and Cathedral description (Figure 25).
Durham Cathedral was built between the late 11th and early 12th century to house the bodies of St. Cuthbert (634-687 AD) (the evangeliser of Northumbria) and the Venerable Bede (672/3-735 AD). It attests to the importance of the early Benedictine monastic community and is the largest and finest example of Norman architecture in England. The innovative audacity of its vaulting foreshadowed Gothic architecture.

The Cathedral lies within the precinct of Durham Castle, first constructed in the late eleventh century under the orders of William the Conqueror.

The Castle was the stronghold and residence of the Prince-Bishops of Durham, who were given virtual autonomy in return for protecting the northern boundaries of England, and thus held both religious and secular power.
The Cathedral lies within the precinct of Durham Castle, first constructed in the late 11th and early 12th century under the orders of William the Conqueror. It attests to the importance of the early Benedictine monastic community and is the foreshadowed Gothic architecture.

The Cathedral is the largest and finest example of Norman architecture in England. Its innovative audacity of its vaulting foreshadowed Gothic architecture.

Durham, who were given virtual autonomy in return for protecting the northern boundaries of England, and thus held both religious and secular power. The bodies of St. Cuthbert (634-687 AD) (the evangeliser of Northumbria) and the Venerable Bede (672/3-735 AD) attest to the importance of the early Benedictine monastic community.

The Cathedral was built between the late 11th and early 12th century and was to house the bodies of St. Cuthbert (634-687 AD) (the evangeliser of Northumbria) and the Venerable Bede (672/3-735 AD).

The Cathedral lies within the precinct of Durham Castle, first constructed in the late 11th and early 12th century.
Taxonomy developed

The taxonomy is intended to be used in analyses and feed into a discussion, never to replace the discussion or to judge. The results might reveal gaps that are intentional, or overlaps that are not. There is no truth as to what ‘should’ be the result of the analysis; the intention is to see what the current state is in order to understand what would be needed in the case that change is wanted, and what the implications of that change might be.

While the possibilities to apply the taxonomy are numerous, it should be noted that there are limitations too. The taxonomy does not cover the full range of possible categories; it only reflects those found in current supranational guidelines. As such, the taxonomy is probably not yet complete or comprehensive. The taxonomy should be seen as a first version, to be further discussed and developed in the coming decades. As shown in Figure 26 there are various cycles of testing and developing the taxonomy. There are multiple actions that need to be taken in order complement the taxonomy. One of them is analysing more policies, for example those directed at specific global regions (Europe, Asia, etc.), or at themes (e.g. underwater heritage, natural heritage) or at bordering disciplines (e.g. urban planning, archaeology).

Analysing heritage management practices by various stakeholders bottom-up will also be
instrumental in the process. Moreover, as ideas and values can differ today and continue to evolve tomorrow, so can this taxonomy, reflecting its time and actors.

The sources (the left side of the scheme) in this research were supranational documents. Other research used other sources to develop categories. Pereira Roders (2007) developed a categorization of cultural values based on heritage theory, and Stephenson (2008) used the ‘insider perspective’ to develop a categorization on landscape values. Pereira Roders’s categories were used as input for the ‘why’ part of the taxonomy, while Stephenson’s findings can be used to further develop the taxonomy. The challenge for further developing the taxonomy is to keep an open mind in analysing the sources, and to find out where the taxonomy can be expanded, improved or changed, while testing and further applying the taxonomy to improve its validity.

Thus, the taxonomy has yet to be tested in a much wider range of settings. As such, it should be used with caution when analysing policies and practices. It is very possible that additional categories of attributes, values, actors and process steps will be identified. Moreover, the taxonomy and the method have been designed as analytic tools, to be used to categorize and organize existing texts and practices. As far as tested here, it proves to be a valid application, taking into account the above considerations.

What has not been explored is the use of the taxonomy as a starting point, for example in setting up new policies and practices. As such processes might benefit from an open approach that is not limited by a set of categories, using the taxonomy could be problematic. On the other hand, as shown by the case study on Amsterdam, the taxonomy provided a set of categories that actually stretched the discussion beyond the traditional biases, implicit or not, that might guide the process of defining heritage policies or practices. Either way, this application should also be tested much further.

Next, applying the taxonomy-based methods to a larger set of documents, let alone applying the method in future workshops, will take a considerable amount of time. While manual labour would be the easiest way to cover a next stage of analysing data by means of the taxonomy, the method could be further developed into a tool for automated analyses. The further testing of the method should therefore preferably also be combined with semi-automated methods to analyse texts and audio.

Another reflection that can be made, relates specifically to the ‘who’ question. While the stakeholder categories and their roles were identified in this research, the topic could be developed much further, for example the role of each stakeholder in relation to the attributes and values per process step. The discussion on who has power and who benefits from heritage has had quite a strong impact on heritage studies as an academic discipline (Pendlebury, 2013; Winter, 2012). The question remains what its impact is in practice. To gain a deeper
To move beyond the traditional disciplines and the fragmentation of knowledge practices, we need a common language. It was therefore important to find out whether the taxonomy would indeed cause confusion. Testing among governmental stakeholders in Amsterdam had revealed a level of confusion regarding the taxonomy, and to further investigate this issue follow-up research was done across academic heritage related disciplines, as also indicated in green in Figure 27.

**Method**

A group of 12 academics from various disciplines (archaeology, architecture, anthropology, art history, heritage management, landscape studies, urbanism, cultural management) and various European universities (i.e. universities in France, Spain, the Netherlands, Serbia, Poland, Germany and the UK), working the field of heritage studies were asked to give their own professional definitions of the terms used in the taxonomy. ('Please write down how you define those words, as to how (if at all) you would use them in your daily (academic) practice.'). The answers for commonalities and differences were compared to identify shared definitions. All answers were combined into a definition covering the main message and additional variations (Figure 28). The main definition is the one found in at least three quarters of the given answers. There were also additional characteristics; they show the variety on the common definition. Additional or different definitions have been distinguished.

**Academic definitions**

Although the sample is not representative of the entire heritage sector, the results indicate that there is not that much confusion over the terminology in heritage studies among academics in Europe. The sample (n=12) was too small and the range of backgrounds and countries too wide to compare between disciplines or European regions. In general, the results show that tangible attributes are better known than intangible ones (Figure 28). For the tangible attributes, only 7 of the 99 answers were left blank, whereas for the intangible attributes 19 were left blank. In addition, most definitions show a high level of commonality. What stands out from the answers is that the division between tangible and intangible is not that strong in most answers. A tangible feature is often defined in terms of its association with or is complemented by an intangible feature, and vice versa. The perception of heritage among the participants seems to be linked to the full taxonomy. Relation(s) to meaning, association (15) and Long-term/unplanned processes, evolution (18) were the least known, and had the most blanks (4 and 3, respectively).

Understanding of these power relations and their impact on heritage management in practice, comparative research and monitoring is needed. The taxonomy as a method to frame the roles of the various actors or actor groups in each step of the process, preferably also in relation to the various attributes and values, could be a means to analyse the process. The results can again be compared to other results or to themselves in time, to monitor the changes and their impact in time.

By using taxonomy, and cross-relating it, a complex framework for comparative analysis, possibly large-N comparison, can be developed. As indicated in blue in Figure 27, this research related levels of governance and compared disciplines (urban, heritage) on the subnational level. The focus was mainly on tracing the taxonomy of supranational policy in one case (Amsterdam) of subnational policy (vertical), comparing two disciplines (horizontal). The results are also used in Chapter 5, to reflect on HUL as a supranational policy document. More levels of governance and more disciplines could be added. Doing so would also provide insights into the reciprocal relation between the levels of governance. As such, comparison could be done on a much bigger scale; between levels of governance and/or disciplines. To raise complexity further, such a comparison could be executed through time, place and society, as well as between or among practices, policies and theories.

![Figure 27: Horizontal and vertical tracing of taxonomy. In black the possible relations; in blue the research in Amsterdam as presented in Chapter 3; in green the testing of taxonomy among academic disciplines.](image-url)
Taxonomy improved

To move beyond the traditional disciplines and the fragmentation of knowledge practices, we need a common language. It was therefore important to find out whether the taxonomy would indeed cause confusion. Testing among governmental stakeholders in Amsterdam had revealed a level of confusion regarding the taxonomy, and to further investigate this issue follow-up research was done across academic heritage related disciplines, as also indicated in green in Figure 27.

Method

A group of 12 academics from various disciplines (archaeology, architecture, anthropology, art history, heritage management, landscape studies, urbanism, cultural management) and various European universities (i.e. universities in France, Spain, the Netherlands, Serbia, Poland, Germany and the UK), working the field of heritage studies were asked to give their own professional definitions of the terms used in the taxonomy. (‘Please write down how you define those words, as to how (if at all) you would use them in your daily (academic) practice.’). The answers for commonalities and differences were compared to identify shared definitions. All answers were combined into a definition covering the main message and additional variations (Figure 28). The main definition is the one found in at least three quarters of the given answers. There were also additional characteristics; they show the variety on the common definition. Additional or different definitions have been distinguished.

Academic definitions

Although the sample is not representative of the entire heritage sector, the results indicate that there is not that much confusion over the terminology in heritage studies among academics in Europe. The sample (n=12) was too small and the range of backgrounds and countries too wide to compare between disciplines or European regions. In general, the results show that tangible attributes are better known than intangible ones (Figure 28). For the tangible attributes, only 7 of the 99 answers were left blank, whereas for the intangible attributes 19 were left blank. In addition, most definitions show a high level of commonality. What stands out from the answers is that the division between tangible and intangible is not that strong in most answers. A tangible feature is often defined in terms of its association with or is complemented by an intangible feature, and vice versa. The perception of heritage among the participants seems to be linked to the full taxonomy. Relation(s) to meaning, association (15) and Long-term/unplanned processes, evolution (18) were the least known, and had the most blanks (4 and 3, respectively).
A main definition was developed using the commonality among the given answers. This common definition is shared by at least 80% of the academics (excluding those who didn’t give a definition). Whereas for more than half of the 18 cases an extra definition was given by one or two participants, only three of those were really different (4, 17, 18). Those ‘other’ definitions are the ones that differ from the understanding of the main definition. For example, the commonly shared main definition of a natural element (4) would be: ‘Component, part, aspect produced by nature.’ The additional characteristics are that such an element gives a certain characteristic, exists in or is produced by nature, and can be tangible and intangible. Some answered it is only that which is untouched by humans, which would be a limiting characteristic. One answer, however, defines a natural element as a ‘natural component, constitutive element of a city, city plan’, referring more to an element representing the nature of the city than an element of nature itself.

The other extra definitions confirm the main definition but also provide an additional one. For example, the main definition of ‘urban element’ is: ‘a component, part, structure, or aspect of or in an urban context.’ The additional characteristics are that such an element adds value and/or functionality, gives a certain characteristic, is a construction, structure, space, can be tangible and intangible, is constitutive and created by buildings or human activities. All answers point towards the common definition; however, two of the answers explicitly state that also the uses, practices and actions in the urban space should be considered urban elements. This was considered an additional characteristic to the main definition that deviates from the understanding of the definition as most of the answers share.

There seems to be some confusion due to the breaking down of concepts. A few participants aimed for more holistic answers. For example, some defined ‘context’ as positioning the heritage asset in space, time and society. This is a perfectly good and holistic definition. This holistic definition of ‘context’ as a concept could include all or only one of these: context or setting (6) and relation(s) to context (11), as well as knowledge, traditions and customs (14), relation(s) to meaning (15), concepts and layering (9) and artistic trends (10). However, the aim of the taxonomy was to break down those bigger concepts in order to be able to be more precise and categorize. This can be of value in the heritage management process, as the different ‘forms’ of context have different implications for what to protect. Is it the actual object that is important in contextualizing the heritage asset? Or is it the atmosphere it creates? Is it use of the space, or the memory it provokes? They can all be related, and they often are, although separately they all have different implications for the focus of urban management and the limits of acceptable change.

That intangible heritage can be considered in a wider and a more narrow perspective is shown by the fact that two participants defined the category ‘knowledge, traditions and customs’
as ‘intangible heritage’. This makes for a loop in definition. It indicates that the definition of intangible heritage, while here defined with 9 categories (10–18) is perhaps more easily associated with knowledge, traditions and customs (14) than with all other categories.

All in all, there is a strong commonality within each of the definitions, and while the adjectives vary, they are never opposing. At most they vary in specificity, as for example with community (16), which is defined as a ‘group of people that shares characteristics, has common denominators’. However, some defined those characteristics geographically, while others widened the definition to include more general characteristics, for example beliefs and interests.

When comparing the taxonomy with the definitions given by the academics, there are a few issues to be highlighted. The definition of landscape as used in the policy analysis tool is a description of the landscape approach, not a description of ‘landscape’. In addition, in general the academic definitions are much more detailed and nuanced. As such, they can very well be used to improve the taxonomy definitions.

The newly proposed definitions:

» Building Element: Part, component, material, feature, or section of a building, which is constructive, constitutive, or decorative; adds value or functionality.

» Building (noun): Result of the art of building, a structure, construction, edifice, or remains that host(ed) human activities, storage, shelter or other purpose.

» Urban Element: Component, part, aspect of/in the historic urban landscape, construction, structure, or space, which is constructive, constitutive, or decorative; adds value or functionality.

» Natural Element: Component, part, aspect of/in the historic urban landscape produced by nature, natural or designed, which is constructive, constitutive or decorative; adds value or functionality.

» Ensemble: Group, compilation, or configuration of urban and/or natural elements. The combination generates or represents specific history, coherence, variation, significance and has recognizable relations.

» Context, Setting: Surrounding environment (or landscape), surrounding, supporting, contextualizing the heritage assets. It is situating, adds understanding, often though not necessarily geographical proximity.

» Area: A conditionally defined place or space, district, urban fragment, structure, route; defined by geographical and/or cultural features

» Layering: Evidence that exists for indicating accumulating phases (periods) of activity and/or value, and the phases; illustrative of the evolution or development of human society and settlement over time. Sometimes also referred to as stratigraphy.
Taxonomy discussed

In contrast to what was revealed by the study with governmental stakeholders and by other studies (During, 2010; Printsmann et al., 2012; Stephenson, 2008; Stobbelaar and Pedroli, 2011), this study did not find confusion over terminology. That, however, does not mean that there is no confusion. The sample was not only too small to generalize the results, but it also comprised academics in Europe. Among policymakers, as was discussed in the previous chapter, some of the terminology was unknown or confusing, and there might also
be a difference between the policymakers and the academics. Moreover, all academics were working in Europe, which makes the general results, if at all, valid only for the European region. The concept of heritage as represented by supranational policies has been criticized as being a European invention, being Eurocentric (Willems, 2014; Winter, 2013) and supporting an ‘authorized heritage discourse’ (Pendlebury, 2013; Smith, 2006). The taxonomy presented here is derived from those supranational policies and as such could be criticized in a similar manner. Testing the understanding and definition of the taxonomy within a group of European academic experts does not counter this criticism. As such, it would be very pertinent to further test and develop the taxonomy with stakeholders from outside Europe.

The landscape approach is a tool for integration. The taxonomy as a whole is to be holistic in the combination of the separate categories. While the idea was to break down the concept of heritage, this is countered by the aim of the academics to actually combine the tangible and intangible within most of their definitions. This indicates that another categorization for the taxonomy might be something to further explore. Not as it is now – tangible/intangible – but for example space, time, society, or product, practice, process. Another classification in this context is that developed by Stephenson (2008), who used the ‘insider perspective’ to develop a categorization of landscape values, and came to a division of forms, practices and relationships.

As discussed, testing the taxonomy is to be repeated and expanded. As shown before, there are many definitions of heritage. Although new ones appear, others do not necessarily disappear, and many definitions exist in parallel. For all those definitions, however, though applied with a specific disciplinary bias, it seems important that there is a process of people (who) assigning value (why) to something (what). As an analysis showed (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a), supranational policy in the past worked with a limited taxonomy. Who, what and why were restricted. This probably led to the exclusion of many conceptualizations of heritage, and definitely had an impact on the perception of the definition of heritage. The widening of the definition of heritage that has been detected by many in recent decades relates to slowly letting go of some of the restrictions it was subject to. HUL aims at a process in which the attributes (what) and values (why) are not restricted. Although the taxonomy grew enormously, it is still limited – but that is inherent to taxonomy. It is therefore very important to always remain open-minded towards new, previously unrecognized conceptualizations of heritage. Analysing descriptions of heritage using the what, why, how and who questions, without directly categorizing, supports such open mindedness. It is also important to keep track of the already recognized categories, to be able to monitor their use and compare empirical data. The taxonomy can also be used to show the impact of the limiting character of taxonomy in the past.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>Taxonomy definition</th>
<th>Definition as used in policy analyses tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Building Element</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parts of buildings e.g. detail, parcel, facade, roof, material, or colours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Entire buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Urban Element</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Man made elements in the urban landscape e.g. a square, bridge, street furniture, quay side, or public art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Natural Element</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Natural (or designed) green elements, flora or fauna, water elements, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A group of buildings or specific urban ensemble or configuration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Context, Setting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The buildings or elements surrounding, supporting, contextualising the actual heritage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A district in a wider (urban) landscape, a specific combination of cultural and or natural elements, e.g. a neighbourhood, urban fragment, urban structure, townscape, route or park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Layering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Illustrative of the evolution or development of human society and settlement over time, a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Every part of the landscape is considered to be of value, and all attributes get a level of significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Concept, Artistic Trend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The ideas behind the design or place, e.g. Period, style, design ideology (often related to, or represented by, a tangible heritage asset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Relation(s) to Context (Location)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The relation with another connected element, location, place, or environment (relation object – object).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The character or image, as supported by specific design, e.g. typology, morphology, layout, composition and proportion, as well as, atmosphere e.g. Tranquil, lively, urban, rural.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Use, Function</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The specific (typical, common, special) use or function of a place or environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Knowledge, Traditions, Customs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The (local) practices, traditions, knowledge, customs of a community or groups (often related to a location or tangible results, tools / instruments).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Relation(s) to Meaning (Association)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Human associations with a place, element, location, or environment (relation men – object).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Community, People(s)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A community or society itself (its members, or specific individuals / groups) and/ or their cultural identity or diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Planned Processes / Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The process of managing, the type of strategy or approach (instead of the result) is what is valuable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>Unplanned Processes / Evolution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>The process of layering, development, or evolution (instead of the result).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28: Summary matrix, comparing definitions as used in the policy analysis tool to the definitions given by academic heritage experts (N=12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Definition - academics (N=12)</th>
<th>additional characteristics - academics (N=12)</th>
<th>Other / Additional definition(s) - academics (N=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part, component, material, feature, section of a building.</td>
<td>Physical, specific, constructive, decorative part; adds value / functionality, is mostly tangible, constituting a separate unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure, construction, edifice, remains.</td>
<td>Most human activities, storage, and other purposes; is solid, fixed, physical, sheltering; is an assembly of materials, needs attention, above ground, from any period; also has immaterial features.</td>
<td>Art of building (verb).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component, part, aspect of / in urban context (urban landscape, urban space, urban environment, city, townscape, urban agglomeration).</td>
<td>Adds value / functionality, gives a certain characteristic, is a construction, structure, space, or action, can be tangible and intangible, is constitutive, and created by buildings or human activities.</td>
<td>The uses, practices, actions in the urban space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component, part, aspect produced by nature.</td>
<td>Gives a certain characteristic, is untouched by humans, is existing in or produced by nature, can be tangible and intangible; independent of location; aspects existing in nature context.</td>
<td>The constitutive nature of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, set, unit, compilation of urban / cultural elements.</td>
<td>Generates / represents specific history, show harmony / coherence / correlation in significance, location, values, and / or practices; can be tangible and intangible; with recognizable internal interrelations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding environment (or landscape), physical, societal, temporal.</td>
<td>Situating, adds understanding, specific, an assemblage of fluctuating relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A conditionally defined place or space.</td>
<td>Creates a context, measurable, broader, bounded, no strict borders, defined by its geographical and cultural features.</td>
<td>Stratigraphy / strata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulating phases (periods) of activity and/or value, and evidence that exists for indicating the phases.</td>
<td>Historic, chronological, subsequent, alterations and/or additions.</td>
<td>Multiple ways of perceiving landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory delimited subjectively and conditionally - as perceived, experienced by observer including human/cultural/natural factors.</td>
<td>Holistic, provoking an aesthetic judgment, result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors, cultural and natural attributes.</td>
<td>Natural environment of certain qualities, associated with the visual capabilities of the observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Set of) attributes of specific nature or quality, defining features.</td>
<td>Long-term / over a given period, iterated, defined by style or aesthetic decisions, culturally specific, mainstream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to / interaction between object/place and its geospatial context.</td>
<td>Geographical proximity, developed or conceived and executed in relation to location.</td>
<td>Interrelation of time, space and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical / instrumental value, purpose, of object / landscape; function= regardless human interaction; use refers to human interaction.</td>
<td>Aesthetics or historic significance, as manifested / receiver by people, reviving memories and stimulating senses, intangible, defines an entity, combination of customs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitted/repeated, evolving, phenomena associated with a place or culture; understanding of the world by a group of people.</td>
<td>Collective, experienced/practiced, linked to certain features, tangible &amp; intangible.</td>
<td>Intangible heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotations, feelings, meaning, cognitive links.</td>
<td>In relation to context, remembered or imagined, socially constructed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of people that shares characteristics, has common denominators.</td>
<td>Shared characteristics only geographically defined; e.g.inhabiting, interacting with, connected to, interested in, or visiting.</td>
<td>Shared characteristics wider defined: e.g. identity, ethnicity, culture, customs, beliefs, roots, traditions, actions, territorial, interests, practices etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions (alteration, construction, design) that are intentional, planned, controlled, and/or determined by strategies and policies (bureaucracy).</td>
<td>Systematic and organized, initiated with common purpose and vision.</td>
<td>The process of introducing new and modern, not necessarily well planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplanned, piecemeal, spontaneous change.</td>
<td>Adapts naturally, without a common initial vision; without intervention of policies or strategies, unorganized; improvised.</td>
<td>Biological change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
What's new in heritage planning?

This chapter is partly based on the following conference paper:
Veldpaus L (2015) The landscape approach: a future for sustainable management of urban resources? Culture(s) in Sustainable Futures, Helsinki, Finland: University of Jyväskylä and European research network COST Action Investigating Cultural Sustainability

The discourse on landscapes became central to heritage management in recent years, driven by evolving ideas on sustainable development and cultural diversity. This chapter starts with a short review of HUL, in relation to this landscape concept and approach. Next, it presents a critical analysis of HUL, to provide an understanding of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of this approach.

The landscape approach: a future for heritage planning?

"As the future of humanity hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, conservation has become a strategy to achieve a balance between urban growth and quality of life on a sustainable basis" (UNESCO, 2011b) – at least, that is what was agreed among the UNESCO Member States by adopting HUL. The main aim is to enhance the quality of the cultural landscape, or human environment, while acknowledging its dynamic nature and need for change, in order to allow communities to prosper.

Against the backdrop of global and on-going transformation of resources in urban and urbanizing areas, and the subsequent need for urban management in a multilevel and complex field, the landscape approach is being further developed. This landscape approach is not new and the ideas that it promotes have been developed over recent decades. It is to be inclusive, as it encompasses cultural, social, economic and environmental factors, in space and time. It is not about allowing (or disallowing) transformation in itself, but about guiding transformation and about its nature. It addresses the future quality of the urban landscape and the relationships forming it. It positions urban resources, including heritage, as active change agents. HUL wants to shift the aim of heritage management by positioning it in the wider landscape discourse. In the planning and management of resources in the urban
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Against the backdrop of global and on-going transformation of resources in urban and urbanizing areas, and the subsequent need for urban management in a multilevel and complex field, the landscape approach is being further developed. This landscape approach is not new and the ideas that it promotes have been developed over recent decades. It is to be inclusive, as it encompasses cultural, social, economic and environmental factors, in space and time. It is not about allowing (or disallowing) transformation in itself, but about guiding transformation and about its nature. It addresses the future quality of the urban landscape and the relationships forming it. It positions urban resources, including heritage, as active change agents. HUL wants to shift the aim of heritage management by positioning it in the wider landscape discourse. In the planning and management of resources in the urban
landscape, heritage becomes a means towards a greater aim, rather than an end in itself. As a landscape approach, HUL frames urban heritage management as a strategy within urban and environmental management. This landscape is to be defined conditionally and territorially, including all cultural, natural and human resources. After unravelling the concepts and process steps behind the landscape approach and applying them in Amsterdam, the critical review of those concepts and process steps became possible. This chapter explores the landscape concept in the heritage discourse and its application in HUL.

Landscape: the new discourse in heritage management

The landscape approach has been developed as an approach that governs how, by whom and for whom the urban landscape is used, cared for and interpreted. In this context, the main aim of HUL is formulated as the need to protect or enhance the quality of the human environment, while acknowledging that this environment is dynamic and needs changes to allow communities to prosper. HUL recommends a holistic and integrated management that is part of larger socioeconomic development framework.

Does the international agenda for the future of heritage management really rely on the idea of a landscape approach? When we describe the landscape approach as an all-inclusive approach that embraces both conservation and development, it seems to be a way forward that is endorsed by many in the field. However, neither landscape nor the integration it implies are unfamiliar in concept to the field of heritage management. Landscape, as a cultural phenomenon, as an increasingly holistic concept has been evolving for over a century. It has its roots in the cultural landscape concept as defined in human and urban geography, and can be traced back to the 19th century (Taylor and Lennon, 2011; Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013). Landscape is also not new in supranational heritage policies, as the concept was introduced as a platform for integration in the 1960s, for example in the focus on the beauty and character of natural as well as urban or man-made landscapes (UNESCO, 1962), and is also reflected in the concept of ‘place’ as used in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia, 1999; Lennon, 2014). In 1992, the WHC (UNESCO, 1972) became the first supranational policy to recognize and protect cultural landscapes, by means of its Operational Guidelines (Rüssler, 2006). Over the course of the last two decades, the landscape and the landscape approach developed into central concepts in heritage management. This happened along the adjoining paths of urban heritage and natural heritage, integrating theory, policy and practice (Brown, 2015; Brown et al., 2005; Taylor et al., 2015).

The development of a landscape approach such as the HUL approach is strongly entangled with theory on landscape as a concept, as it develops in geography and urban studies. Landscape in this case refers to how humans affect geographic space as well as to real places (Nassauer, 2010). However, both the landscape and its application in HUL are unfamiliar in concept to the field of heritage management. Landscape, as a cultural phenomenon, as an increasingly holistic concept has been evolving for over a century. It has its roots in the cultural landscape concept as defined in human and urban geography, and can be traced back to the 19th century (Taylor and Lennon, 2011; Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, et al., 2013). Landscape is also not new in supranational heritage policies, as the concept was introduced as a platform for integration in the 1960s, for example in the focus on the beauty and character of natural as well as urban or man-made landscapes (UNESCO, 1962), and is also reflected in the concept of ‘place’ as used in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia, 1999; Lennon, 2014). In 1992, the WHC (UNESCO, 1972) became the first supranational policy to recognize and protect cultural landscapes, by means of its Operational Guidelines (Rüssler, 2006). Over the course of the last two decades, the landscape and the landscape approach developed into central concepts in heritage management. This happened along the adjoining paths of urban heritage and natural heritage, integrating theory, policy and practice (Brown, 2015; Brown et al., 2005; Taylor et al., 2015).
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Landscape: the new discourse in heritage management

Among others, Taylor et al. (2014) and Brown et al. (2005) define the landscape as being universal, as it is found everywhere people and nature have interacted; dynamic, as it inevitably changes and evolves over time, in response to natural processes and to the changing needs and activities of people; hierarchical, like a Russian doll, as a large landscape area contains smaller units; and holistic, as it cannot be understood or managed except through an integrated, multidisciplinary approach that embraces all its components. The landscape approach is therefore not about transformation in itself, but about guiding the nature of the transformation; it addresses the quality of the relationships that form a landscape (Cortina, 2011; Dalglish, 2012).

Chapter 2 also showed that in addition to this appropriation of the landscape concept, there has also been a shift in thinking in cultural studies, including heritage studies. These studies traditionally focused on the materiality by deciphering embodied meaning and social expectations. More recently, however, this has moved towards a more performative, constitutive understanding of objects as actors that create value, rather than as symbols that represent value (Albena, 2013; Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a). Value is a culturally and historically constructed concept, and heritage is a ‘value-loaded concept’ (Hardy, 1988; Harvey, 2001; Pendlebury, 2013). Based on this premise, heritage is seen as an ever-present interplay between resources and values, past and present (Avrami et al., 2000; De la Torre, 2014; Winter, 2012). To manage such interplay in a more integral and ethical way, heritage is conditionally framed by a landscape, which is to incorporate social, economic and environmental factors, through space and time (Agnoletti, 2014; Axelsson et al., 2012; Stobbelaar and Pedrol, 2011; Taylor et al., 2015). This landscape discourse puts heritage management into a new perspective. So it is likely that it is accompanied by changes to the concepts often used in heritage management. To understand these changes, a systematic analysis of supranational policies leading up to HUL was conducted.

Contributions of the landscape approach

Attributes and values

Since the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH), heritage is mostly understood as encompassing two dimensions: a tangible (material) dimension and an intangible (immaterial/social) dimension (Ahmad, 2006; Alves, 2014; During, 2010). HUL, however, defines heritage as the attributes and values that constitute key testimony to humankind’s endeavours and aspirations, in geographical and cultural space (landscape) and in time (layering). By explicitly using the notion of attributes and values, a different way of defining the dimensions of heritage is suggested. Instead of distinguishing...
between material and social, a distinction is made between what (attributes) and why (values) (Tarrafa Silva and Pereira Roders, 2012; Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014a). Attributes are what we inherit from the past, and can be tangible or intangible. They are the resources that constituted enough value to past generations to be kept for present ones, either by active protection or otherwise. Values are the reason why certain attributes are considered to be heritage.

At first, defining heritage in terms of attributes and values may not seem very revolutionary. However, it is a change in perspective that is needed to further develop a landscape approach in heritage management. It will probably also advance on-going discussions in the discourse on heritage values. In current literature on heritage management, the difference between attributes and values is often unclear; they are often used as synonyms, or mixed up. This clouds the arguments and discussions. Such confusion over terminology and lack of clarity about what the difference is between tangible, intangible and values was also found in the Amsterdam workshops. Moreover, it is generally only the concept of values that is being theorized. The concept of heritage values has been theorized and used since at least the turn of the 20th century. Instead, the term ‘attribute’ (as a noun) has not been theorized in the context of heritage management as such. In addition, before 2011, the term was used only in the regional 1992 US/ICOMOS charter called ‘A Preservation Charter for the Historic Towns and Areas of the United States of America’ (US/ICOMOS, 1992). HUL is the first global UNESCO policy to introduce ‘attributes’, after the term had first been included in the Operational Guidelines to the WHC in 2005. The latter, however, specifically refers to a selected list of attributes expressing cultural values to meet conditions of authenticity, while the HUL approach does not give any such limits to the concept.

Attributes are what we value, or what creates values, and the values are the reason(s) why a resource is valuable. While the notion ‘attribute’ is new in the context of supranational policies, the attribute as a concept – when defined as the answer to the question ‘What do we value?’ – is not new. All supranational documents describe, in their own way, what is considered heritage. The contribution of the HUL approach is that it explicitly asks for an answer to both the ‘What?’ and the ‘Why?’ question when inventorying the landscape for its significance. In addition, the way attributes and values are presented in relation to each other is also different from previous guidelines. The HUL approach, in line with cultural theory, considers value to be created by humans in relation to the tangible or intangible attributes, whereas previous supranational policy mostly presents value as something that is contained or conveyed by the attribute.

When heritage is defined in terms of attributes and values, heritage management is defined in relation to it. When something is said to contain value, endogenous as it were, the need is
to protect that something at the state of nomination, independent of its level of integrity, so that the capsuled values remain intact. When something is said to create values, however, value is no longer considered endogenous. As such, heritage management should be aimed at the resource’s ability to keep creating the same or other values. Different assets (tangible or intangible, movable and immovable, natural and cultural) to protect or different reasons for protection could mean different measures to do so.

When looking at the categories of attributes and values acknowledged as possible heritage in supranational policies, there is an increasingly rich diversity to be found. The taxonomy presented in Chapter 2 shows an increasingly inclusive and complex definition of heritage. The types of cultural values reflected in those policies grew from four to nine, while the attribute types increased from 10 to 18. The policies increased in inclusiveness and complexity by doubling the acknowledged types of attributes and values, as well as the possible combinations and dynamic and evolving relations between those attributes and values.

Moreover, attributes seem to follow a more hierarchical pattern of including and overlapping each other, while the values exist in parallel to each other, although they are usually ranked in importance, whenever set in relation to each other, to support decision making. The use of the landscape concept in the definition of heritage is meant to be comprehensive. Landscape is in fact not just an additional ‘category’: it is the category that comprises all definitions of heritage previously distinguished. It is a platform for integrating any or all attributes and values.

Process and actors

While it is implied that HUL built upon previous supranational policy, HUL actually provides a different narrative. The focus is on setting up a process and stimulating the development of tailored toolkit in support of this process, rather than defining general types of heritage and/or universal rules for their conservation. As described above, the HUL approach formalizes the already lingering notions of ‘attributes and values’ as an umbrella system of ‘what’ and ‘why’ to capture all existing and future typologies of heritage, and defines a process to reveal, locate, monitor and manage their transformation over time. In other words, the landscape approach is not about transformation in itself, but about guiding the nature of transformation. This process-oriented way of looking at heritage is what makes HUL stand out from previous conventions and recommendations.

The HUL action plan accompanies the Recommendation online and defines six process steps (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2010). Only the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 1999) has provided a similarly explicit description of a management system. An analysis of the supranational policy guidelines showed that there are eight steps mentioned in previous supranational policies, and most of them have been recommended.
since the 1970s, though less explicitly, as compared in Figure 29 (see also Figure 07, Chapter 2). The contribution of the HUL approach, beyond making those steps more explicit, is the way the steps are framed by the landscape discourse to make the approach as holistic as possible. With HUL, the focus in supranational policy moved from defining a selective but global range of what and why, to suggesting a process (how) that helps to establish attributes and values (what and why) locally, depending on a specific who and where and when. This specific set of attributes and values forms the baseline for further decisions in the process to follow, also to be monitored, to re-evaluate and re-establish this baseline in time.

The process steps do not define what can or cannot happen to those attributes and values, but provides a process to determine vulnerabilities and limits of change in relation to the context they would apply to. The recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape aims at a balance between change and quality of life, between the urban and natural environment, and between current and future needs and the legacy from the past. It does not define what such a balance means, as it can mean something different in every situation. The limits of acceptable change are therefore to be defined in relation to the attributes and values, and thus to a specific project, influenced by its place and time and society. This emphasizes the need to pay greater attention to understanding and balancing certain ideals, biases and ethics. There is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process steps</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Steps in HUL action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Inventory + Analyse the Landscape</td>
<td>Inventory and analyse (all) human, natural and cultural resources</td>
<td>HUL step A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Define Attributes + Values</td>
<td>Define what resources (attributes) have what value(s) (and for whom)</td>
<td>HUL step B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Define Vulnerabilities</td>
<td>Define general and specific affecting factors, which resources are vulnerable to (which) threats.</td>
<td>HUL step C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Define Strategy / Action</td>
<td>(Re) develop supporting strategies/actions based on the defined attributes, values, and vulnerabilities.</td>
<td>HUL step D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Integrate</td>
<td>Integrate those strategies in the wider socio-economic and urban policy frameworks / draw upon existing policies to improve strategy/action.</td>
<td>HUL step D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Prioritize</td>
<td>Prioritize (projects or actions) to protect or develop the valued/vulnerable resources.</td>
<td>HUL step E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Built Partnerships</td>
<td>Establish partnerships between different actors for the coordination &amp; management of actions &amp; resources.</td>
<td>HUL step F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Monitor change</td>
<td>Monitor the change in resources and actions</td>
<td>not explicit in HUL steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Process steps in HUL Action Plan (UNESCO, 2015) versus the process steps found in supranational policies between 1964 and 2011 (Chapter 2).
not necessarily more tolerance to change; the limits can still be very strict. However, the idea is that the limits are no longer defined by global doctrines or ‘standards’, but based on what is valued and why. What is valued and why, depends on who is involved in their definition, often as defined by subnational and national governments.

In the past, many limits and thresholds were set concerning what could and would be seen as heritage. These same thresholds are still echoed in heritage studies today (Lixinski, 2013). Legislation and policies, as well as trends, cultural biases, and design and development practices, come with rules and habits. Policies are to be interpreted by those involved in heritage management, and their interpretation often varies, influenced by cultural context. This means there is always a dynamic of inclusion and exclusion of certain resources to become designated as heritage as often suggested in theory (Labadi, 2013; Pendlebury et al., 2009; Smith, 2006). The decision on what becomes heritage and why, and how it should be managed, is often based upon an assessment by governmental and/or professional experts (Marta de la Torre et al., 2002; Pereira Roders and Van Oers, 2010; Willems, 2014). They assess and decide whether a resource constitutes a level of value that exceeds a defined threshold, which is also defined by experts. This process was also largely confirmed for Amsterdam (Chapter 3).

What the HUL approach implies is that, ideally, if a landscape is approached as a layering of attributes and values, collectively and comprehensively, nothing or no one gets excluded a priori. One could perceive and analyse the landscape as an eternal vertical and horizontal layering of attributes and values, an ‘attribute and value-scape’ to be managed accordingly (Sobhani Sanj bod et al., forthcoming). This approach is rather different from all previous supranational policies, which are more selective in defining the categories of what can become heritage (e.g. the WHC defines cultural heritage as ‘monuments, groups of buildings and sites’). While the answers to the question ‘What is heritage?’ show a continual increase in scale and widening in scope throughout the supranational policies, this shift to defining it as a landscape of attributes and values makes heritage much more inclusive, at least in theory.

Although the process could be much more open and inclusive to ‘other’ attributes and values, and to other groups in society, an unavoidable process of selection or ranking, and its thresholds, limits and biases, will still influence what becomes designated as heritage, and what does not. This could vary greatly, according to who selects and ranks the attributes and values, and who influences the process. In the end, heritage is a process of selection, which is by principle discriminatory, and society is free to define it. There is an on-going democratization process within heritage management, when it comes to who gets to decide or manage value (Avrami et al., 2000). Processes recommended to describe and define individual and community values are becoming more inclusive, socially just and culturally diverse in urban and heritage management. The HUL approach stimulates anyone with a vested interest
in the landscape at stake, to take an active role in its heritage management. Again, not excluding anyone or anything beforehand.

The question ‘who’ is involved, is much more about the role, responsibility and thus power that each stakeholder has, takes or receives. Not excluding anyone beforehand does not necessarily exclude power relations. There are many stakeholders that could play a role. The question is, to what extent can and will they? What is their influence and responsibility? And at which stage of the process will they be involved? When community is only to be informed and educated to respect and appreciate the already designated heritage, without being involved in the process of defining which resources have significance, why would they feel responsible for protecting it? They may value it, or learn to do so, but what if they don’t? What if that same community gets to decide which attributes and values are to be designated as heritage? Will that change what gets designated? And will that change the management approach to what was once designated? Research on the supranational level shows that the variation of actors recommended to be involved in heritage management has increased hugely. Responsibilities and the subsequent hierarchy between stakeholders groups, however, remain largely intact (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders, 2014b). A wide range of stakeholders will as easily support as preclude a participatory approach. The question is: who gets to decide? In the case study of Amsterdam, it became apparent that community stakeholders are mostly informed about or possibly consulted in the process of decision-making in most of the process steps. A joint pilot project between the inhabitants of a small neighbourhood in Amsterdam and the local government to make the inhabitants decision makers in the ‘define value’ step of the process will be an interesting one to follow in this respect.

The historic urban landscape approach: a critical review

While it is important to raise understanding of the HUL approach and understand its contributions to heritage management theory and practice, a critical review is also important to devise a strategic research agenda for furthering the landscape approach as a suitable and sustainable approach to the management of urban resources. For this, a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis was performed. The aim of the analysis was to define a future strategy that makes best use of the strengths and takes advantage of the opportunities, while addressing the weaknesses and countering the threats. SWOT can be used as an assessment and management tool to combine analyses of the positive and negative, internal and external factors (Fertel et al., 2013; Helms and Nixon, 2010).

Using SWOT for analysing environmental policies in multilevel governance settings has its
Using SWOT for analysing environmental policies in multilevel governance settings has its internal and external factors (Fertel et al., 2013; Helms and Nixon, 2010) as an assessment and management tool to combine analyses of the positive and negative, opportunities, while addressing the weaknesses and countering the threats. SWOT can be used to define a future strategy that makes best use of the strengths and takes advantage of the weaknesses, opportunities, threats. Analysis was performed. The aim of the analysis was sustainable approach to the management of urban resources. For this, a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis was performed. The aim of the analysis was sustainable approach to the management of urban resources. For this, a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis was performed.

While it is important to raise understanding of the HUL approach and understand its contributions to heritage management theory and practice, a critical review is also important. The historic urban landscape approach: a landscape concept is to be embedded in a bigger system, involving, applying and combining the approaches, knowledge and skills from all types of disciplines and affiliations. This is definitely an enthusing exercise that provides a clear opportunity for horizontal and vertical co-creation, and as such stimulates new crossovers and innovation. HUL recommends integrating those academic and professional disciplines in the landscape by means of 'the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework' (article 10).

A historic urban landscape of integration

In HUL, landscape is an established notion of integration of physical attributes and human values in more territorial research disciplines (e.g. urban studies/cultural geography). The HUL approach is applicable to the entire landscape, including all tangible, intangible, movable, immovable, cultural and natural resources and all the values they constitute. There is no a priori exclusion of anyone or anything.

The landscape approach stresses holistic heritage management. It supports the integration of many branches of heritage, types of policy, levels of governance, academic disciplines and scales of geography, and stimulates them to find common ground – literally. The landscape concept is to be embedded in a bigger system, involving, applying and combining the approaches, knowledge and skills from all types of disciplines and affiliations. This is definitely an enthusing exercise that provides a clear opportunity for horizontal and vertical co-creation, and as such stimulates new crossovers and innovation. HUL recommends integrating those academic and professional disciplines in the landscape by means of 'the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework' (article 10).
## SWOT Analysis of Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTERNAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXTERNAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSITIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HUL is defined as concept of integration;</td>
<td>• Combining approaches, knowledge and skills from all types of disciplines and affiliations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HUL is defined as management approach (6 critical steps);</td>
<td>• Process steps can be tailored per project and making them explicit, opens up the process for ‘outsiders’, can help streamlining;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HUL uses the umbrella terms: attributes and values instead of specific heritage categories, by them heritage gets redefined in a more neutral way, no a prior in- or exclusion of minor heritage categories;</td>
<td>• No a prior in- or exclusion of attributes, values, or stakeholder groups: everyone and everything can be involved;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible stakeholder groups are made explicit in the recommendation.</td>
<td>• System of attributes and values can support revealing differences in time, place, culture, etc.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAKNESSES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>NEGATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration is a reactive and problem-solving measure, it lacks a proactive vision or strategy</td>
<td>• Multilevel and multidisciplinary governance is getting more and more complex;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implication of focus on process are hidden, while the results can be radically different</td>
<td>• Implications of the focus on process are clouded by mixing in arguments about categories;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The terms attributes and values, or their relations are not further explained or clearly defined in the recommendation;</td>
<td>• Leaving the notions of attributes and values undefined can lead to varied interpretations. This could impede their use, benefit, and impact on heritage management and makes them difficult to monitor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It remains unclear how role and responsibility (power) are to be (re) distributed, and thus how co-creation and consensus building can work.</td>
<td>• Implicit preferences (implicit bias) can play a huge role in the heritage management process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It remains unclear how role and responsibility (power) are to be (re) distributed, and thus how co-creation and consensus building can work.</td>
<td>• Process focus might open up ways of change that were never believed possible;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The line of reasoning becomes very important, chance for a more open and just process is as likely as miscommunication or even misuse;</td>
<td>• The line of reasoning becomes very important, chance of miscommunication or even misuse;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HUL is ultimately a stakeholder-led process; it should open up the discussions between stakeholder groups, and stimulate inclusion, democratization and the redistribution of power.</td>
<td>• Current critiques on power relations in heritage are not addressed by making the process and the line of argumentation leading;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPPORTUNITIES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>THREATS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As long as it is unclear how power is to be (re) distributed or how co-creation can work, it is very well possible nothing much changes.</td>
<td>• As long as it is unclear how power is to be (re) distributed or how co-creation can work, it is very well possible nothing much changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30: SWOT analysis historic urban landscape recommendation (UNESCO, 2011).
However, the landscape as a conceptual framework for integration is still to gain prominence in many academic and professional disciplines that are related to heritage management (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015). When it comes to more concrete suggestions of integration, HUL is very much focused on integrating heritage management and urban development. Integration in urban policies has been recommended in most supranational policies since the 1970s. As it is emphasized in HUL even more strongly, it is safe to say it is still not at a satisfactory level. The integration of heritage management and urban development might be considered a first and necessary step towards this wider integration. This, however, can easily undermine the intention of integration in a more general sustainable development framework, as it does not stimulate consideration of a more holistic approach to integration for example in socioeconomic policies, or even wider environmental and natural policies. Moreover, the actual level of integration of heritage policies in urban development frameworks is largely understudied. The studies that have investigated this are all based on one or a few case studies; no research was found that reveals regional or global trends (Pereira Roders, 2014). While some studies indicate it is the way forward (Dupagne and EC, 2004; Getty Conservation Institute, 2010; Landorf, 2009; Pickard, 2002, 2010), they also show that the level of integration is still generally low.

Finally, integration is a reactive measure and it implies bringing together existing systems that also evolve themselves. Thus, integration can never fully catch up with existing systems, unless the original systems cease to exist. In addition, the definition of heritage continues to expand and shift, which makes the integration with other policies more and more necessary. The context of heritage policy, and its integration in the multilevel and multidisciplinary setting it has to operate in, is becoming increasingly complex.

A historic urban landscape of attributes and values

For a long time, the supranational policy tried to set common categories. The ever-growing critique is that this precludes anticipating diversity. As discussed above, HUL focuses on suggesting a landscape approach instead. While the landscape concept provides a platform to integrate various perspectives, it does not provide a means to describe individual qualities. So, as introduced before, HUL introduced the notions ‘attributes’ and ‘values’. A heritage landscape is then a complex and layered set of attributes and values, determined and built up in consensus by all involved stakeholders. The umbrella term ‘values’ or ‘significance’ had already replaced more specific definitions of such values, such as ‘beauty’ or ‘historic’. The notion ‘attributes’ can be seen as the umbrella for all specific categories that were introduced in supranational policies, for example ‘monument’ or ‘intangible’.

One of the main potentials of the notions of attributes and values is that they help to redefine the concept of heritage in a more neutral way, to be nuanced, open and socially just. One
landscapes can then consist of many different overlapping, conflicting or parallel attributes and values, which are probably also changing over time. Working with attributes and values as umbrella terms based on relatively simple ‘What?’ and ‘Why?’ questions provides the opportunity analyse, categorize and compare heritage theory, policy, nominations and management practices; for example, to better understand how, and how much, attributes and values remain/change/conflict in relation to each other, time, place, society or person and thus on a wider, potentially global scale.

Although there is a lot of potential in using attributes and values, these terms are not further explained or clearly defined in HUL. Using these notions also implies a different way of approaching the heritage management process; the novelty of this perspective is neither explained nor emphasized in the Recommendation. There is a need to further understand and thus theorize and analyse the conceptual and concrete application of the notions of attributes and values, and their relations. One of the threats of this shift to attributes and values is that the categories are no longer acknowledged as guiding the thinking on heritage, but remain steering in a more implicit way. Another threat is that the attributes and values approach is potentially too nuanced and open, which might lead to time-consuming and thus expensive processes.

A historic urban landscape management process

The landscape approach is explained throughout the Recommendation and the attached ‘action plan’ as a set of process steps. The proposed steps provide a management structure for national and subnational urban and heritage policy, to be tailored accordingly. Specific cases or projects are also expected to benefit from the proposed process. Presenting the steps this way makes the process potentially more accessible, especially to non-expert stakeholders. It can synchronize moments of input, increase understanding for decision-making and support the integration with other processes.

There is a shift from category-driven to process-driven guidelines. HUL aims to make the process the main place for integration: streamlining urban and heritage management processes. For the WHC, it was chosen not to suggest a single regulatory framework (Vadi, 2014), but to define categories of cultural heritage (monuments, groups of buildings and sites) to be protected by any kind of regulatory framework established nationally. The HUL approach turns this around. It suggests a process and as such a regulatory framework, and does not lay down the categories to which it would apply. This is a radical change in supranational guidelines that supports the opportunity for heritage management to become more open to a much wider variety of attributes, values and stakeholders. Instead of steering on common categories, the aim is now to develop a common process (how). Within this common process
the stakeholders (who) with a vested interest should agree on the landscape of attributes and values, and its management.

The landscape approach is intended to expose overlapping, matching as well as conflicting, values, needs and ethics (among groups, individuals, levels of power, etc.). Revealing and managing these is not an easy process, and it remains a matter of give and take, of selection, concession, mitigation and conflict resolution. However, HUL stimulates governments to transparently draw and map the landscape of attributes, values and needs, and co-create a strategy accordingly. The landscape of attributes and values is a starting point for the process as suggested by HUL. From here, one can sketch scenarios to understand the potential impacts on the communities and their resources of favouring certain attributes, values or needs over others. As such, they are a baseline to understand the impact of certain development scenarios (both in future projects and in retrospect) on those attributes and values. It is in this perspective that HUL does not prescribe specific categories or treatments, as those are based in the local reality of the defined attributes and values. In other words, there are no pre-set limits, either for what is heritage or for what is acceptable in terms of change.

The processes of adding heritage categories, such as intangible heritage, and the shift towards a process-minded heritage management are related to each other. They are, however, often presented as the same argument. This is a threat to fully understanding the implications of both. Shifting the emphasis from tangible to intangible is replacing one attribute category with another. Shifting from an aesthetic to an ecologic bias is a change in value. This is different from replacing the suggested categories for a suggested process, as HUL does. A bias towards one category (what and/or why) over another could, but does not necessarily change the overall way of thinking, as HUL aims for.

The implications for or impacts on heritage management caused by this shift from category to process remains unacknowledged and unclear, and might be experienced as confusing. HUL builds on a legacy of supranational policy guidelines (UNESCO, 2011b) . This statement undermines the radical shift HUL makes in relation to its predecessors. Moreover, opening up the process in theory does not mean the actual process will be more open, and biases can still have a strong influence. Not only explicit, but also implicit preferences can play a huge role in this process, if only because of how heritage was defined in recent decades or even centuries. Rethinking what we value and why, and possibly even actively stimulating the exploration of ‘other’ attributes and values, seems necessary.

The strategy towards the landscape is to be based on the defined set of attributes, values and needs. This way of approaching the process can be both positive and negative. It might open up ways of change that were never believed possible or seen as acceptable. The line of reasoning becomes very important, and a more open and just process is as likely as miscommunication
or even misuse. For example, due to the focus on process, stakeholder groups that are less involved or informed such as the wider public might understand less about certain decisions. The approach to two different buildings that seem like similar cases might be totally different based on the actual attributes and values agreed upon.

A historic urban landscape of and its actors
Not excluding any resources or treatments beforehand is primarily an opportunity to not exclude people, disciplines, ideas, and perspectives – and thus potentially making the entire process more holistic. HUL is open: everyone and everything could be part of the process; the stakeholders decide. To make clear that this could involve stakeholders beyond the most direct and obvious ones, the possible stakeholder groups are made explicit in the Recommendation. ‘This approach addresses the policy, governance and management concerns involving a variety of stakeholders, including local, national, regional, international, public and private actors in the urban development process’ (article 6). Heritage is always a stakeholder-led process; attributes and values do not select themselves. This is not inherently different from previous supranational policies. The approach HUL suggest is, however, potentially more inclusive. However, the differences in stakeholder roles and responsibilities, or any possible shift in this regard, are not very explicitly addressed in HUL. Their roles and responsibilities per process step are also not made explicit. The only explicit reference to that is the aim for consensus on attributes and values among all stakeholders. It can be questioned whether consensus is always the best way. Either way, it still remains unclear how power and responsibility are to be redistributed, and thus how co-creation can work, preferably while increasing effectiveness and efficiency. Apart from the fact that there is no ready-made solution here, and the current guidelines are not all that clear, there is also not much research to be found that goes beyond the individual case study. If it is unclear how power is to be redistributed or how co-creation can work, it is very well possible that nothing will change. Moreover, none of the current criticisms of power relations in the definition and management of heritage are solved by making the process and the line of argumentation leading. Understanding the impact of democratisation of heritage needs to remain or even rise on the agenda.

Is the future in the landscape?
If the future of humanity indeed hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, we should take seriously the ideas that HUL promotes. Not because it is a perfect and clean solution to a problem, but because it pushes for different ways of thinking, for new perspectives and for openness in processes of heritage management. A landscape approach
is inclusive, as it encompasses cultural, social, economic and environmental factors, in space and time. It is holistic and development-minded, and promotes a focus on sound reasoning and process over a specific preselection of attributes and values that should or should not be protected. It positions heritage in the wider landscape discourse and alters the conceptual framework for heritage management.

The HUL approach does not propose the a priori inclusion or exclusion of anyone or anything. Defining what is of value and why (attributes and values) by the stakeholders involved, sets a baseline for determining the impacts of future actions. Heritage is a stakeholder-led process. HUL does not prescribe specific categories or treatments, as those are based in local reality of the defined attributes and values. In other words, there are no pre-set limits, either for what is heritage or for what is acceptable in terms of change. As such, what is really new about HUL is the shift from category-driven to process-driven guidelines.

Based on the conclusions presented in Chapters 2 and 3, we can say that it is not probable that a landscape approach to heritage management can be implemented overnight. However, when it happens, the implications for practice as well as science can be rather substantial. The focus on the process of setting a baseline and determining impact, allows for a different way of looking at the built environment. It starts looking at urban planning as urban resource management, where different resources have different levels of value. Their value and transformation can be mapped and monitored. Such knowledge of urban value and transformation would be not only a very useful source for future urban management but also intriguing, as it would potentially reveal things about the human–urban interaction we were never aware of, especially in combination with upcoming technologies that open up large datasets (Van der Net, 2015) and make possible the large-scale monitoring of change on the ground (Comer and Harrower, 2013).
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This epilogue provides a reflection on the research and addresses the research questions. It summarizes the added value of the research. Finally, suggestions for a future research agenda for research are presented, to stimulate the continuation of the discussion and open future perspectives.

Reflections on the research

The landscape approach that is put forward by HUL poses a great challenge to today’s practices in heritage management. Firstly, it focuses not solely on the heritage resources, but on all urban resources. Secondly, it allows for a much wider group of stakeholders than just experts to decide upon the definition and subsequently the management of heritage. It advocates that heritage management is one of the tools for the effective planning and management of resources in historic urban landscapes. HUL, and the associated approach, builds on an existing supranational policy framework that was developed within and in dialogue with both practice and academia. It takes the landscape, as concept and approach, as a potential framework to stimulate an interdisciplinary and integrated way of working and thinking across various levels: social and ecological, development and conservation, value and vulnerability, tangible and intangible, large and small scale, supranational and subnational, long and short term, expert and non-expert. The landscape approach integrates all these levels, and as such also provides a platform to reveal conflicts between them, as they represent the different people, processes and practices that are directly or indirectly involved in heritage management. The landscape is expected to provide a dimension to balance, mitigate and respect the complexity and wealth of diverse values in a rapidly changing world (Cortina, 2011; Taylor et al., 2015). By pushing such an interdisciplinary and integrated way of working and thinking, the HUL approach pushes the parties involved to identify the similarities and differences, the gaps and
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Reflections on the research

The landscape approach that is put forward by HUL poses a great challenge to today’s practices in heritage management. Firstly, it focuses not solely on the heritage resources, but on all urban resources. Secondly, it allows for a much wider group of stakeholders than just experts to decide upon the definition and subsequently the management of heritage. It advocates that heritage management is one of the tools for the effective planning and management of resources in historic urban landscapes. HUL, and the associated approach, builds on an existing supranational policy framework that was developed within and in dialogue with both practice and academia. It takes the landscape, as concept and approach, as a potential framework to stimulate an interdisciplinary and integrated way of working and thinking across various levels: social and ecological, development and conservation, value and vulnerability, tangible and intangible, large and small scale, supranational and subnational, long and short term, expert and non-expert. The landscape approach integrates all these levels, and as such also provides a platform to reveal conflicts between them, as they represent the different people, processes and practices that are directly or indirectly involved in heritage management. The landscape is expected to provide a dimension to balance, mitigate and respect the complexity and wealth of diverse values in a rapidly changing world (Cortina, 2011; Taylor et al., 2015). By pushing such an interdisciplinary and integrated way of working and thinking, the HUL approach pushes the parties involved to identify the similarities and differences, the gaps and
common denominators. Therefore, there is an urgent need for methods to compare, match and merge the variety of experiences, knowledge and data available between the involved levels, disciplines and fields.

Research statement
The aim of this research was to understand the contribution of HUL to subnational policy. While this contribution has definitely been explored, the question became more open along the way. From a focus on assessing the contribution of HUL, the focus shifted to trying to design a method for the comparative analysis of various levels of heritage governance. As such, the hypothesis of this thesis became that making policies and practices comparable by means of a comparative analysis framework, would deepen understanding, support practice and reveal trends in heritage management, and its integration with urban planning.

In the previous chapters, the landscape approach has been unravelled in terms of concepts and process. The development of taxonomy gave an overview of the evolution of concepts in heritage management in recent decades. Its application in the policy analysis tool in the Amsterdam case study showed how policy can be analysed using the taxonomy. Ideally, the tool would be tested in a wider, global range of case studies, in order to test the comparison of results of each case study. Moreover, the workshops could include a much wider set of stakeholders, to reveal differences and overlaps between the various stakeholder groups. These workshops results could be compared to text analysis of the policy documents, or to what is happening in reality by means of fieldwork that reveals the actual change within the urban landscape in relation to the attributes and values.

To understand the impact of a landscape approach on heritage management, the starting point was to understand a current local management framework by analysing its structure in relation to the taxonomy and process steps found in supranational policy. Much more research is needed to establish whether this method can be further developed to make policies and practices comparable and deepen understanding, support practice and reveal trends in heritage management and its integration with urban planning.

While further research is needed, this research shows substantial evidence to support it. Cross-referencing the revealed taxonomy and applying this method in the policy analysis tool have definite potential in the systematic and possibly also large-N comparative research in multilevel governance and heritage management. Comparing sub- and supranational levels remained the main focus of this research. By addressing the evolution of concepts in the heritage management, the contribution of HUL could be identified on the supranational level. Subsequently, the revealed taxonomy was used in the policy analysis tool to analyse policies on the subnational level, in this case in Amsterdam.
Research relevance

The concept of heritage as represented by supranational policies has been criticized for being a European invention, being Eurocentric (Willems, 2014; Winter, 2013) and supporting an ‘authorized heritage discourse’ (Pendlebury, 2013; Smith, 2006). Authorized heritage discourse is a conceptual framework that has gained considerable importance in heritage studies over the past decade. How do we now continue to go beyond theorizing such discourse, and further understand the impact and authority of such discourse? The taxonomy presented here can be positioned within this authorized heritage discourse. It is based upon a set of supranational policy documents. Analysing the evolution and identifying the taxonomy got us closer to the core of this discourse. It reveals that the critical interpretation of the definition of heritage such as authorized heritage discourse is providing, is taken seriously by those developing supranational policies, as the inclusiveness of the heritage concept increased a lot over the past decade. This research shows what has so far been included in the concept of heritage, and intentionally leaves room for including more of what is not yet considered to be part of this definition. The intention was to use that knowledge to analyse the impact of the supranational policy discourse on heritage management and its evolution. This approach was taken to be able to raise understanding and identify the merits of the definition and its impacts, before criticizing or disputing it.

As such, this research has both social and scientific value. The taxonomy proved to be supportive in actually revealing the impact of the supranational policies on subnational policies – as tested in Amsterdam. This is useful to identify and discuss governance practices in the local context, especially when the aim is to further implement what is recommended by those supranational policies. The policy analysis tool proved to be useful in revealing how sub- and supranational policies relate. While such gaps were not found when applying the framework in Amsterdam, it likely that the analysis could also reveal gaps are in the taxonomy, and as such in discourse developed on supranational levels. In addition, it becomes possible to evidence the validity of statements as above. This demonstrates that the research has both a societal and a scientific relevance.

Research Limitations

As stated in the prologue, the aims of this research go beyond what is feasible for one PhD student. Ideally, the taxonomy would be developed on a much wider basis, as explored in Chapter 4. Subsequently, this taxonomy, and its application in a comparative framework, should be tested in a wide range of case studies, by different people to see whether the method really is reproducible. And by means of workshops and document analysis, to validate the method and to test whether the results are indeed comparable. Comparability between
cities could be tested, and also between stakeholders, documents, or between documents and reality. By developing a taxonomy based on a set of supranational policies, and testing it in only one case study, I started this process, but I have definitely not finished it yet.

Overview of the research questions

Here, I shortly answer the sub-questions, before answering the main question:

‘What is the contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscapes approach, to existing subnational heritage policy and practices in the management of urban resources?’

The first subquestion: ‘What is the contribution of the (historic urban) landscapes approach to current supranational heritage management policy and heritage theory?’

The research was based on the assumption that in order to know how to use or implement in a tailored way the heritage concept and subsequent management approach as presented by HUL, it needs to be clear what exactly is so new or different about them. Therefore, the novelty and specificity of this landscape approach to heritage had to be explored in relation to the previous supranational guidelines.

The main aim of the approach proposed by HUL is to enhance the quality of the human environment, while acknowledging that this environment is dynamic and needs changes to allow communities to prosper. For this, an integrated landscape approach is recommended. Examples of forerunners are the protected landscape approach (IUCN), the Landscape Convention (CoE) and cultural landscapes (UNESCO). The HUL approach develops this discourse and makes it applicable to the urban landscape. By defining the landscape as the foundation of the heritage concept, the a priori exclusion of any kind is minimized, and a holistic and inclusive approach to heritage management is stimulated. Whether and, if so, how this would work in practice is most challenging and is still to be explored much further.

Charting the evolution of heritage concepts and subsequent management approaches led to a better understanding of the contributions of HUL to supranational policy. The analysis was structured by the following questions:

What is defined as heritage and why is something considered to be heritage?

The short answer is attributes (what) and values (why). To elaborate a bit: the landscape approach considers the entire landscape, including all resources, tangible, intangible, movable, immovable, cultural and natural, and all the values they constitute. Landscape is perceived as a layering of attributes and values, an ‘attribute- and value-scape’, collectively
perceived as a layering of attributes and values, an ‘attribute- and value-scape’, collectively movable, immovable, cultural and natural, and all the values they constitute. Landscape is an established notion of integration of physical attributes and human values in territorial research disciplines. For heritage management, however, it is a relatively new approach. It goes hand in hand with a shift from exclusive and category-driven to inclusive and process-driven heritage management. The landscape approach will then also streamline urban and heritage management processes.

Not excluding anything beforehand is primarily an opportunity to not exclude people, disciplines, ideas and perspectives – and thus potentially making the entire process more holistic. HUL is open; everyone and everything can have a role in the process. HUL is focused on policy guidance, and while participation and consensus among stakeholders is stimulated, the responsibility of the government to make this happen remains largely intact. A redistribution of power and responsibility and co-creation is suggested but not specified.

The second subquestion: ‘How can supranational recommendations on the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscapes approach, be compared to subnational policy?’

Based on the answers on the first subquestion, the idea was to build a comparative framework based on an evolution of concepts of heritage. Charting the evolution of heritage concepts and subsequent management approaches also led to a domain dependent taxonomy, reflecting the evolution of supranational heritage policy over the last 50 years. Such taxonomy, and thus categorisation, may seem at odds with the conclusion that there is a shift from category-driven to process-driven guidelines. However, to analyse and monitor the process, there is a need for indicators and categories. The taxonomy is to be used as an open-ended set of heritage concepts, applicable in monitoring changes in the policies and processes of heritage management.

The taxonomy comprises four sets of nine definitions (nine tangible attribute categories and nine intangible attribute categories; nine value categories and nine actor groups) and eight process steps defining the ‘how’. The taxonomy as a common language is expected to make the comparison and integration of disciplines and levels of governance easier. A method of cross-referencing taxonomy was developed and applied in a policy analysis tool for the comparative analyses of heritage-related policies in multilevel governance. This tool was developed to map, reveal and discuss the overlaps, gaps and impacts of heritage management.
The taxonomy provides a common language that could help to close the terminology gap in heritage practice, policy and theory, a gap that has become increasingly clear due to the push for integrated and interdisciplinary approaches. In addition, application of this taxonomy in the policy analysis tool is novel for its potential to support a large-N systematic comparison between policies, and possibly other sources.

The third subquestion: ‘What is the contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscapes approach, to subnational urban and heritage management practices in Amsterdam?’

The policy analysis tool was tested with governmental stakeholders in Amsterdam. As expected, due to the city’s pioneer role in heritage management, Amsterdam has a heritage management system that is largely compatible with what has been recommended by heritage management guidelines in the last 50 years. As such, the results also confirm the evolutionary logic of the framework. More recent categories, while known and of interest, are the least embedded in the minds of Amsterdam policymakers as concepts in heritage policy. The taxonomy also seemed to challenge the participants in Amsterdam to reflect on their definition of heritage and revealed differences in definition between departments. Moreover, the research showed that the taxonomy can be understood as a way to ‘break down’ the concepts underpinning heritage management, specifying process steps, attributes, values and actors.

While further research is needed to refine and optimize the tool and taxonomy, the testing confirmed that such a taxonomy-based tool is promising for the analysis of urban and heritage policies. It offers a way to produce structured and comparative results on a qualitative and a quantitative level.

The main question: ‘What is the contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscape approach, to existing subnational heritage policy and practices in the management of urban resources?’

The research was designed to start developing a comparative framework that could support the understanding of contribution of the landscape approach, and in particular the historic urban landscape approach, to existing subnational urban and heritage policy. While it indicates that the developed taxonomy and its application in the policy analysis tool can indeed be used for large-N analysis for this purpose, wider application and testing is needed to answer this main question on a more general level. So far, the taxonomy has only been applied in a policy analysis tool, which has only been tested in Amsterdam. Thus, further research could be developed many other settings and directions. Comparative studies applying this same
policy analysis tool could follow, and the developed taxonomy could be tested much further, as all can support an evidence-based development of the landscape approach for heritage management.

Research recommendations: a future agenda

There is a gap between the original research question: ‘What is the contribution of the (historic urban) landscapes approach to current supranational heritage management policy and heritage theory?’ and the reality of this research. Obviously, one case study is not enough to answer this question, and nor would two or three case studies be enough. Therefore, the choice was made to focus on developing, testing and validating the taxonomy and its application in a policy assessment tool. This, it is assumed, is only the beginning of a journey to build the taxonomy and method, and execute analyses that will allow the research needed to answer the full question. As such, the main recommendation here is to continue this research, by further developing the taxonomy and assessment methods, and by gathering and comparing data by applying the method on a wider range of case studies.

This thesis identified a lack of research focused on revealing the relation between sub- and supranational policy guidelines in urban and heritage planning. To be more precise, there is a lack of methods to obtain, combine and analyse data in a manner that allows for going beyond empirical and case-based knowledge. The present research started developing a method for comparative analysis that could support future heritage management practices, and possibly reveal underlying structures. So far, the taxonomy has undergone one cycle of improving definitions, and one cycle of testing and validating in one case study (Amsterdam). The many settings and directions in which further research could be developed were discussed in Chapter 4. In addition, as shown in Chapter 5, the landscape approach as understood by this research could be a game changer for heritage management. Thus, both the foundations and implications of this approach would benefit from further discussion and theorization.

Further research is needed to explore the integration of the various disciplines involved in heritage management, and their respective taxonomies and processes. There is also a need to understand the impact of actions undertaken and guidelines laid down on a wider scale. The landscape, as a heritage concept, and the integrative power ascribed to it should be theorized and practised much further. More specifically, its effect and impact should be analysed in the setting of large-N comparative research. The process of theorizing has already been started by several authors (Brown, 2015; Fairclough, 2013; Fairclough et al., 2008; Lennon, 2014; Moylan et al., 2009; Pendlebury, 2009; Taylor et al., 2015; Taylor and Lennon, 2012). The comparative testing, analysis and monitoring of practices and processes, to understand their impact, is still very much in its infancy.

The future research agenda is therefore mainly focused on this assessment of impact, on understanding
the current state in relation to the desired state, or in relation to a previous state. This will reveal the transformation undergone, or yet to come, and is expected to support better decision making in the future. The results will also provide the feedback loop back into theory and improving supranational guidelines. A prerequisite for this agenda is the recommendation that comes from the research agenda presented by Van Oers (2015) and active collaboration, preferably co-creation, between disciplines.

There are more tools needed to assess process, taxonomy and stakeholder involvement, for example tools to:

» Map, understand and exchange knowledge of the various processes and policies;
» Map, understand and exchange knowledge of various taxonomies;
» Map, understand and exchange knowledge of stakeholders, their roles and responsibilities
» Further develop and test the methods as presented in this research;
» Automate the text analysis using the taxonomy, to run quick scans on large bodies of text.

Next, further exploring, developing and sharing of innovative methods for comparison is needed. Comparison between scale, time, space and society, and throughout practices, policies and theories, such as methods for:

» Systematic analysis, to enable large-N comparative research;
» Monitoring the impact of taxonomy;
» Integration, to reveal the overlap as well as gaps in policies and practices on a wider scale;
» Understanding the evolution and impact of new concepts, such as the introduction of the notions of attributes and values, in terms of how they are used and integrated in existing frameworks.
» Understanding the evolution and impact of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and how they change;
» Linking policy and practice, and evaluating those links;
» Locating and comparing attributes and values between textual sources, visual sources and maps.

Finally, we need to continue questioning the underlying frameworks regarding their content, and for example:

» Open up to new, non-traditional, attributes and values, and their related disciplines, ethics, processes and policies;
» Rethink and critically analyse what is valued and why, and the subsequent measures taken;
» Understand the role of disciplinary (implicit) bias;
» Theorize, analyse and practice the landscape concept and subsequent approach, but never stop questioning it altogether. It is an idea yet to be proven.

Heritage is an inherently interdisciplinary subject, so why not be as transparent and co-creative as possible? We can involve and learn from what all the different disciplines and stakeholders have to offer, share methods and innovations, ideas and values, and find common ground. Together we will find ways to decipher, rethink and support a sustainable future for a rapidly transforming world. I will continue my quest and hope to play a constructive and inspiring part in this process. As far as I am concerned, this thesis is only the beginning!
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Appendix C

Summaries of supranational policy

WHAT & WHY

The Venice charter defines heritage as a historic monument, which can be either a single architectural work or an urban or rural setting, which has ‘acquired cultural significance with the passing of time’. The aim is to safeguard heritage for the benefit of future generations. A historic monument can embody the evidence of particular uses or traditions of past generations, a significant development or historic event. A historic monument is inseparable from both its historic and its physical setting. The specific, mostly formal and stylistic elements to be aware of terms of significance are: items of sculpture or painting, composition, technical features, typology, decoration, layout, style, colour, mass and scale or their relation with each other, or their setting or surroundings. The integrity and authenticity of cultural heritage is to be protected in all its richness, because of its aesthetic, artistic and/or historic value from any period in time. In addition to these explicitly mentioned values, the text also includes more implicit references to what is valued. Significance is acquired ‘with the passing of time’; therefore, age in itself also seems to be valued. Also a scientific value seems to be recognized, by describing heritage as an evidence of civilization and the witness to age-old traditions, and defining technical features as possible elements of significance.

The World Heritage Convention defines three specific types of cultural heritage: monuments, groups of buildings, and sites. It also defines three types of natural heritage. Those types remain the same in name, but did evolve in definition as can be found in the UNESCO Operational Guidelines. For example, the sites that are ‘combined works of nature and of man’ are now known as cultural landscapes. The Convention was drawn up to single out those cultural and natural heritage properties that are most representative, unique and irreplaceable and therefore of outstanding universal value, to be preserved for mankind as a whole, ensuring its transmission to future generations. Cultural heritage can be revealed from a historic, aesthetic (art and architecture), scientific or social (ethnological or anthropological) point of view. They are the result of the genius and the history of the peoples of the world; no matter to whom it belongs. UNESCO defines the ‘site’ as ‘works of man or the combined works of nature and man’, though specifically from a historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. As such, nature becomes a possible feature, implicitly introducing the ecological value, though only in relation to the other explicitly defined values.

The Washington Charter defines heritage as a cultural property that constitutes the memory of
mankind, emphasizing the historic urban area. Such areas are not delimited in size/scale. They include all spiritual and material elements that express the historic character, for example functional and formal/stylistic features and the relationship of either are all of those elements to the natural or man-made setting and to the urban settlement as a whole. The Charter aims at protecting and developing urban areas, which are of value as historical documents and/or as an embodiment of traditional urban cultures. Such areas constitute the memory of mankind and include all material and spiritual elements that express their values. Values present can be those of historical, aesthetic, social and economic values. In addition the technical value mentioned implies scientific value, and the importance given to value acquired over time, implies age is also valued. As the natural environment of a cultural property can be of importance, this charter is referring to ecological values, though only as context. The significance should be protected but also used to adapt these areas to contemporary life. By doing so, heritage becomes part of a development strategy, not only addressing its political value, but also for the first time taking the concept of heritage as a driver for sustainable development, possibly in the slipstream of the release of 'Our Common Future'.

The Burra Charter defines heritage as a place of cultural significance, which is a historical record of any scale, important as tangible expressions of identity and experience. It refers to the material and physical location of a place as much as to the significance embodied in its setting, use, relationships, associations and meanings. It states cultural significance is irreplaceable and precious, and defines a value system that comprises the following values: aesthetic, historic, scientific, social (e.g. identity, experience, spiritual) and natural, which are important for past, present and/or future generations. These values are equally important and can coexist; the range of values could be different for different individuals or groups and as such are possibly conflicting. There is no unwarranted emphasis defined on one particular value. However, Burra introduces the idea of defining relative degrees of cultural significance for a place, which can lead to tailored management strategies.

The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage defines intangible heritage as 'the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith’ that people(s) recognize as part of their cultural heritage. Domains are defined where such heritage may manifest itself: in oral traditions and expressions, in performing arts, in social practices, rituals and festive events, in knowledge and practices and/or in traditional craftsmanship. It basically aims at protecting human practices, performances, traditions, knowledge and skills, which are transmitted from generation to generation (age value) and constantly re-created by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history. In this convention, the social, ecological (nature), historical and scientific (knowledge and skills) value are explicit; the political and economic values can be
derived from the text. Remarkable is the absence of any reference to aesthetic value, not even implicitly. Intangible attributes should be protected because, when respecting human rights, they are considered a mainspring of cultural diversity, cultural dialogue and a guarantee of sustainable development.

The Historic Urban Landscape recommendation defines urban heritage as urban areas that constitute a key testimony to humankind's endeavours and aspirations through space and time. More specifically, it defines historic urban landscapes (formerly urban heritage) to be an urban area including its urban and/or geographical setting that is the result of an historic layering or accumulation of cultural and natural (tangible and intangible, natural and man-made) attributes and values. The HUL Recommendation also considers development processes, diversity and identity, and local practices as possible attributes, additional to previously mentioned elements and relations. The recommendation addresses a wide spectrum of cultural values, including aesthetic, historic, scientific, economic, social or spiritual (sense of place), memory and ecological as important for past, present or future generations. The political values are implied by, for example, the valuing of urban process/development values, and also here the passing of time implies age is being valued. It recognizes such values for both tangible and intangible attributes, and they can be present in a specific location or in a wide landscape. Such values are shaped by generations and constitute a key testimony to humankind's endeavours and aspirations through space and time. The aim for a balanced and sustainable relation between the needs of current and future generations and the legacy of humankind's endeavours and aspirations through space and time. The aim for a balanced and sustainable relation between the needs of current and future generations and the legacy of humankind's endeavours and aspirations through space and time.

In the Valletta principles, heritage is defined as historic areas and their surroundings, including all elements – tangible and intangible – that have significance in relation to the coherent whole of the site, its constituent parts, and any context that influences the static or dynamic way such areas are perceived, experienced and/or enjoyed including the social fabric and cultural diversity. The principles value the coherence of all tangible and intangible elements that represent the authenticity and integrity of an urban area, including social (e.g. civic, traditional, religious, sociological, meaning, emotion, mystery, educational, leisure), historic, economic, ecological (environmental, respect the balance of natural cycles and natural resources), aesthetic (beauty, architectural, character) and scientific (skills and knowledge, technical values) values. Many characteristics that can be of value are addressed in this document; as categorized above. They can also refer to different or multiple values. In addition political values are implied for example by stating changes in political governance requires change in the urban areas.
HOW & WHO

According to the Venice charter (ICOMOS, 1964), safeguarding is a common responsibility, though it only refers to a body of experts in sciences and techniques in the process of managing heritage. Those experts are to conduct the needed analytical, technical and critical research, in order to understand the monument and to reveal its values. Based on that, a group of experts is to evaluate this knowledge, to decide upon the importance of the elements and the subsequent levels of protection; such decision cannot be taken on an individual basis. Once it is defined, action can be taken; every stage of this process should be documented and archived. Any type of change related to conservation is preferably facilitated by making use of the heritage for a social purpose. Such reuse, however, should not detract from the defined significant elements and values. Newly added parts should integrate harmoniously with but be distinguishable from the original.

The World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 1972) focuses on the states parties (SPs). When they adopt the convention, they are to facilitate the process of implementing it, and are responsible for the process of nominating and managing World Heritage on the national level. They should take effective and active measures to manage heritage and integrate it into community life (present/inform) and into comprehensive planning programmes. It is however, a collective duty to preserve and safeguard World Heritage. SPs are to inventory which properties are suitable for inclusion, and in the list and coordinate and encourage scientific, economic and technical research and operating methods to inventory and protect them and counteract the threats. To do so, SPs should set up national and subnational service(s) for the protection, and involve the necessary experts, technicians and specialists, as well as UNESCO’s advisory bodies. Their people(s) should be publically informed about and educated in protection, possible threats and the subsequent actions, to strengthen knowledge, appreciation and respect.

The Washington charter (ICOMOS, 1987) states that intervention should be preceded by multidisciplinary studies by specialists to document the area and define the factors of influence: values and threats. Based on the outcomes decisions regarding what to preserve or not, can be taken. Those factors, decisions and the proposed measures should be assembled in a conservation plan. Such a plan should be an integral part of coherent policies of economic and social development and of urban and regional planning at every level. Public national and subnational services are to manage safeguarding. The support and involvement of local communities and residents is essential for the success of a conservation programme. Their participation should be encouraged by educational programmes. The conservation plan should therefore be drawn up by the experts, local stakeholders and public services together. Transformation demands prudence, a systematic approach, and discipline, as well as flexibility and case specificity. It should not harm or damage the historic fabric or its environment,
but be beneficial to it; contemporary elements should be implemented in harmony with the surroundings, and the town as a whole. Also a harmonious relationship between private and community life is to be kept.

According to the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 1999), conservation is to be an integral part of ‘good management’. Burra is the only document to explicitly define the process in a schematic way. Although it is suggested that this process is iterative and may need adaption, the general process is depicted as follows: First, data must be collected and analysed to understand the cultural significance of a place and other factors affecting its future (user needs, values and threats). Next, policy is to be developed based on this knowledge, to manage the place. People (groups and individuals) for whom a place has special associations or meanings, or who have responsibilities for the place, should have the opportunity to contribute to and participate in conserving, interpreting and managing, where appropriate. However, competent direction and supervision has to be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with the appropriate knowledge and skills. The process is guided by the motto to ‘change as much as necessary but as little as possible’ and is to be based on cultural significance. Change may be necessary to retain significance. If possible, the records associated with the changes of the place should be archived and publicly accessible.

The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage defines the process of managing intangible heritage for states parties. They are responsible for the identification and definition of heritage, together with all the stakeholders essential in identification and management. Those can be non-governmental or governmental organizations, experts and, practitioners, as well as, the communities and people(s) that are involved in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and recreation of the heritage. SPs are to adopt policy aimed at promoting the function of intangible heritage in society, as well as measures aimed at management of and training for the transmission of such heritage. Such should be integrated into planning programmes, and heritage in danger should be prioritized. They are also to create competent bodies and foster research to increase effective safeguarding, especially in the field of education, awareness raising and capacity building, to support the continuation of the heritage. Efforts should be aimed at respect for, and ensuring continuation or even enhancement of, the heritage. This should always be done with respect for those keeping the heritage alive and respect for human rights in general. The general public should also be kept informed of threats and of the activities carried out to protect. Documentation institutions for the intangible cultural heritage should be established.

The Historic Urban Landscape recommendation (UNESCO, 2011) provides guidelines for a sustainable landscape management approach. HUL aims at a balance between urban growth and quality of life. The described process for recognition of cultural significance and diversity,
and monitoring and management of change comprises the following steps: inventory of resources, jointly define values and attributes to protect, assess threats and vulnerability and define areas of attention, combine into a management plan to be integrated into a wider framework of urban development. The plan should include priorities and the set-up of appropriate partnerships and local management frameworks. National and subnational governments should be facilitated to (re)develop instruments and tools to support this. The process entails active collaboration with a variety of governmental, public and private stakeholders, as well as research institutions, international organizations and international and national non-governmental organizations and communities, inhabitants, users, experts and professionals. Change should be guided by a plan based that is on the revealed and commonly defined cultural significance and diversity, impacts assessment and related managerial and mitigation measures.

According to the Valletta principles (ICOMOS, 2011) heritage should be fully integrated into contemporary society. Heritage management is presented as the cornerstone of urban and regional planning, and as essential for sustainable economic and social development policies. An effective management system is based on cultural significance and on the practices of inhabitants. A management plan should specify the strategies and tools used to manage heritage and development needs. The whole process from defining factors (values and threats) to producing a plan should aim for effective collaboration between all stakeholders (e.g. residents, users, governmental, agents, services, private sector, public sector, specialists, professional organizations, voluntary bodies and universities) by means of direct consultation and continuous dialogue. Broad and well-informed orchestration amongst all of them should be organized timely. Moreover, active awareness raising and training should be organized. If transformation is guided by respect for the significance it can improve the quality of the environment and of life, while avoiding direct and secondary negative impacts. Aim is a fundamental spatial, environmental, social, cultural and economic balance.
Appendix D

Next page, list of supranational policies mentioned in HUL (UNESCO, 2011) and its Preliminary Study (UNESCO, 2009).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supranational heritage policy</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Recommendation concerning the safeguarding of the beauty and character of landscapes and sites</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Venice charter</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Recommendation concerning the conservation of cultural property endangered by public or private works</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Declaration of the united nations conference on the human environment</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Recommendation concerning the protection, at national level, of the cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 European charter of the architectural heritage</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The declaration of amsterdam</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Recommendation concerning the safeguarding and contemporary role of historic areas</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The vancouver declaration on human settlements</td>
<td>UNHABITAT</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Historic gardens</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mexico city declaration on cultural policies</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Charter for the conservation of historic towns</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nara document on authenticity</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Summit of the world commission on culture and development</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Istanbul declaration on human settlements</td>
<td>UNHABITAT</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Action plan on cultural policies for development</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Action plan</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The stockholm conference</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 European landscape convention</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Universal declaration on cultural diversity</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Yamato declaration on integrated approaches for safeguarding tangible and intangible cultural heritage</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>PS HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Declaration on the conservation of historic urban landscapes</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Vienna memorandum</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Memorandum</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Xian-declaration</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Quebec city declaration on the conservation of the spirit of place</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Recommendation on the historic urban landscape</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

More detailed quantitative results of Workshop II Amsterdam.

Figure 31 a–b: Results per step taken over all matrices as % of the total amount of answers given in relation to that step – specified for City and District participants, and as indicated by the sampling grid.
Figure 32 a–b: Results in Figure 31 a and b further detailed, for Yes for All and Yes for Heritage answers.
Figure 34 a–b: Results in Figure 33 a and b further detailed, for Yes for All and Yes for Heritage answers.

Figure 33 a–b: Results per step taken over all matrices as % of the total amount of answers given in relation to that step – specified for participants from Urban Departments and Heritage Departments as indicated by the sampling grid.
Figure 34 a–b: Results in Figure 33 a and b further detailed, for Yes for All and Yes for Heritage answers.
HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES
Framing the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance

Urban development and heritage management have often been positioned as opposing powers in the management of historic urban landscapes. Heritage is seen as one of the 'usual suspects' of local grass-roots opposition to urban development, while development pressures are perceived as endangering heritage. In heritage theory and supranational policy, the trend is to recommend a holistic, integrated and multidisciplinary management of resources, by means of a new approach in heritage management: the landscape approach. In this context, landscape is defined as an inclusive and comprehensive platform that cannot be understood or managed except through an approach that embraces all its components. An urban application of this landscape approach is the historic urban landscape (HUL) approach, which is promoted by the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. It provides the principles as well as guidance on implementing a landscape approach in national and subnational policy.

Heritage management as a cultural practice has long been primarily about conserving the fabric of the past for future generations. As such it was more concentrated on the tangible and aesthetic dimensions of heritage. Instead, the historic urban landscape approach is considered holistic- and development-minded. It is not about allowing (or disallowing) transformation in itself, but about establishing and guiding the nature of the transformation. It addresses the future quality of the urban landscape and the relationships forming it. It positions heritage as an active change agent in the process of urban management. However, implementation on the national or subnational level proves to be a great challenge. The main aim of this thesis is to raise understanding of the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance, and in particular to explore ways to best reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy.

Heritage management is often subject to multilevel governance. A substantial body of laws, principles and policy guidelines, ranging from supra- to subnational levels are developed in this context. There is, however, a lack of systematic methods for comparative policy research in the field of cultural heritage. This hinders an understanding of policy transfer (vertical and horizontal) on a scale that goes beyond the case study, which then interferes with the feedback loop back into the supranational policies. In this research, a domain dependent taxonomy of heritage was identified in supranational policies. The taxonomy was used to develop a method of cross-referencing taxonomy, which was applied in a policy analysis tool. This tool can be used to analyse, classify and compare subnational urban and heritage policy.
Summary

HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES
Framing the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance

Urban development and heritage management have often been positioned as opposing powers in the management of historic urban landscapes. Heritage is seen as one of the ‘usual suspects’ of local grass-roots opposition to urban development, while development pressures are perceived as endangering heritage. In heritage theory and supranational policy, the trend is to recommend a holistic, integrated and multidisciplinary management of resources, by means of a new approach in heritage management: the landscape approach. In this context, landscape is defined as an inclusive and comprehensive platform that cannot be understood or managed except through an approach that embraces all its components. An urban application of this landscape approach is the historic urban landscape (HUL) approach, which is promoted by the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. It provides the principles as well as guidance on implementing a landscape approach in national and subnational policy.

Heritage management as a cultural practice has long been primarily about conserving the fabric of the past for future generations. As such it was more concentrated on the tangible and aesthetic dimensions of heritage. Instead, the historic urban landscape approach is considered holistic- and development-minded. It is not about allowing (or disallowing) transformation in itself, but about establishing and guiding the nature of the transformation. It addresses the future quality of the urban landscape and the relationships forming it. It positions heritage as an active change agent in the process of urban management. However, implementation on the national or subnational level proves to be a great challenge. The main aim of this thesis is to raise understanding of the integration of urban and heritage planning in multilevel governance, and in particular to explore ways to best reveal the relations between supranational and subnational policy.

Heritage management is often subject to multilevel governance. A substantial body of laws, principles and policy guidelines, ranging from supra- to subnational levels are developed in this context. There is, however, a lack of systematic methods for comparative policy research in the field of cultural heritage. This hinders an understanding of policy transfer (vertical and horizontal) on a scale that goes beyond the case study, which then interferes with the feedback loop back into the supranational policies. In this research, a domain dependent taxonomy of heritage was identified in supranational policies. The taxonomy was used to develop a method of cross-referencing taxonomy, which was applied in a policy analysis tool. This tool can be used to analyse, classify and compare subnational urban and heritage policy
policies. It facilitates the systematic identification of heritage concepts in policy. The tool was tested in Amsterdam by means of a series of three focus group interviews, held to introduce, apply and validate it. The results confirm the tool’s utility to cross-relate policies in multilevel governance. It allowed the interviewees to assess and reflect upon their policies and decide whether to revise them, in a constructive and evidence-based manner. While further research is needed to refine and optimize the taxonomy and its application in the policy analysis tool, it already promises to have applications beyond its initial aims. Vertical and horizontal comparison of policy provides input for evidence-based heritage planning and policy. The wider field of heritage significance and impact assessments could also benefit from exploring the application further.
Nederlandse samenvatting

Stedelijke ontwikkeling en behoud van erfgoed worden met regelmaat gepositioneerd als tegengestelde krachten in de ruimtelijke ordening. Erfgoed wordt gezien als een van de ‘usual suspects’ in het verzet tegen stedelijke ontwikkeling, terwijl de druk van stedelijke ontwikkeling wordt ervaren als bedreigend voor het erfgoed. Om de traditionele patstelling te doorbreken, worden zowel in de academische reflectie op erfgoed als in beleidskringen pogingen gewaagd om de aan erfgoed en ruimtelijke ordening gekoppelde belangen te integreren, in plaats van te polariseren. Dergelijke inspanningen worden academisch wel gegroepeerd onder wat aangeduid wordt als de ‘landschappelijke benadering’, die holistisch en multidisciplinair van aard is. Een ‘landschap’ wordt hierbij gedefinieerd als een overkoepelend en inclusief platform, dat enkel kan worden begrepen of ontwikkeld in samenhang. Een stedelijke toepassing van de onderhavige manier van denken is de ‘Historic Urban Landscape’ (HUL)-benadering. Deze benadering wordt aanbevolen in de 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Dit supranationaal beleidsdocument zet de principes van de landschappelijke benadering uiteen en biedt ondersteuning bij de implementatie ervan in nationaal en lokaal beleid.

De maatschappelijke omgang met erfgoed was lange tijd gericht op kwesties van behoud, dan wel het prijs geven, van historische objecten en structuren voor toekomstige generaties. Het erfgoedbeleid en -management concentreerde zich dienovereenkomstig op de materiële en esthetische dimensie van het erfgoed. De HUL-benadering biedt een aanpak die zich juist richt op transitie, transformatie en daarmee op een vitale toekomst ervan. Het gaat niet om het al dan niet toestaan van transformatie, maar om het vaststellen en (bij)sturen van de aard van die transformatie. De HUL-benadering richt zich dan ook met name op de toekomstige kwaliteit van het (stedelijke) landschap. Erfgoed brengt kwaliteit, en wordt dus niet gepositioneerd als hindernis, maar als breekijzer in het proces van ruimtelijke ontwikkeling. Het is een middel, geen doel op zich. Hoe vanzelfsprekend deze ontwikkeling in het denken over erfgoed ook mag lijken, de implementatie van deze ideeën in lokaal beleid blijkt een grote uitdaging. Het doel van dit onderzoek is dan ook om inzicht te creëren in de integratie van erfgoed- en ruimtelijk ordeningsbeleid op verschillende beleidsniveaus. In het bijzonder richt het onderzoek zich op het ontwikkelen en testen van een methode om relaties tussen het supranationale en het lokale beleid bloot te leggen.

Erfgoed is onderhevig aan verschillende beleidsniveaus. Op al deze niveaus is in de loop van de tijd een aanzienlijke hoeveelheid wetten en beleidsrichtlijnen ontwikkeld. Een methode die
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