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The acceleration of development pressures in recent decades has focused attention on the spectrum of major challenges facing the diverse stakeholders charged with the safeguarding and protection of World Heritage Sites. This paper compares two sites that have highlighted these challenges, both of which were inscribed on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage List in 2004: Dresden Elbe Valley, Federal Republic of Germany, placed on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2006 and delisted in 2009; and Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City, UK, placed on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2012 and the subject of ongoing debate. The paper questions inconsistencies in the decision-making processes that may have triggered conflicts of interest in these two cases, positions the developing UNESCO concept of historic urban landscape as an enabler of integrative urban development, and draws lessons for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.
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Introduction
In validating the context, the opening paragraph of the preamble to the 1972 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage
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Convention notes: ‘the cultural heritage and the natural heritage are 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’. The eighth paragraph of the same preamble states: ‘it is essential for this purpose to adopt new provisions in the form of a convention establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods’. Within the framework of a Convention that is ratified worldwide by 191 State Parties, there is an elemental prerequisite for certainty, clarity, and consistency — the ‘3Cs’ of effective protection. The cases of Dresden Elbe Valley and Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City have focused attention on recent processes that have led to conflict between two of the State Parties to the Convention and the World Heritage Committee, and raised wider questions concerning the effective implementation of the Convention in the face of a known catalogue of threats.

The Dresden and Liverpool sites were both inscribed at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee held in Suzhou, China, in 2004. As will be seen, in both cases there were inconsistencies in interpretation of the advisory body reports that were placed before that session which may have contributed to the conflicts that subsequently arose between the various stakeholders involved in the decision-making processes at the local, national, and international levels: for Dresden, over the construction of the Waldschlößchenbrücke crossing of the river Elbe; for Liverpool, over the planning proposal for Liverpool Waters (effectively a new city) on land substantially within the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone. In both cases, subsequent sessions of the World Heritage Committee determined that these development projects would represent an irreversible threat to the outstanding universal value of the inscribed sites. In 2006, within two years of inscription, Dresden Elbe Valley was placed on the World Heritage List in Danger; in 2009, within five years, it was deleted from the World Heritage List, a decision that was opposed by the State Party and Dresden City Council and unanimously regretted at the local level. Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City was placed on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2012 within eight years of inscription, a decision that was anticipated by Liverpool City Council which supported Liverpool Waters, and welcomed by opponents of that project as a ‘wake-up call’ to the State Party to apply an integrated planning approach to development proposals affecting the World Heritage Site and city as a whole.

This paper opens with a description of both case studies in order to distil their similarities and differences. Based on scrutiny of the documents and anchored in a legal, political, and planning approach, this is followed by a review of the reciprocal conflicts of interest and their handling by the various stakeholders involved. Thereafter, the evolving concept of historic urban landscape is applied to both cases, with the objective of identifying its utility for the facilitation of integrative urban development and the mediation of conflicts related to development projects affecting cities that comprise or incorporate World Heritage Sites.

Description of the case studies

**Dresden Elbe Valley**

The city of Dresden, capital of the Free State of Saxony, is situated in a valley on the river Elbe close to the border with the Czech Republic. It was first established as a princely residence in 1206. From 1485 onwards the city developed as an important
political, economic, and cultural centre, seat of the Dukes, Electors, and subsequently Kings of Saxony. At the height of its architectural and artistic renown it was known as Elbflorenz — ‘Florence of the Elbe’ (Figure 1). From the middle of the 19th century Dresden developed as a major manufacturing centre; the city’s population peaked at 630,300 in 1939. Allied bombing in February 1945 devastated the historic city centre and, by 1946, the city’s population had shrunk to 467,966. Today, Dresden is one of the fastest-growing cities in Germany, recording a population of 523,058 in 2010. With over 62 per cent of the city given over to green areas and forests, it is also one of the greenest cities in Europe. An important component of this landscape is the Elbe meadows, which cross the city in a 20km swathe (overall), and across which the Waldschlößchenbrücke has now been constructed.

In 1982, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) National Committee of the German Democratic Republic (1949–90), to which Dresden belonged, organised a symposium in the city which resulted in The Declaration of Dresden on the ‘Reconstruction of Monuments Destroyed by War’. This recognised

**FIGURE 1** Dresden: ‘Florence of the Elbe’. The Augustus Bridge in the foreground and, left to right: the Baroque buildings of the Academy of Fine Arts on the Brühl’s Terrace, the Church of Our Lady (Frauenkirche), the Ständehaus, and the Hofkirche. This emblematic view of the historic centre, which in essence remains largely unaltered, was painted c 1748 by Bernardo Bellotto (1721–80), nephew and pupil of Giovanni Antonio Canal (1697–1768), better known as Canaletto. © Perrine Deruelles 2008.
the spiritual and symbolic validity of reconstructing cultural sites following wartime destruction alongside the importance of architectural development and functional continuity. In 1989, against this background, and with the precedent in 1980 of the inscription on the World Heritage List of the reconstructed historic centre of the Polish capital of Warsaw, the authorities of the German Democratic Republic submitted a nomination for the Baroque Ensemble of Dresden under the Convention’s category of a ‘group of buildings’. This nomination was not supported for reasons associated with the degree of authenticity in the reconstructed city. Subsequently, however, and following reunification of the two parts of Germany in 1990 as the enlarged Federal Republic, it was suggested that a new nomination should be prepared as a ‘cultural landscape’ under the Convention’s category of ‘site’: ‘the combined works of nature and man’.

Nominated in 2003, Dresden Elbe Valley was inscribed on the World Heritage List as a ‘continuing cultural landscape’ in 2004,\(^9\) based on four criteria for the justification of outstanding universal value\(^10\) (Table 1). The summary description of the Dresden Elbe Valley World Heritage Site (2004–09) reads as follows:

The 18th- and 19th-century cultural landscape of Dresden Elbe Valley extends some 18 km along the river from Übigau Palace and Ostragehege fields in the north-west to the Pillnitz Palace and the Elbe River Island in the south-east. It features low meadows, and is crowned by the Pillnitz Palace and the centre of Dresden with its numerous monuments and parks from the 16th to 20th centuries. The landscape also features 19th- and 20th-century suburban villas and gardens and valuable natural features. Some terraced slopes along the river are still used for viticulture and some old villages have retained their historic structure and elements from the industrial revolution, notably the 147-m Blue Wonder steel bridge (1891–93), the single-rail suspension cable railway (1898–1901), and the funicular (1894–95). The passenger steamships (the oldest from 1879) and shipyard (c 1900) are still in use.\(^11\)

As seen in Table 1, the four inscribed criteria emphasise the architectural, artistic, and industrial heritage values of the man-made components of the cultural landscape rather than its natural features. In both the nomination dossier and the ICOMOS evaluation, however, the unconstructed meadows (of the flood plain because the Elbe is subject to regular over-flowing) are incorporated into the statement of authenticity and integrity. This element of the site played an important role in the conflict between the State Party and the World Heritage Committee that arose post-inscription over the construction of the Waldschlößchenbrücke. This inconsistency may be explained in part by the non-involvement of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (the IUCN), which is the advisory body for natural sites.

More central to the assessment of inconsistencies in the decision-making processes that triggered the conflict over the Waldschlößchenbrücke are, first, the recognition under inscription criterion (v) that ‘this cultural landscape […] is now under new pressures for change’;\(^12\) and second, the statement in the ICOMOS evaluation referring to the proposed Waldschlößchenbrücke which reads: ‘Its design results from an international competition. The profile has been kept slender and low in order to reduce impact on landscape’.\(^13\) Whereas the first relates closely to the dynamic nature
### TABLE 1
**CRITERIA FOR THE INSCRIPTION OF THE DRESDEN AND LIVERPOOL WORLD HERITAGE SITES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE PERCEPTIONS BY THE STATE PARTIES, THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, AND THE ADVISORY BODY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts for the justification of outstanding universal value as inscribed at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee, Suzhou, China (2004), based on the cultural criteria set out in the Operational Guidelines</th>
<th>Dresden Elbe Valley</th>
<th>Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Criterion (ii): The Dresden Elbe Valley has been the crossroads in Europe, in culture, science and technology. Its art collections, architecture, gardens, and landscape features have been an important reference for Central European developments in the 18th and 19th centuries.</td>
<td>‘Criterion (ii): Liverpool was a major centre generating innovative technologies and methods in dock construction and port management in the 18th and 19th centuries. It thus contributed to the building up of the international mercantile systems throughout the British Commonwealth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Criterion (iii): The Dresden Elbe Valley contains exceptional testimonies of court architecture and festivities, as well as renowned examples of middle-class architecture and industrial heritage representing European urban development into the modern industrial era.</td>
<td>‘Criterion (iii): The city and the port of Liverpool are an exceptional testimony to the development of maritime mercantile culture in the 18th and 19th centuries, contributing to the building up of the British Empire. It was a centre for the slave trade, until its abolition in 1807, and for emigration from northern Europe to America.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Criterion (iv): The Dresden Elbe Valley is an outstanding cultural landscape, an ensemble that integrates the celebrated baroque setting and suburban garden city into an artistic whole within the river valley.</td>
<td>‘Criterion (iv): Liverpool is an outstanding example of a world mercantile port city, which represents the early development of global trading and cultural connections throughout the British Empire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Criterion (v): The Dresden Elbe Valley is an outstanding example of land use, representing an exceptional development of a major Central-European city. The value of this cultural landscape has long been recognized, but it is now under new pressures for change’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of the site by the State Party in the nomination dossier</th>
<th>Harmonious connection between landscape and architecture, with fields integrated into a city.</th>
<th>Global maritime mercantile importance; surviving extent of complementary components of the architectural and industrial heritage; coherent urban landscape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the site by the World Heritage Committee and the advisory body (ICOMOS)</td>
<td>Representative of the drama and reconstruction of an entire town and people. Good example of a continuing cultural landscape with a long and complex history. Importance of the valley’s cultural and natural aspects.</td>
<td>World port city; pioneering developments in dock technology and related systems; range and quantity of significant buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of authenticity and integrity</td>
<td>Continuity of the site, preservation of the artistic connection of the construction development related to the river and meadows as a green and recreational area.</td>
<td>Urban landscape as testimony to the historical role and importance of the city and manifestation of the site’s tangible authenticity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the nomination dossiers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focused on the state of conservation of the historic docks and buildings, including their architectural features and minor detailing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the ICOMOS evaluation</td>
<td>Despite grave losses in the historic city centre during World War II, the site has retained its overall historical authenticity and integrity in its distinctive character and components.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Bénédicte Gaillard and Dennis Rodwell.
of a continuing cultural landscape and anticipates the need for sound management generally across the site, the second represents acknowledgement that ICOMOS was both familiar with and endorsed the design of the bridge that subsequently led to the delisting of the Dresden Elbe Valley World Heritage Site.

The project to construct a crossing at the location of the Waldschlößchen was not new: it had been a consistent feature in the city planning for Dresden since the middle of the 19th century (Table 2). The 2003 nomination document for the World Heritage Site confirmed that the City Council had taken a final decision to build the bridge. The Waldschlößchenbrücke was seen as essential for cross-river connection between the northern and southern districts of the city to the east of the city centre in order to reduce traffic congestion in the city centre and lighten vehicle loadings on the historic bridges. It was only repeated discordance between politics, planning, and funding, coupled with the intervention of World War II, which prevented the bridge from being constructed decades before the nomination of Dresden Elbe Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>The project for an Elbe bridge crossing at the location of the Waldschlößchen (a 1790 hunting lodge) first featured in the Dresden General Construction Plan of 1859–62. Over the following decades, cycles of political and financial uncertainty prevented implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934–37</td>
<td>Project revived, then World War II intervened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Failed project for a 6-lane bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978–79</td>
<td>Failed project for an 8-lane bridge with large intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Decision to build a 4-lane bridge. A design competition planned for 1989 was aborted by the downfall of the German Democratic Republic (GDR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Nomination of the Baroque Ensemble of Dresden by the GDR. This was not supported and was withdrawn by the State Party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>German Reunification: the länder of the GDR were incorporated into the Federal Republic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–94</td>
<td>Dresden City Council revived the debate for a crossing at the Waldschlößchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Workshop organised by the Mayor of Dresden to decide bridge vs. tunnel. Following a majority vote, the project for a 4-lane bridge was agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>International design competition for the Waldschlößchenbrücke. Won by Eisenloffel, Sattler, Kolb, and Ripke (ESKR) Engineers &amp; Architects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Nomination to UNESCO of Dresden Elbe Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>March: ICOMOS advisory report and evaluation: the Waldschlößchenbrücke project and design were noted and no threat to the outstanding universal value of the site was perceived. July: World Heritage Committee (28th session): Dresden Elbe Valley inscribed on the World Heritage List.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City

The city of Liverpool is situated close to the mouth of the river Mersey at a landward terminus that leads to the Irish Sea and Atlantic Ocean. Founded as a royal burgh in 1207, Liverpool’s heyday as one of the great port cities of the world embraced the late-18th through to the early 20th centuries, during which period it became known as the ‘Second City of Empire’ (Figure 2); the city’s population peaked at 846,101 in 1931. By the 1970s, precipitated by World War I and the depression that followed, and hastened by the post-World War II dismantling of global Empire and changeover in international shipping practices from manually intensive dockside to automated containerisation, Liverpool had ceased to be a maritime mercantile city with parallel impacts on the associated manufacturing industries and severe consequences for the socioeconomic life of the city’s diverse communities. In the words of one observer of the times, Liverpool had become ‘less the Gateway to Empire than the Tradesmen’s Entrance’. By 2001 the city’s population had fallen to 439,476, a low point of little over half the 1931 figure. Official projections forecast a stabilisation in population numbers to around 460,000 by 2021, an increase that has been attributed to expanding student numbers and inward

---

**TABLE 2 CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2006 | January: ICOMOS issued a statement opposing the *Waldschlößchenbrücke* and called for discussion of ‘less harmful alternatives’.  
April: Visual Impact Study by the Institute of Urban Design and Regional Planning of the Technical University of Aachen (RWTH Aachen) highlighted negative impacts of the bridge project.  
July: World Heritage Committee (30th session): concluded that construction of the *Waldschlößchenbrücke* would irreversibly damage the integrity and *outstanding universal value* of the property; inscribed Dresden Elbe Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger, with the view to considering delisting at the next session if the construction of the bridge proceeded; and urged discussions with all stakeholders to find alternative solutions.  
August: Dresden City Council halted the bridge construction procedures. |
| 2007 | March–May: a decision of the State of Saxony Higher Administrative Court upheld the outcome of the 2005 Referendum as the decision of the citizens. This was then confirmed by the German Federal Court.  
June: World Heritage Committee (31st session): retained Dresden Elbe Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger, urged the State Party to continue its efforts to find an alternative solution, and decided to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism.  
November: bridge construction commenced. |
| 2008 | March–May: a petition for a second Referendum (‘Elbe tunnel initiative’) was opposed by the Mayor of Dresden and the Dresden Administrative Court.  
July: World Heritage Committee (32nd session): urged the State Party to halt the construction works that had started; deferred a decision to delist the site to allow the State Party to reverse the damage already caused by the commencement of construction and reconsider the alternative tunnel option. |
| 2009 | June: World Heritage Committee (33rd session): Dresden Elbe Valley deleted from the World Heritage List on the premise: ‘the State Party was unable to fulfil its obligations defined in the *Convention*, in particular the obligation to protect and conserve the *Outstanding Universal Value*, as inscribed, of the World Heritage property of the Dresden Elbe Valley’. |
| 2013 | August: official opening of the *Waldschlößchenbrücke* for traffic at the *Brückenfest* (Bridge Festival). |

**Source:** Bénédicte Gaillard.
migration from Central and Eastern European accession countries to the European Union.22

Liverpool has suffered a severe identity crisis since at least the 1970s and, at the dawn of the new millennium, its salvation was seen in terms of recovery of the status of ‘world city’ through parallel policies of cultural promotion and economic development. The nomination of Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City for inscription on the World Heritage List was an integral part of this process (Table 3). Nominated in 2003, Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City was inscribed on the World Heritage List as a ‘group of buildings’ under the Convention,23 and an inhabited historic town under the Operational Guidelines,24 based on three criteria for the justification of outstanding universal value (Table 1).25

The summary description of the Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site reads (2004 onwards) as follows:

Six areas in the historic centre and docklands of the maritime mercantile City of Liverpool bear witness to the development of one of the world’s major trading centres in the 18th and 19th centuries. Liverpool played an important role in the growth of the British Empire and became the major port for the mass movement of people, e.g. slaves and emigrants from northern Europe to America. Liverpool was a pioneer in the development of modern dock...
TABLE 3
LIVERPOOL: TIMELINE OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN CULTURAL PROMOTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF THE LIVERPOOL — MARITIME MERCANTILE WORLD HERITAGE SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Merseyside granted Objective 1 status under European Union regional funding policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Britain’s first Urban Regeneration Company, Liverpool Vision, established: focused on economic development. Liverpool twinned with Shanghai, historically China’s foremost mercantile trading port whose historic urban landscape echoes Liverpool’s. Liverpool placed on the UK’s Tentative List to UNESCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Nomination to UNESCO of Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>March: ICOMOS advisory report and evaluation; threats posed by development projects affecting the site and buffer zone were noted; ‘urban landscape’ was deleted from the State Party’s proposed text for the justification of outstanding universal value. July: World Heritage Committee (28th session): Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List; the decision text recommended close monitoring of the processes of change affecting the site’s areas and surroundings and focused particular concern on the then-proposed ‘Fourth Grace’ at the Pier Head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UNESCO Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture — Managing the Historic Urban Landscape. Preamediated in the preamble as a ‘key statement for an integrated approach linking contemporary architecture, sustainable urban development and landscape integrity based on existing historic patterns, building stock and context’, Article 21 compromised this by stating that ‘urban planning, contemporary architecture and preservation of the historic urban landscape should avoid all forms of pseudo-historical design, as they constitute a denial of both the historical and the contemporary alike’. The Memorandum contains no variant of the word ‘harmonious’, and Article 21 has proved a recipe for conflictual modern interventions worldwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>July: World Heritage Committee (30th session): reported serious concerns about the dominant scale and intrusive design of the substitute projects at the Pier Head — the waterfront Museum of Liverpool and three buildings on Mann Island — and urged the State Party to set in place clear strategies for design briefs and for the overall townscape, skyline, and river front. October: first UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Liverpool World Heritage Site: deferred to English Heritage’s assessment that the high quality of architectural design and materialisation of the Museum and Mann Island projects complemented the historic Pier Head group, described the planning system to manage the city’s urban renaissance as ‘impressive’, and concluded that the overall state of conservation of the World Heritage Site was good and the site’s outstanding universal value was not under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>February: State Party responded to the 2006 mission report by confirming steps to strengthen measures and guidance to protect the site, and offered Liverpool as a case study for the elaboration of the proposed UNESCO Recommendation on the historic urban landscape. April: completion of the flagship £22 million restoration of St George’s Hall. July: World Heritage Committee (31st session): called for the introduction of a stricter regime of planning control, including the control of building heights and adherence to townscape characteristics, and an increased level of information to the general public about the outstanding universal value of the site and its management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Opening of the first phase of the £1 billion Liverpool One, vaunted as the largest retail-led city-centre regeneration project in Europe. Major retailers in the city relocated to Liverpool One from historic buildings in the established city centre. July: World Heritage Committee (32nd session): renewed call for the State Party to develop a strategic plan for the overall townscape, skyline, and river front, including prescribing building heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>June: World Heritage Committee (33rd session): anticipated that the forthcoming Supplementary Planning Document would largely respond to previous Committee decisions. October: Liverpool City Council adopted its Supplementary Planning Document for the World Heritage Site. This document, which received a number of awards within the UK planning community, identified opportunities for high-rise buildings immediately adjacent to the World Heritage Site and inside the buffer zone, in effect anticipating Liverpool Waters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
technology, transport systems and port management. The listed sites feature a great number of significant commercial, civic and public buildings, including St George’s Plateau.26

As seen in Table 1, the three inscribed criteria emphasised the history of Liverpool as a world mercantile port city (including many dimensions that may be construed as ‘intangible’) coupled with innovations in technology, construction, and port management systems. Additional to setting out the history and manifold individual components of the site, the nomination document stressed the surviving urban landscape, which it described as outstanding.27 The ICOMOS evaluation report reiterated this: ‘The nominated site is a complete and integral urban landscape that provides coherent evidence of Liverpool’s historic character and bears testament to its exceptional historic significance’.28 Notwithstanding this, ‘urban landscape’ was deleted by the advisory body from the State Party’s proposed wording for the justification of outstanding universal value under criteria (iii) and (iv), and not re-incorporated into the decision that was adopted by the 2004 World Heritage Committee. Whereas the definition of a ‘group of buildings’ in the 1972 Convention includes ‘homogeneity’ and ‘place in the landscape’,29 the deletion of any reference to ‘urban landscape’ in the justification for inscription proved a crucial impediment to the subsequent reactive monitoring of the Liverpool site,30 and underscored the serious later inconsistencies in the outcomes of the joint 2006 and 2011 UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

**Summary**

In the linear process from nomination through inscription to monitoring, the advisory body evaluation reports are the principal documents that are placed before the members of the World Heritage Committee to guide their decisions. Thereafter, the adopted
texts for the justification of outstanding universal value provide the benchmark for monitoring. In the case of Dresden Elbe Valley, a site inscribed under the category of ‘continuing cultural landscape’, ‘new pressures for change’ are noted in the justification under criterion (v), while the ICOMOS evaluation noted the project to construct the Waldschläbchenbrücke. Irrespective of conflicting views of the appropriateness of a bridge at this location or its design, public authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany were entitled to consider that a project endorsed in the ICOMOS evaluation could proceed without objection and to assume they could continue with planning and contractual arrangements. In the case of Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City, a site inscribed under the category of a ‘group of buildings’, the ICOMOS evaluation excluded ‘urban landscape’ from the State Party’s intentions with regard to the statement of justification under two out of the three inscribed criteria. Irrespective again of conflicting views of the appropriateness of Liverpool Waters, whether in urban planning, morphological or other terms, public authorities in the UK were entitled to consider that the city’s historic urban landscape was not a defining consideration for the purposes of monitoring the World Heritage Site and safeguarding its outstanding universal value. Such were the seeds of conflict that led to both sites being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, with the Dresden site being subsequently delisted.

Conflicts of interest between development and heritage protection of the inscribed sites

Dresden Elbe Valley

Dresden Elbe Valley comprised a World Heritage Site covering 1,930ha in a single area, with a buffer zone of 1,240ha. With an implication of regret at the losses to the urban fabric which had prevented a successful outcome to the 1989 nomination, the adopted decision at the 2004 session of the World Heritage Committee noted: ‘the important events associated with the City’s history in World War II’, and invited the State Party to consider re-nominating the inscribed site on the additional basis of the cultural criterion (vi). It was only subsequently that controversy erupted concerning the Waldschläbchenbrücke, arising from representations from a number of individuals and a spectrum of non-governmental organisations, including members of ICOMOS who had not been party to the 2004 advisory body report. Not discussed at the 2005 session, concerns were first confirmed at the 2006 World Heritage Committee, at which time the site was immediately placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the battle lines drawn that would lead to the delisting of the site in 2009.

The Waldschläbchenbrücke lies east of Dresden city centre, some 4km along the course of the Elbe at a position where the natural line of the river is 127m wide (Figures 3 and 4). The four-lane bridge is 636m long and forms a level carriageway at an elevation to suit the embankments on either side and avoid the periodic extensive flooding of the meadows. The subject of an international design competition in 1997, the winning team (ESKR Engineers & Architects) explained their project as follows:

The design of the bridge, which combines road, tramway, bicycle lane and pedestrian path, is to be conceived as an interpretation of the historic arched bridges of Dresden
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FIGURE 3  Dresden Elbe Valley: View looking eastwards from the city centre along the course of the Elbe to the site of the Waldschlößchenbrücke crossing. © Perrine Deruelles 2008.

FIGURE 4  Dresden Elbe Valley: The same view showing the Waldschlößchenbrücke nearing completion. © Bénédicte Gaillard 2011.
without the attempt to copy them. The form is conservative, only the crossing of the river Elbe is stressed by the elevation of the arch over the river.\textsuperscript{33}

In response, it should be noted that the arches of Dresden’s historic bridges feature under the carriageways, not over them. Furthermore, the \textit{Waldschlößchenbrücke} is designed and detailed to look as though it is structurally made of concrete, but is in reality a steel structure that was then infilled (Figure 5).\textsuperscript{34} It is the view of this paper’s authors that there was no primordial engineering reason for the \textit{Waldschlößchenbrücke} to be designed with a superstructure above the line of the carriageway.

In the intensive and increasingly acrimonious international through to local diplomatic, political, legal, professional, and media debates that first were manifested at the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2006,\textsuperscript{35} the following are of particular note (Table 2):

- The timeline that led to the construction of the \textit{Waldschlößchenbrücke} (2007–13) began in 1862, at which time the city featured just two bridges. By 2000, when the City Council voted for the construction of the 1997 competition-winning design, the city had accumulated seven crossings. The statistical projections justifying an eighth crossing were contested.
- The project for a crossing at the \textit{Waldschlößchen} was revived shortly after German Reunification in 1990. Key decisions to construct a bridge were taken by Dresden City Council in 1996 and 2000. The Referendum that was held in 2005 did not provide for the option of a tunnel on the ballot paper.
- Although the bridge project had been the subject of local political controversy for at least a decade, concerns about the \textit{Waldschlößchenbrücke} first reached the World Heritage Centre subsequent to the 2005 session of the World Heritage Committee through a concert of complaints from individuals and local non-governmental organisations, which were supported by representatives of the self-same advisory body that had prepared the pre-inscription evaluation. Objections to the bridge design were articulated unambiguously in the April 2006 Visual Impact Study by RWTH Aachen, which concluded — in manifest contradiction of the ESKR report cited above — that:
  a) the Waldschlösschen Bridge does not fit in with the existing series of Dresden City bridges;
  b) the Waldschlösschen Bridge obscures a number of views of the Dresden skyline and the Elbe Valley which are of historical importance as well as continuing relevance to daily life in the city;
  c) the Waldschlösschen Bridge cuts into the cohesive landscape of the Elbe river bend at its most sensitive point, splitting it irreversibly into two halves.
- The degree to which citizens were made aware that the status of Dresden Elbe Valley on the World Heritage List was at stake is open to serious question, and the provisions of the World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines were not considered material to key decisions made in the courts.
- Whereas the alternative of a tunnel also would have had negative environmental impacts, more severe in disturbance of the river banks, a redesign of the bridge project to avoid the arched superstructure — a design option rather
than an engineering necessity, and the single feature that has the most detrimental impact on views along this curved stretch of the river Elbe — does not feature in the sequence of decisions made by sessions of the World Heritage Committee. The stark choice was therefore between the 1997 competition-winning bridge design that led to the delisting — to which the authorities were committed but not encouraged to revisit — and a tunnel that would mitigate the visual but aggravate the ecological impact. Stark choices are not a good recipe for the mediation of conflicts, and attempts at resolution by the Committee through 2007 and 2008 were fatally compromised.

- Dresden Elbe Valley was deleted from the World Heritage List without the consent of the State Party, a precedent which has yet to be repeated. From a situation at the 2004 session of the World Heritage Committee in which the construction of the Waldschlößchenbrücke was not perceived to be a threat to the site’s outstanding universal value, Dresden Elbe Valley was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the first — 2006 — session at which it was discussed, and delisted in 2009 accompanied by a strongly worded rebuke to the State Party, which appears disproportionate (Figure 6).

- The Waldschlößchenbrücke controversy remains a divisive subject in civil society in Dresden, where the loss of the World Heritage label is keenly felt (although negative impacts on tourism and property values have not been reported). As expressed by a colleague: ‘I do feel the removal of Dresden because of the river bridge is pedantic in extreme especially when you look

**Figure 5** The *Waldschlößchenbrücke* under construction. © Dennis Rodwell 2011.
at the poor old Tower of London’. The decision to delist Dresden communicates as being specific to a particular set of failures of communication and conflict mediation, contrary to the exhortation to objectivity made in the preamble to the 1972 Convention (as cited in the Introduction above).

Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City
Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City is a 136ha World Heritage Site comprising six disparate components that are either contiguous or linked on plan. The buffer zone covers 75ha. In accordance with UNESCO guidance, both were delineated two rather than three-dimensionally on plan. The 2004 advisory evaluation, which concerned itself principally with the state of conservation of the buildings and their detailing within the nominated site, noted:

The ICOMOS mission was generally satisfied with the planning and development control mechanism. There are strong legal and practical mechanisms to ensure the protection of the historic core areas and the individual buildings. The Buffer zone is considered well defined and large enough to protect the nominated area. The local City Government is determined to ensure that there will be sufficient protection in the Buffer Zone.
The advisory report also judged overall that ‘the nominated area has well retained its historic authenticity and integrity’.\textsuperscript{38} At the same time, it stressed the need to ‘vigilantly monitor’ a series of specific threats; notably, the planned new construction of a ‘Fourth Grace’ at the Pier Head, and the preparation of a tall buildings’ policy for the city.

The nomination of Liverpool coincided with a period of acute financial and political volatility in the city. Flush with European and UK development funding, which in turn attracted predatory ambitions in the private sector, safeguarding the city’s historic environment called for extreme care on the part of all concerned, especially the international and national heritage organisations. Of particular note for Liverpool was the political enthusiasm for major new development projects, frequently as statements of ambition to position the city as a ‘world city’ irrespective of functional need.

The project which focused attention at the 2004 session of the World Heritage Committee was the competition-winning ‘Fourth Grace’ design by architect Will Alsop (dubbed the ‘glittering cloud’) for land immediately to the south (right side, as seen from the river) of the Pier Head trio of buildings (known as the ‘Three Graces’). A star architect was sought for the design of an iconic structure, the intended function of which was not clearly defined, that would provide a ‘wow’ factor and attract a worldwide visitor audience. Analogies were drawn with the Sydney Opera House and the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao.\textsuperscript{39} For the Council leader, it was sufficient to say: ‘We want the Fourth Grace to be a statement of intent that Liverpool is a world-class city with world-class architecture’.\textsuperscript{40} In the aftermath of inscription, Alsop’s project was dropped,\textsuperscript{41} to be replaced by a project for a new Museum of Liverpool and three new structures on the neighbouring Mann Island.

Notable was the determination by the City Council to build on the constricted space between the Albert Dock and the Pier Head group: the former, Liverpool’s pioneering project of heritage-led regeneration commenced in the 1980s; the latter, the defining symbol of the city’s historical significance. The new museum project was strongly opposed by ICOMOS-UK, and the museum’s design architect, Kim Nielsen, is quoted as saying: ‘Our first reaction was that you shouldn’t build here’; a view which also has been endorsed by SAVE Britain’s Heritage.\textsuperscript{42} Employing a logic that is incoherent in urban planning terms, the second 2011 UNESCO-ICOMOS mission report applauded the siting of both the Museum and Mann Island developments (Figure 7).

\textit{Liverpool Waters} is a purely speculative planning application for the £5.5 billion development of a 60ha site that lies substantially within the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone north of Prince’s Dock to the seaward side of the Pier Head group. Its scale and location is such that it would lead to the creation of a new city adjacent to and in direct competition with historic Liverpool (Figures 8 and 9). Also known as ‘Shanghai-Liverpool’ in recognition of the twin city status since 1999, \textit{Liverpool Waters} has achieved strong support from local politicians captivated by the architects’ visual imagery, the sheer physical scale and financial magnitude of the project, promises of massive job creation, and association with the politically-charged mantra of economic growth. \textit{Liverpool Waters} contradicts the City Council’s own forecast of stabilisation in the city’s population numbers following a near century of decline, and premeditates a serious level of abandonment of buildings and infrastructure in
In the context of the extended series of state of conservation reports, monitoring missions, World Heritage Committee decisions, coupled with consideration of the relationships between the components of the World Heritage Site and the city of Liverpool as a whole, the following are of particular note (see also Table 3):

- The UK planning system has a complex framework of policy guidance and development plans which gives the outside impression of being comprehensive. The system is, however, primordially negotiable and permissive in the interests of development; and a ‘tall buildings’ policy’ signifies a policy to encourage locations for tall buildings, not to discourage them and establish restrictions on building heights. Critically, there is no national designation for historic areas, and urban sites such as Liverpool are propelled from an assemblage of policy fragments to the status of World Heritage Sites in the absence of a nationally-formulated protective framework that embraces them. The 2004 ICOMOS advisory evaluation, the 2006 UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, and successive sessions of the World Heritage Committee appear not to have recognised these flaws in the UK planning system and the absence of an overarching protective regime.
- The remit for the first UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2006 focused on the waterfront projects at the Pier Head, and was also broadened to encompass the overall situation ‘with regard to the state of conservation of the
FIGURE 8  Liverpool: Aerial view of the Pier Head group looking northwards across the site of Liverpool Waters.
© Image created by www.ruststudios.co.uk 2009.

FIGURE 9  Liverpool: The same view showing the proposed development of Liverpool Waters.
© Image created by www.ruststudios.co.uk 2014.
site in its widest urban context, its integrity and authenticity’.44 Whereas the resultant mission report raised a number of visual integrity and management issues, including inadequate guidance in the design briefs for the two waterfront projects, it was inhibited by the limited definition of contemporary in the UNESCO Vienna Memorandum45 from challenging their endorsement by English Heritage. Additionally constrained by the deletion of ‘urban landscape’ from the texts of justification for outstanding universal value, the 2006 mission report also concluded that redevelopment initiatives in the wider urban context were ‘carefully re-establishing the city’s coherence through the enhancement of its numerous remaining historical features [and] the infill of vacant lots’, and omitted to comment critically on the post-inscription high-rise waterfront developments in the Prince’s Dock area of the buffer zone; indeed, it described the urban morphology of the docks and harbours as remaining intact.46 This failure to address the historic urban landscape holistically contradicts the subsequent condemnation of the Liverpool Waters project (Figure 10).

• The remit for the second UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2011 focused on Liverpool Waters. The project has been opposed within the UK by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment on design grounds, and by English Heritage for its lack of correspondence with the configuration and morphology of the former historic docklands. Numerous non-governmental heritage organisations — including SAVE Britain’s Heritage — and individuals also oppose the scheme. The governmental objectors have concentrated on project details rather than the principle of the development. Others have questioned the threat it would pose to the functionality of the historic city as well as ongoing investment in it. The 2011 mission report, founded primarily

![Figure 10](image_url) Panorama of the Liverpool waterfront from the seaward north-west, including the completed Museum of Liverpool building at the far right. Whereas none of the taller modern buildings to the left of the Pier Head group featured in the documentation that was submitted to the 2004 meeting of the World Heritage Committee, they were either completed or at the planning stage at the time of the first UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2006, which made no adverse comments in relation to threats to the outstanding universal value and authenticity and integrity of the World Heritage Site. © Dennis Rodwell 2011.
on the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, focused on issues related to urban morphology and views, notably the heights of the proposed 192m, 55-storey Shanghai Tower — the landmark feature in the Liverpool Waters imagery — together with a secondary cluster of tall buildings, and concluded that Liverpool Waters would irreversibly threaten the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site. Previously, and contrary to its condemnation of Liverpool’s unbuilt Shanghai Tower, UNESCO had acquiesced in the construction of the much taller 310m London Shard (Renzo Piano, architect) in close proximity to the Tower of London and Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey World Heritage Sites.47

- International heritage branding has not impacted beneficially on many of the city’s established communities. The high levels of unemployment and consequent social problems that have characterised Liverpool since the 1930s have not been addressed by successive waves of high-value, high-profile development projects in the city centre and waterfront. Indeed, these have intensified divisions between pockets of gentrification and a generality of deprivation. Liverpool has consistently headed the table of the highest proportion of the population claiming income support of any city in the UK,48 and the Toxteth district was the scene of riots in 1981 and again in 2011.

- In the World Heritage context, Liverpool has been cited as a European example of ‘heritage classifications being used as a status symbol for purposes of economic regeneration’.49 Similarly: ‘The award of the title of European City of Culture for 2008 is being used as an excuse by the Council to encourage rampant commercial development at the expense of the surviving historic fabric of the city’.50

Summary
The cities of Dresden and Liverpool have faced distinctly different economic situations since the 1990s. While Dresden, a regional centre integrated into the Federal Republic of Germany in 1990, was progressively prospering, Liverpool was in search of an accelerated path from terminal decline as a mercantile port to recovery of its erstwhile status as a ‘world city’. Indicatively, the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session in 2004 articulated reservations concerning the major development dynamics in Liverpool but no parallel concerns about Dresden.

In the case of Dresden Elbe Valley, a linear route from placement on the UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger to delisting can be discerned from 2006 to 2009, but the positions taken by both ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee from 2006 onwards are not consistent either with the spirit or the letter of the ICOMOS advisory report and the decision taken at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004. The Waldschlößchenbrücke was a project for the city with a known momentum that dated from the mid-19th century.

In the case of Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City, the path taken by both ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee is less clear. The State Party proposed that ‘urban landscape’ be included in the texts of justification for outstanding universal value under criteria (iii) and (iv), but this was not supported at the self-same 2004 session of the World Heritage Committee. Threats to the site in the form of
individual iconic modern buildings and development pressures generally were recognised at the time of inscription, but an essential foundation for subsequent monitoring of the site was removed. In this, it is implicit that ‘urban landscape’ was not recognised at the time as a value under the Convention’s category of a ‘group of buildings’, notwithstanding that the nomination document lauded this (see the caption to Figure 2). Sophia Labadi has forcibly critiqued such lack of coordination between the inscription and management of World Heritage Sites.51

The 2005 UNESCO Vienna Memorandum served as a further constraint to the 2006 reactive monitoring mission, and it was only following the adoption of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape that the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee was minded to place the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, based on the City Council’s granting of consent for the speculative planning application for Liverpool Waters.

The UNESCO historic urban landscape initiative

This initiative, a main project of the UNESCO World Heritage Cities Programme, constitutes an ambitious attempt to coordinate an integrated, dynamic approach to the management of historic cities in the face of a known raft of threats and challenges, as a platform and management tool for the reconciliation of multiple disparate interests on the urban scale.52 Initially and provisionally articulated through the 2005 UNESCO Vienna Memorandum, it led to the adoption of a new standard-setting instrument, the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.53 Key to this Recommendation is its definition: ‘The historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of a “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting’.54

Dresden Elbe Valley

The 2006 decision to place Dresden on the List of World Heritage in Danger and 2009 decision to delist the site were not referenced to the historic urban landscape initiative, which was still under development at the time. Had it been in place, given the manifold heritage dimensions of the site, it might have enabled the disputing parties to focus mediation on a number of key areas related to the ‘historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes’, including: first, the self-evident disparity between the 1997 ESKR Engineers & Architects justification of their visually intrusive arch design and the essential design characteristic of Dresden’s historic bridges as highlighted in the 2006 RWTH Aachen Visual Impact Study, leading to a reappraisal of the selected bridge design; and second, the need for any additional crossing of the Elbe at the Waldschlößchen, given contestation of the statistical justification for it and that five further river crossings had been constructed since the project was first mooted nearly a century and a half previously.

Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City

The 2012 decision to place Liverpool on the List of World Heritage in Danger was founded upon the ‘soft law’ of this 2011 Recommendation which, necessarily, was not
available previously. Given the multiple, overarching and detailed, tangible and intangible dimensions of the Liverpool site combined with its natural and urban setting, it can hardly be in dispute that the Recommendation has the potential to be of profound relevance for the long-term management of the site and city. The rationale for the Danger listing was, however, related primordially to selected morphological and visual issues. As such, ‘extending beyond the notion of a “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting’ formed no part of the consideration in the 2011 UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring report or the decision adopted at the 2012 session of the World Heritage Committee.

Thus, whereas historic layering is a main component of the historic urban landscape approach, the decision to inscribe the Liverpool site on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not related to any consideration of the merits of Liverpool Waters as a projected major new layer for a city with a stagnant demographic profile. Nor was it related to any consideration of the predictable impacts of Liverpool Waters on the future environmental as well as economic viability of the World Heritage Site. Essential issues of integrated urban planning, therefore, have not informed the UNESCO process and, although the Liverpool site was proposed in the 2006 UNESCO-ICOMOS mission report as a case study for the elaboration of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation, this was only taken forward in a very narrow sense.

In the authors’ view, for the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation to have meaning as the basis for an integrated approach to historic cities, based as it should be on the urban geographer’s interdisciplinary approach to the evolution and development of cities in concert with their heritage values, any consideration of the impact of major developments such as Liverpool Waters must embrace more than just a reaction to a limited, and manifestly inconsistent, interpretation of its outstanding universal value and contribute significantly to the urban debate. The historic urban landscape approach has little relevance otherwise — especially in relation to a World Heritage Site comprising six disparate components, such as Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City. It is additionally unreasonable to anticipate that a reformulated multidisciplinary approach to the management of a complex and dynamic urban World Heritage Site can be applied retrospectively, not least in a situation where the State Party’s emphasis on the urban landscape dimension of the site in the nomination document and management plan was deleted from the texts for the justification of outstanding universal value at the date of inscription.

Conclusion

The comparison of the Dresden Elbe Valley and Liverpool — Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Sites has disclosed inconsistencies in the decision-making processes of the key stakeholders. In both cases the State Parties, ICOMOS, and the World Heritage Committee evidenced different understandings of the outstanding universal value and integrity and authenticity of the two sites and these varied over time. Such inconsistencies in the interpretation of core values contributed to trigger the fundamental conflicts of interests that manifested post-inscription in relation to the Waldschlößchenbrücke and Liverpool Waters. The preamble to the 1972 World Heritage Convention calls for ‘an effective system of collective protection of the cultural
and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods. An elemental prerequisite is for certainty, clarity, and consistency throughout the various stages of the process, from nomination through inscription to monitoring. The 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape has the potential to make a major difference to how historic cities are managed in the future. The Dresden and Liverpool cases suggest, however, that we still have a long way to go before the ambition of the Convention’s authors to establish an ‘effective system of collective protection’ is realised.
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