

CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL  
DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES



INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL  
ON MONUMENTS AND SITES

**Report on the Joint ICOMOS/IUCN mission  
to evaluate the state of conservation of**

**THE SINTRA WORLD HERITAGE  
CULTURAL LANDSCAPE  
(Portugal)**

*P.J. Fowler (ICOMOS) and G. Collin (IUCN)*

**Report on the joint ICOMOS/IUCN MISSION to evaluate the state of  
conservation of  
THE SINTRA WORLD HERITAGE  
CULTURAL LANDSCAPE (Portugal)**

***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

**A mission to evaluate the state of conservation (*suivi réactif*) to Sintra Cultural Landscape proved unnecessary in the strict sense, for this World Heritage Site is not under urgent threat nor is it being badly managed. This mission arrived, however, at a critical point in the evolution of management of a World Heritage Site which has been defined within a landscape generally under tremendous external pressure for development. It lies in a popular area devoted to leisure, recreation and retirement and holiday living; yet, with its mountains, forests and waters, quite apart from its historical, architectural and aesthetic interests, the Cultural Landscape and its environs provide a priceless ‘green lung’ for the residents of nearby Lisbon. This report therefore discusses various issues arising from this situation and makes nine recommendations to the World Heritage Committee.**

## *CONTENTS*

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>1.1 Occasion for the mission</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>1.2 Conduct of the mission</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>1.3 Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>1.4 Reactive monitoring mission</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>SINTRA RE-VISITED</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.1 A World Heritage Cultural Landscape</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.2 Religiosity</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.3 Literary and artistic associations</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.4 Local roads</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.5 Major monuments</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>2.6 Some conservation issues</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>2.7 Management structure</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>2.8 Monte da Lua: function</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>2.9 ‘Monte da Lua’: management</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>2.10– 2.12 Tourism</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>SINTRA WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: a brief appraisal</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>3.1 The physical geography of Sintra Mountain</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>3.2 Restoring water systems</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>3.3 Re-cycling the environment</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>3.4 Role of the forest in the cultural landscape</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>3.5 An integrated management plan</b>	<b>11</b>

<b>3.6 Interpretation in the management of the World Heritage site</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.7 Improving the management structure</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. CONCLUDING COMMENT</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX Publications used and deposited in the ICOMOS Documentation Centre, Paris</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Occasion for the mission

ICOMOS was requested by the World Heritage Committee to send a state of conservation reporting mission (*mission de suivi réactif*) jointly with IUCN to the Sintra Cultural Landscape, Portugal (World Heritage List No. 460). The mission took place on 28 October – 3 November, 2000.

### 1.2 Conduct of the mission

One expert from each of ICOMOS and IUCN spent four working days with relevant officials. Throughout, arrangements were efficient, friendly and hospitable.

There was considerable media interest in our presence in Sintra, not least because of locally expressed dissatisfaction with the management of the World Heritage Landscape (about which we had not been fully briefed) and a rumour, entirely new to us, that we were in Sintra to remove the cultural landscape from the World Heritage List (*see below* para. 1.4a). In the circumstances, including unavoidable appearances on television because we were filmed simply leaving our hotel going about our business, in consultation with the Mayor's office we judged it best at the end of the mission to state to the media the nature of World Heritage and cultural landscapes, and the procedures involved in their nomination, inscription, and monitoring.

### 1.3 Methodology

Basically two methods were used: semi-formal discussion and site-visiting. Both were preceded by reading a considerable amount of material, including the nomination dossier and reports provided by the State Party up to mid-2000. This was followed by studying even more written material given to us during the visit. The mission began and ended with semi-formal discussions with the Mayor of Sintra, both alone and in company with representatives of the main bodies involved with the conservation and management of the area of the Sintra Cultural Landscape (paras. 2.7–2.8).

The bulk of the time was spent visiting sites and areas in that cultural landscape, always with senior officials of the managing bodies, supplemented by colleagues and consultants engaged specifically on the site being visited.

All the visits were in the town of Sintra and the associated cultural landscape except for one helpful drive to the north at our request, out through the buffer zone and into the transitional zone. Our purpose was to see Sintra and its mountain from a distance; they were appropriately draped in rain cloud. We also visited a stunning new epigraphic museum at São Miguel de Odrinhas on the same tour, possibly a home for the cultural landscape archive centre. No opportunity was provided to meet local people. Nor, fortunately, were evening events part of the programme, so we were able to keep abreast of written material given to us each day, and to discuss in private our reactions to the mission as it developed.

### Recommendation 4.9c

### 1.4 Reactive monitoring mission

*a* Although we were not given a specific brief, we understood that complaints from residents in the Sintra area about possible development had been received by the World Heritage Centre, prompting enquiries as in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, para. 68: "Reactive monitoring is the reporting by the World Heritage Centre ..... on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat .... Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List."

*b* The Sintra World Heritage Cultural Landscape is not under any specific threat, other than ambient developmental pressure (para. *f below*), and there is absolutely no question of any need to consider it as a candidate for deletion from the List, or even for putting on the list of World Heritage in Danger. Far more important is it positively to encourage existing efforts, enthusiasm, skills, and the wise use of available resources.

#### **Recommendation 4.1**

*c* Both of the specific complaints drawn to our attention before the mission (the opening of a tourist complex near Guincho and the development of an attraction park north-east of Sintra) concerned proposed developments not only outside the cultural landscape but also outside the buffer zone. Both seemed best, therefore, left to local planning provisions as exercised by the Municipality and the Natural Park. In any case, even if approved, neither would be obtrusive as viewed from the World Heritage site. Furthermore, both cases seemed to have been raised by interests groups looking to serve their own agendas rather than being primarily concerned to promote World Heritage as such. We did not, therefore, pursue either case any further.

*d* Our hosts' own assessment of progress since 1995 was:

- i. Restoration of the Royal Palace in Sintra and the creation of a car-free zone in front of it;
- ii. Completion of the restoration of Pena Palace, including major drainage and sewage works, with electricity to be renewed next
- iii. Opening various new restaurants and shops in the Parks
- iv. Undertaking much routine work e.g. provision of car parks, improved access points etc.
- v. Management had been given a strong motivation by inscription, for example in planning more precise work in the field and in renewed liaison by the "external" bodies with the Municipality
- vi. Local pride in Sintra generally had been encouraged by Inscription, though this had not led so far to much community participation in the World Heritage site. IPPAR's local involvement was negligible and the Natural Park, which enjoyed several partnerships locally, had not yet developed this aspect of its work.

#### **Recommendations 4.5, 4.8b**

*e* In general, we found the site to be physically in reasonable condition, though clearly progress on the ground has been slow since inscription. However, inadequate public relations have contributed perhaps as much to local complaints as actual poor management or major mistakes.

*f* We would stress, however, that extensive (and in places intensive) development has already filled much of the view from the cultural landscape to both north and south. Management of the World Heritage site should, therefore, concentrate on preventing any inappropriate development within the cultural landscape – which appears as a large green oasis in the landscape from outside – and indeed hold the line against intrusions at the outer boundary of the buffer zone.

#### **Recommendation 4.6**

*g* Within the cultural landscape, all now depends on the achievement of the major and ambitious programme of works over the next six years, for which, we were assured several times, the finance is in place. Most of it (75%) is to come from the European Union under its Environment Programme, via the Portuguese Government. Monitoring of the work at Sintra could be helpful.

#### **Recommendation 4.9**

## 2. SINTRA RE-VISITED

The ICOMOS evaluation and recommendation to the World Heritage Committee (No. 273, September 1995) stands up to re-examination and need be neither significantly revised nor repeated. Here we merely remind the Committee of some salient facts about the Sintra World Heritage site while noting developments since Inscription in 1995, with some commentary.

### 2.1 A World Heritage Cultural Landscape

We confirm that Sintra and its mountain is a cultural landscape of World Heritage quality. It was nominated and inscribed on the basis of *criteria ii, iv, and v*. We found this judgement fair, though the property's "fit" with criterion v is perhaps arguable, depending on the significance attached to the word "traditional." It could as easily have been considered under *criterion vi* (see b. and c. below). As a cultural landscape, it meets criteria 39 i, ii (a continuing landscape with an active social role), and iii.

### 2.2 Religiosity

As visitors to the site for the first time, we would stress the element of religiosity in the landscape as a whole: it has been and is clearly a "holy mountain." We were also impressed by the way that religion is embedded in numerous sites and monuments throughout the cultural landscape. Two of the major palaces, for example, were originally religious foundations, and one of the private gardens we visited was not only exquisitely beautiful but also designed and ornamented entirely around the theme of religion – Classical, Christian and Muslim. The Capuchos monastery is significant not only because it carries the feeling of a sacred mountain and represents the transformation of a religious complex into a palace, but also because it retains the reality of a religious place.

### 2.3 Literary and artistic associations

The literary and artistic associations – with the Englishmen Byron and Beckford, for example – require emphasis in any appraisal of the place, not only in terms of works written locally and of garden design but rather in terms of the standing of the place in the Romantic Movement.

### 2.4 Local roads

Because the nomination concentrated on the designed elements of the landscape, no attention was given to one of the outstanding constructed elements of the landscape as a whole, the idiosyncratic network of narrow, local roads. Kilometres of these roads within the cultural landscape are characteristically steeply confined and often sunken, either cut down into bare rock or walled. The cuts into and through rock are demanded by the topography; the walls are the outward signs of the estates around the palaces and the *quintas*. With trees arching above, the effect is of moving through a series of sinuous, semi-dark tunnels. It is important for this landscape that this effect is retained and not demeaned, for example by road-widening or road-straitening schemes.

## Recommendation 4.6

### 2.5 Major Monuments

The whole cultural landscape is an interlinked ensemble but, in summary, the main cultural monuments are the town of Sintra itself (part of it outside the World Heritage site) with its "old quarter" and series of outstanding buildings, and, on the surrounding hills, parks and gardens embracing Pena and Monserrat Palaces, Regaleira Quinta, the Moorish Castle, Capuchos Monastery, and hundreds of temples, follies, grottoes, and other Romantic structures. The general state of individual monuments, from single monoliths to palace complexes, is often good, owing to the relatively short time since some were abandonment (100–50 years), the absence of frost, and the quite narrow temperature range (*c* 4–24°C) which reduces the stresses on external surfaces. Decorated tiles on external walls, for example, are often in good condition. On the other hand, the characteristic rain and damp have clearly taken their toll on roofs and fittings in houses and parks. There is a fundamental conflict in this respect: the very moist atmosphere is essential for the development and maintenance of the cultural/natural landscape, but it creates serious problems for architectural monuments.

### 2.6 Some conservation issues

Monserrat Palace has been badly affected internally by rain but it is now wrapped up in scaffolding and cladding, with a large corrugated iron roof firmly fixed over it. That there was no notice explaining the reasons for this ugly state of affairs, with dates of likely start and finish of repairs, makes our point: as we watched, visitors arrived, look disappointed, and straggled away. The real problem, however, as we discuss in Section 3, lies with the vegetation and the actual structure of the parks and gardens. Here is a huge and long-term challenge, compound of an often poor state of physical repair, a rampant Nature, and great public interest. Vistas, the very structure, however intangible, of a Romantic park, are of urgent concern, for everywhere they are lost or obscured and require careful, sensitive restoration. Vandalism is, perhaps surprisingly, an immediate problem, with arson (at least two important buildings) and widespread graffiti symptoms of frequent misuse of the secrecy and isolation afforded by large parks with extensive woodland. Security precautions are in place, but guards cannot patrol the many kilometres of boundary wall effectively.

## **2.7 Management structure**

The management structure of the whole area and beyond is immensely complex, but essentially the World Heritage cultural landscape and its buffer zone lie entirely with a Natural Park and entirely within the Municipality of Sintra; both have Planning powers and responsibilities. Two other bodies have particular responsibilities both within and outside the cultural landscape: IPPAR (Portuguese Institute for the Architectural and Archaeological Heritage) looks after public historic buildings, while the woodlands come under the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food with the Forest Administration of Sintra.

## **2.8 Monte da Lua: function**

As of 1 September 2000, a new body was incorporated to try to facilitate work in the public parks. Harking back to Ptolemy's reference to Sintra's Serra as the "Mountain of the Moon," the new body is called "Monte da Lua." It was variously described to us as an agency, a society, an association, an institute, and a company: clearly, different partners and their supporters have divergent views as to what it actually is and should be. Clarification of this point is vital for successful co-operative working, and also for the public image and public relations.

## **2.9 Monte da Lua: management**

Managed by a board of representatives of the four existing managing bodies in the area, it is in effect a partnership mechanism intended to co-ordinate, facilitate and execute. It already has its own director and small staff, and is very much concerned at the moment with the detailed planning, including budgeting, and commissioning for a major new programme of restoration works in 2000–2006. While it could well develop as the most relevant single body in the management of the World Heritage Cultural Landscape, it was stressed to us that it has no jurisdiction over the *c* 60% of the land in the Cultural Landscape which is in private, or at least non-governmental, ownership. It is worthy of note that the name chosen by this organization is a very symbolic one, which once again stresses the sacred aspect of the mountain.

## **2.10 Tourism 1**

Another aspect central to management in this case was not discussed in the 1995 documentation: tourism. Sintra, the town, and its major monuments around, constitute a prime tourist attraction, both to the resident population of Lisbon, 40 minutes by train to the east, and the thousands of visitors who come to southern Portugal on holiday. Tourists have, of course, been coming for over two centuries: in one sense this is part of the essence of the place, popularly renowned for its pure air and green spaces as much as for its aesthetic qualities and history. Now, 300,000 visitors go to the Palaces each year; there are huge visitor and traffic problems at the "Palace end" of Sintra itself where, after carefully contrived improvements to facades and street surfaces, the area is nevertheless visually teetering on the edge of becoming just another day-tourist destination overfull of souvenir shops and the like. Sintra was packed on holidays even during our stay at the end of October. Major works already carried out in and around the town, - a new railway station, a new bypass - and ambitious plans in hand (including a long underground car park just outside the World Heritage site), are all driven by the pressures of tourism.

## **2.11 Tourism 2**

While such pressures, demanding a range of facilities, must clearly be managed, it is vital that management is sensitive to the requirements of a World Heritage Site, both in the town and outside on



the hills, avoiding inappropriate developments which could, in a variety of ways, diminish the magic of the place. Particularly at Sintra, the *genius loci* seems an apt phrase.

### **2.12 Tourism 3**

Fortunately, properly managed much of the pressure can be safely and instructively dispersed across the mountains, where management already possesses an asset many another attraction seeks to create. We refer to its multiple properties, all potentially separate tourist destinations. As we stress later on (para. 3.4), however, realization of such a plan requires that these not only be restored individually but, as importantly, be linked physically and imaginatively too.

### **Recommendation 4.7**

### 3. SINTRA WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: A BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Here we add to the description in the World Heritage documentation and emphasize what we believe to be particularly significant aspects of the site itself.

#### 3.1 The physical geography of Sintra Mountain

In order to understand better the natural characteristics of Sintra mountain and subsequently their relations with the cultural landscape, it is necessary to appreciate the general natural substratum. The geology of the mountain is mainly a magmatic massif that has occurred through tertiary limestone plateaux. It is interpreted as a “ring structure” (similar to those of Scotland or Western Africa) with a high range of petrographic variety.

The orography is that of a low mountain (highest point: Cruz Alta = 528m), orientated east–west. The massif is only 15km long by 5km wide but, sticking up from the extensive surrounding plateaux, it has always been considered as a real mountain (looking from the land as well from the sea where Sintra Mountain ends at Cabo da Roca).

The mountain receives an average of 1000mm of rain per year, the nearby plateaux only 400mm. The mountain is also the meeting-place of a temperate, very humid Atlantic influence (northern slopes) and a hot dry Mediterranean one (southern slopes). The rivers are numerous and contribute greatly to the erosion of the mountain. They run over soils directly developed from magma: humid, variable in texture, sandy, and permeable.

The top of the mountain is often covered by a kind of mist that gives it the appearance of cloudy tropical forest. Depending on the orientation of the side-valleys, all kinds of micro-climate can be found between the Mediterranean and Atlantic influences. The climax vegetation is considered to be characterized by diverse groups of Mediterranean–Atlantic features with *Quercus faginea*, *Quercus suber*, and *Pinus pinea*, but with high diversity of habitats related to a great variety of conditions. Of the 900 plants considered as part of the natural ecosystem of Sintra Mountain, 51% are Mediterranean or Western-Mediterranean, 11% Mediterranean–Atlantic, and 5% Atlantic.

Human activities mainly in the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century included felling of trees for firewood, burning of the bush for cattle, and destruction of vegetation by goats. These led to a near-complete destruction of the climax vegetation (*Pinus pinaster*, so present today, was absent until the 19th century). The conjunction on the one hand of the interest in the Sintra mountain of Romantically inclined persons like Dom Fernando II, William Beckford, and Francis Cook, and on the other of the necessity for the reconstitution, by state forestry, of a new forest cover led, in the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, to a new landscape. Romanticism introduced, beside local vegetation, exotic plants from everywhere in the world (*Acer japonicum*, *Agave mexicana*, *Araucaria angustifolia*, *Cedrus libani*, *Chamaecyparis funebris*, *Cryptomeria japonica*, *Asplenium bulbiferum*, *Pittosporum tobica*). Foresters worked mainly with pines, acacias and eucalyptuses.

Even that briefest of summaries emphasizes that Sintra World Heritage site cannot now be conserved and interpreted without paying sufficient attention to natural history and to man–nature relations, both inside and outside the parks and gardens now so characteristic of the place.

#### Recommendations 4.2, 4.3

#### 3.2 Restoring water systems

Large parts of the parks and gardens were provided with water, partly to create hydrological conditions for acclimatization of wet sub-tropical or tropical plants, and above all to provide movement and sound-effects in the three-dimensional stage-set which was a Romantic garden: hence the laying and making of kilometres of buried pipes and drains along the sides of paths and walks, and the creation of gushing woodland brooks, all leading to cascades, canals, ponds, and lakes.

A lot of the water system created to achieve these two objectives is actually in a bad state after 50–100 years of lack of maintenance: pipes broken or leaking, drains eroded and blocked, canals empty with sand and leaves, streams polluted, and lakes in process of eutrophication.

The conservation and the restoration of the parks and gardens cannot be done without a precise survey of their water systems and of water quality.

#### **Recommendation 4.3**

### **3.3 Re-cycling the environment**

The vegetation that is today such an important part of the landscape of the Sintra mountain, in as well outside the parks, has all, or nearly all, been created over the last century. Consequently, many trees are now nearing or at the end of their natural life. As in a managed forest, therefore, the time has come to choose a strategy.

Two risks will occur if the vegetation is left to evolve by itself:

- some exotic plants will disappear as they will not be able to survive that phase of vegetational re-composition in competition with local plants;
- the location of plants will change, leading to a new landscape not in accord with the precise composition and planting designed by the original Romantic gardeners and landscape architects.

The alternative strategy, here advocated, is to manage the vegetation completely by felling and planting trees in order to restore and maintain, in natural and historic terms, the cultural landscape.

The conservation and restoration of the ‘natural’ dimension in the cultural landscape needs not only a precise survey of plant species but also an assessment of vegetation dynamics and associations as well as the compilation of historical documents concerning the gardens and parks (original maps, photographs, inquiries on oral memory etc).

#### **Recommendation 4.2, 4.3**

### **3.4 The role of the forest in the cultural landscape**

The World Heritage cultural landscape of Sintra must be considered as a whole: that includes, conceptually and in practice, architecture as forest and forest as architecture. Forest was an integral part of the various original designs as the originators sought to create their environment in terms of a Romantic ideal. They sought to look out at the practical realization of such Romanticism from the rooms of their castle; they also wanted to discover their castles half hidden by vegetation and mist.

The overall plan for the Sintra landscape, and the management plan of each place, must include proposals for conservation and restoration of vegetation, appreciating that it is as important as the work on buildings and that, at the end, the success or otherwise of this restored landscape will depend on the visual and aesthetic fusion in an authentic historicity of the works of man and the works of nature.

#### **Recommendation 4.3**

### **3.5 An integrated management plan**

The management of the World Heritage cultural landscape could be considered at the moment as mainly a matter of planning the works of restoration of the heritage, coupled with some new eating facilities intended to produce revenue as well as meet a need. The proposals so far prepared (and shared with us) by the bodies participating in Monte da Lua provide the technical and financial framework for the realization of restoration works but do not appear to consider adequately principles of conservation management in this particular place, short- and long-term objectives, and the very important question of the steps to be taken for a planned, progressive improvement of public access to the World Heritage site, both physical and intellectual.

A management plan should be prepared for the World Heritage Cultural Landscape, stating short-term (6-year) and longer-term (10-20 year) objectives, the principles on which it is intended to manage the World Heritage Site, and distinguishing the order of priorities in restoring both ‘natural’ and man-made elements in the Landscape while linking both to interpretation, presentation and access and such practical

matters as financial supply and management, the availability of craftsmen, the development of community participation and other factors that the Authorities consider significant in this particular case.

**Recommendations 4.4, 4.7**

### **3.6 Interpretation in the management of the World Heritage site**

There appears to be a current and understandable tendency to prepare the interpretation of each of the main places of built heritage as an entity in itself, not as part of a whole: there seems at present little coherence in the interpretation and presentation of the whole cultural landscape, and little convincing evidence that such has been identified as a priority.

Such an approach may be normal and necessary at Sintra; it would seem to be encouraged by a reliance, through individual and specific contracts, on external consultants employed separately for significant parts of the work. No awareness of wider considerations was apparent, for example, in our discussions with those developing what seemed sound proposals in themselves for the Capuchos monastery and area. Such an approach, however, can generate at least two main problems: a failure to project to visitors an holistic vision of the whole mountain, and a failure at each site to relate it to the other components of the whole. A central vision, not just central co-ordination, is necessary.

The preparation as soon as possible of an integrated interpretation plan for the whole of the World Heritage Site is strongly recommended.

**Recommendation 4.2; it could be included in the Management Plan eventually, *above 3.5*, but its preparation should not be delayed by the achievement of that larger task).**

### **3.7 Improving the management structure**

The decision to create the agency Monte da Lua is real progress, for it allows and indeed encourages the main bodies playing a role in the Sintra landscape to work together within a formal structure. The overlapping of geographical areas of responsibility in and around the World Heritage cultural landscape, and the different objectives of the various bodies, are unavoidable given their statutory functions and the structure of Portuguese government, but the new agency has after all been set up, with Government blessing, by the very bodies which could so easily be competing rather than co-operating. As this new structure has only been in place for two optimism, a willingness to co-operate when, on our last morning, we met what was in effect the management board of Monte da Lua. Perhaps a unique management structure will evolve with time.

Meanwhile, the World Heritage Committee should give its full support to the new management organisation and the managing partners in it as they attempt simultaneously to make the new arrangements work while carrying through an ambitious programme of restoration and, we hope, interpretation (*above 3.6*).

**Recommendation 4.1**

On a point of detail, but of significance for World Heritage purposes, support should also be given to the Natural Park of Sintra Cascais to propose a minor modification of its boundary in the next revision of its management plan so that the totally protected area of the Natural Park coincides exactly with the core area of the World Heritage site.

**Recommendation 4.8d**

## **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**4.1 That the World Heritage Committee, and its associated NGOs, should now, exactly five years after the original inscription of the Sintra cultural landscape on the World Heritage List, give every encouragement and support to the Portuguese Government, its relevant agencies, and the Municipality of Sintra to carry out in the most effective way to the highest standards the**

**programme of restoration and improved management in the Sintra World Heritage cultural landscape over the years 2000–2006, as expounded to the ICOMOS/IUCN mission in October 2000.**

**4.2 That objectives of this programme should include the appropriate restoration of individual monuments, gardens, parks, and forests, and other work, within a process of implementing the very best of conservation practice that this World Heritage cultural landscape deserves; and a conscious attempt to realise the Sintra cultural landscape's potential to become an exemplar of good 'cultural landscape management' in World Heritage terms, with particular reference to community liaison and, as a priority, integrated interpretative planning and presentation.**

**4.3 That in activating the ambitious programme for the Sintra cultural landscape almost immediately, the relevant authorities carefully avoid rushing, or giving the impression of rushing, new works; and demonstrate that they can be seen to have given consideration to all the appropriate preliminaries such as building up teams of appropriate crafts-persons with time to develop their skills (e.g. in plasterwork) and carrying out biological, floral, and historical research and impact assessment in what all recognise to be a sensitive and often fragile environmental context.**

**4.4 That, during the six years of the restoration programme, management should avoid any impression of working towards a single opening date when restoration will be complete, and the cultural landscape "finished" and "ready to receive visitors." It should rather promote the concept of dynamic conservation, with its commitment to constant care and sustainable maintenance.**

**4.5 That, during the same restoration programme, management significantly increases its interaction with the public, notably in a continuous programme of development of its embryonic educational programme, both for children and adults, and in a continual programme of events, however minor, especially related to places and features in the parks, and particularly as new access points or paths become available, the whole designed to convey the reality as well as the impression of continual progress to the public benefit.**

**4.6 That, given the enormous pressure for land development all around the Sintra World Heritage cultural landscape, the relevant authorities, notably Sintra Municipality, should be as rigorous as possible in exercising their planning powers, "holding" intact the outer limit of the buffer zone as far as possible and recognizing that contentious issues must be fought out and precedents set in the buffer zone and in the transitional zone beyond and not on or inside the boundary of the cultural landscape itself.**

**4.7 That the Sintra authorities should produce before the end of 2002 a management plan for the Sintra World Heritage cultural landscape.**

**4.8 That four practical steps be considered:**

- a. the formation of an independent World Heritage Cultural Landscape Scientific/Academic Advisory Committee, to offer advice specifically to the management board of the new agency and where appropriate to any or all of the bodies with management responsibilities in the World Heritage site;**
- b. the creation of a consultative body, such as an association, of residents and other land-owning interests in the area of the cultural landscape;**

- c. the establishment of a single central public information, research, and archive centre for the whole World Heritage cultural landscape;**
- d. an adjustment of the high protection area of the Natural Park to coincide with the core area of the World Heritage Site.**

**4.9** That, in the light of the scale and ambition of the proposals in the Portuguese authorities' programme for Sintra 2000–2006, and of the Committee's invitation in *Guidelines* para. 73, further ICOMOS/IUCN missions should be offered to Portugal late in 2002, and perhaps also in 2004–2005, not as reactive monitoring but very much as constructive steps to help develop the welfare of the World Heritage cultural landscape along the lines suggested here, and in particular to realize Recommendations 1 and 2.

## **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Many organizations and people contributed to the professional quality, efficiency, and pleasantness of the mission, and we thank them all. We acknowledge in particular the contributions of Dr. Edite Estrela, Mayor of Sintra; Cristina Rolo Duarte, Assistant to the Mayor, Sintra; Arqt<sup>a</sup> Óscar Knoblich, Presidente, Parque Natural de Sintra-Cascais; Dr. Paulo Pereira, Vice-Presidente, IPPAR; Professor António Ressano Garcia Lamas; Dr. Paulo Serra Lopes, Presidente, Monte da Lua; Ana Bramão Ramos, Public Relations Office, Sintra; Dr. José Cardim Ribeiro, Sintra's 'Mr. World Heritage' and our constant companion; and Dr. Teresa Simões, archaeologist.

## **6. CONCLUDING COMMENT**

When dealing with a complex landscape, in which cultural and natural heritage are intimately linked, a joint ICOMOS-IUCN mission does more than provide complementary analyses. The result must be a truly synthetic approach with proposals that are global in their application. In the opinion of the authors of this report, evaluation and state of conservation reporting missions should in the future generally follow the pattern established for Sintra.

**Dr. P. J. Fowler (ICOMOS) and Dr. G. Collin (IUCN)**

*13 November 2000.*

## APPENDIX

### Publications used (deposited in ICOMOS Documentation Centre, Paris)

- Calado L.F., Pereira P. and Leite J.P. (eds.), *património. Balanço e Perspectivas [2000-2006]*, Portuguese Institute of Architectural Heritage (IPPAR), Ministry of Culture, no place of publication or date but ?Lisbon 2000, ISBN: 972-8087-77-2
- Convento de Santa Cruz da Serra de Sintra. Convento dos Capuchos*, Monte da Lua, Parques de Sintra [2000]
- Decreto Regulamentar no. 8/94 e no. 9/94 de 11 Março*, Parque Natural de Sintra-Cascais, Sintra
- Guide of the Protected Areas near Lisbon*, Instituto da Conservação da Natureza, Ministério do Ambiente, undated but current
- Michelin, *Portugal*, 1998
- Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, World Heritage Centre, 1999
- Parque e Tapada de Monserrate: Strategic Plan*, Monte da Lua [2000]
- Patrimoine Mondial Sintra*, Sintra Municipality, 1995
- Pereira P. and Carneiro J.M., *Pena Palace*, Scala Publishers, London 1999
- Plano de Investimentos 2000-2006*, Monte da Lua [2000]
- Plano de Recuperação do Parque da Pena*, Monte da Lua [2000]
- Preparar o futuro Sintra*, supplement to *Arquitectura e Vida*, undated but current
- Quinta da Regaleira*, 30 October, 2000 [prepared for the mission's visit]
- Regulamento de Obras em Calçadas da Vila de Sintra*, Sintra Municipality, 1988
- Ribeiro J.C. (ed.), *Sintra World Heritage*, Sintra Municipality, 1998 [The authoritative study in some 300 large format pages, it begins by recording as part of the title page that 'Sintra was classified as World Heritage Cultural Landscape at 11.05 a.m. on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1995 at the 19<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee Meeting in Berlin.' Such precision is characteristic of its quality throughout. –pjf]
- Ruy J., *Sintra. The Enchanted Moon Cliff (History of Sintra in Comic Strips)*, Editorial Notícias, Lisbon
- da Silva J.C. and Luckhurst G., *Sintra, A Landscape with Villas*, The Genius of the Place Collection, Edições Inapa, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, 1997
- Simões T., *O sítio neolítico de São Pedro de Canaferrin, Sintra*, Archaeological Institute of Portugal, Lisbon 1999
- Sintra, Património Mundial. Paisagem Cultural*, Parque Natural de Sintra Cascais, undated but current
- Sintra. Strategic Plan for the Rehabilitation of the Historic Center*, Sintra Municipality, undated but current
- Sintra World Heritage*, Tourism Division, Sintra Municipality, undated but current
- Sintra World Heritage. From the mountain to the Sea. Itineraries*, Sintra Municipality
- 3a Trienal Arquitectura, Sintra: Arquitectura e Paisagem, 11-26 July 1998*, Sintra Municipality, 1998



**Guidebooks/leaflets to/about:**

*Archaeological Museum of St Miguel de Odrinhas*

*Costa do Estoril & Sintra*

*Estoril Coast, Sintra and Oeiras 2000/1*

*Moorish Castle*

*Parque da Pena Quinta da Regaleira, Sintra*

*Palácio da Pena*

*Palácio de Sintra*

*Quinta da Regaleira*

*Sintra*

c:\whmonit\sintra.doc