The Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai (India) No 1480

Official name as proposed by the State Party
The Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai

Location
Mumbai, Maharashtra State
India

Brief description
The demolition of the fortifications of Bombay in the 1860s marked the transformation of the city from a fortified outpost into a world class commercial centre and made available land for development. A group of public buildings was built in the Victorian Gothic style and the open green space of the Oval Maidan was created. The Backbay Reclamation Scheme in the early 20th century offered a new opportunity for Bombay to expand to the west with Art Deco residential, commercial and entertainment buildings and the creation of Marine Drive along the sea front. Today the Oval Maidan presents a composition of a spectacular ensemble of Victorian Gothic buildings on its eastern side, and another spectacular ensemble of Art Deco buildings on its western side, a testimony to the modernization phases that Mumbai went through during the 19th and 20th centuries leading to a modern independent India in 1947.

Category of property
In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a group of buildings.

1 Basic data

Included in the Tentative List
22 May 2012

International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund for preparing the Nomination
None

Date received by the World Heritage Centre
29 January 2014

Background
This is a new nomination.

Consultations
ICOMOS consulted its International Scientific Committees on Shared Built Heritage, on 20th Century Heritage, on Historic Towns and Villages, and several independent experts.

Technical Evaluation Mission
A technical evaluation mission from ICOMOS visited the nominated property from 6 to 11 September 2017.

Additional information received by ICOMOS
A letter was sent from ICOMOS to the State Party on 1 August 2017 requesting updated information on the nomination dossier, particularly on issues of protection management and conservation. Also, additional information was requested regarding the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone, justification for inscription, the resolution of the submitted maps, and questions about management and protection. A response with additional information was received by ICOMOS from the State Party on 5 September 2017.

An Interim Report was sent to the State Party on 22 December 2017 and the State Party provided ICOMOS with additional information on 13 February 2018. The information submitted has been incorporated in the relevant sections of this report.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
14 March 2018

2 The property

Description
The nominated property is of 66.34 ha total area and buffered by an area of 378.78 ha. It is located in the south of Mumbai. It is a group of buildings, consisting of 94 historic buildings and the open green space of the Oval Maidan.

The buildings of the nominated property represent modernization endeavors in architectural and urban planning. An urban ensemble of 19th century Victorian Gothic buildings and groups of early 20th century Art Deco buildings flank the open green space of the Oval Maidan. The Art Deco buildings extend to a row of buildings along Marine Drive. The property includes other buildings to the north of the Oval Maidan and to the east and south of the Victorian Gothic buildings.

The transition from the 19th century Victorian Gothic style to the 20th century Art Deco is represented by a few buildings of the turn-of-the-century Indo Saracenic style and the early 20th century Edwardian Neo-classical style. The four styles represented in the property form an overall narrative of endeavors to modernize Mumbai into a cosmopolitan city and reinforce Mumbai’s position as “the Gateway to India”.

80
The Oval Maidan and the buildings east, north and south of it are located within the Fort Precinct. Buildings west of the Oval Maidan are located within the Marine Drive Precinct.

The Oval Maidan is an important open space for the city. It separates the 19th century Victorian Gothic buildings of the late 1800s to its east from the Art Deco buildings to its west, which were built on the Backbay Reclamation Scheme and Marine Drive in the 1930s. At the same time the Oval Maidan offers an opportunity to view both groups of buildings and enjoy the different phases of the modernization of Mumbai.

**The Victorian architecture and motifs**

The 19th century buildings are considered to be “Anglo Indian style”, as they are modelled on Gothic forms while using Indian materials and craftsmen and were adapted to Indian conditions. They are built of igneous basalt, which is locally available in the Deccan Plateau, while the decorative carvings are made of soft limestone from Porbunder in Gujarat. They include Gothic Revival features such as turrets, spires, pointed arches, trefoils, quatrefoils, gargoyles and vaulted ceilings. Also incorporated in the same buildings are Indian architectural features, such as sloping terracotta tiled roofs, carved balconies and linear verandas, which were suited to the Indian climate. The carvings feature Indian men in traditional turbans and costumes.

The Art Deco buildings introduced to Mumbai and India new materials and typologies. They were constructed using reinforced concrete, which allowed for high-rise constructions, free forms and speed of construction, resulting in the dense assemblage of private apartments. The introduction of cinemas added a new feature to urban cosmopolitan life, represented in the property by the Regal and the Eros Cinemas.

The Art Deco buildings introduced a hybrid of Art Deco and Indian motifs which form what can be called “Indo-Deco”. The early Art Deco buildings of Mumbai were built with a combination of traditional materials, such as bricks and plaster on the one hand, and technologically advanced materials such as reinforced concrete on the other.

Local products and materials were incorporated in these buildings by Indian architects. Decorative features were made of plaster and other locally-available materials, such as wood, marble and tiles. Many of the decorated tiles, which are significant features of these buildings, were produced by the Bharat Tile Company (est. 1923). Decorative terrazzo features are significant and were also produced by the same company.

Lease agreements for construction on the Backbay Reclamation Scheme mandated a clear space of 20 feet around each building, making the distance between every two buildings 40 feet. Most of the buildings were of uniform height and the same number of floors: five or six storeys. Such heights were facilitated by the use of reinforced concrete. They are characterized by large balconies and Art Deco decorative features. They are also characterized by harmonious street frontages using attractive color schemes, curvilinear balconies and articulated corners. As they were built at different times, and as both residential and commercial buildings, they express individual charm whilst observing an overall harmony. Not only did this development of Mumbai introduce the Art Deco style to the city, it also introduced modern forms of entertainment such as cinemas and social clubs.

**The Indo-Saracenic architecture and motifs**

This is a hybrid style that blends Western planning and Indian architectural features, mainly Mughal, such as domes, chattris, brackets, jaalis and jharokhas, which became popular around the turn of the 20th century. This style was created with the ambition of it becoming the “Pan Indian” style.

**The Classical Revival architecture and motifs**

Buildings of this style were also referred to as ‘Edwardian Neo-classical’ or ‘Renaissance Revival’. They incorporated classical facades and motifs, such as pedimented facades, Corinthian columns, double height pilasters and classical motifs above windows.

**History and development**

Mumbai is the name given to the group of seven islands by the fishermen who inhabited them. Mumbai derives from the name of the locally worshiped goddess at the time: Mumba.

In the 16th century, the Portuguese converted the islands into a trading outpost. In 1665, the islands came under British rule as part of Catharine de Braganza's dowry upon her marriage to Charles II, King of England. The main island was fortified by the British East India Company, which leased it from the British Crown. After 1866, the East India Company moved its seat of governance and the centre for its maritime activities from Surat to Bombay. Fortification walls were built to protect the main island from attacks by neighbouring enemies.

In 1715, the governor Charles Boone created the Bombay Fort. In 1772, an expansive area of land around the walls was cleared to provide a clear field of fire, as a precaution because of fear of attack by the French. This area, which was known as the Esplanade, extended for 400 yards from the ramparts to the edge of the sea. It was extended to 800, then 1000 yards in 1804. The 1850s and 1860s witnessed the transformation of
Bombay from a trading post to a town, thanks to two governors: John Lord Elphinstone and Sir Bartle Frere.

The demolition of the fort started in the mid-1850s and was completed by the 1860s as the city prospered as a result of the importance of its cotton trade during the American civil war. The work of demolishing the fort and laying down new roads was carried out by the Ramparts Removal Committee, headed by James Trubshawe. As the city received an influx of wealth and people, an ambitious city planning scheme was initiated, whilst land was available for development, either as a result of pulling down the ramparts or land reclamation.

The Esplanade, or the Maidan as it was called, became a breathing space for the city as it faced the sea at the time. By the late 1860s a master plan was developed for the land east of the Esplanade, which became available for construction after the demolition of the ramparts and the lifting of the ban on construction within close proximity to the fort. The newly developed area was laid out with wide roads and open spaces. The Oval Maidan was preserved as an open space, and the ‘Vihar Water Works’ was established to provide the area with a water supply.

Bombay was emerging as a modern cosmopolitan city, helped by the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, the establishment of the Municipal Corporation in 1872 and the Bombay Port Trust in 1873. The efficient civic infrastructure asserted Bombay’s place as the main Indian seaport and the commercial and industrial capital of western India.

In the 1870s, the Victorian Neo-Gothic buildings were constructed along the eastern edge of the Oval Maidan, symbolizing the second city of the British Empire. Land reclamation started in the 1860s, with most notably the land for the Great Indian Peninsula Railway terminus completed in 1871. Other reclamation took place in different areas including the Backbay, which was set back by the slowing of the economy as a result of the end of the American civil war, and thus the end of the Bombay cotton boom. The Backbay Reclamation Scheme (1928-1942) incorporated all the failed or unfinished reclamation projects since the 1860s and completed 552 acres of land by the end of 1929. Three different plans were made for the government to develop on the reclaimed land housing, schools, hospitals and other facilities for the growing Indian middle class. None of them was implemented. In the early 1930s, the block facing the Oval Maidan and Churchgate was constructed in the Art Deco style, to become the first Art Deco buildings in India. They were extended in the 1940s to Marine Drive and made up the densest concentration of Art Deco buildings in Mumbai. These developments reflected major socio-economic changes in India during the 1920s and 1930s, including the rise of Western-educated Indian architects, the new concept of living in apartments and commuting to work, and the growth of the middle class.

The Ideal Home Exhibition in 1937 showcased Art Deco designs for buildings, interiors and furniture and encouraged the spread of Art Deco style in India during the 1930s and 1940s. Independence in 1947 put an end to the place of Art Deco as an expression of Indian aspirations for modernity as Jawaharlal Nehru embraced modernism after Independence, which brought an end to the spread of Art Deco architecture in India.

Today the buildings of the nominated property are still in use. The Victorian Neo-Gothic buildings are still public buildings. The Art Deco buildings have residential, commercial and entertainment uses. Many conservation initiatives have taken place over the last two decades, some by the Public Works Department and others by the community through the ‘Oval Trust’, ‘Kala Ghoda Association’ and other non-governmental organizations. In 1995, the Heritage Regulations for Greater Bombay were introduced. Accordingly, Mumbai became the first Indian city with a legal framework to protect its urban heritage.

3 Justification for inscription, integrity and authenticity

Comparative analysis
The comparative analysis is conducted by the State Party at international and national levels with urban ensembles of 19th and 20th century colonial cities inscribed on the World Heritage List and others that are not inscribed.

Internationally, comparisons are made with Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City, United Kingdom (2004, (ii), (iii), (iv)); Historic Centre of Macao, China (2005, (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi)); Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Strait of Malacca, Malaysia (2008, (ii), (iii), (iv)); The White City of Tel-Aviv – the Modern Movement, Israel (2003, (ii), (iv)); and Levuka Historical Port Town, Fiji (2013, (ii), (iv)).

Comparisons are also made with the following cities that are not inscribed on the World Heritage List: Melbourne, Australia; City of Durban, South Africa; Shanghai Bund, Shanghai, People’s Republic of China; and Central Park, New York, United States of America (included in 2017 on the Tentative List).

The nomination dossier mentions briefly 18 colonial settlements, towns or urban centres, some of which are inscribed on the World Heritage List or on the Tentative Lists, such as Delhi, A Heritage City, on the Indian Tentative List (2012, (ii), (v), (vi)), and the inscribed property of The Architectural Work of Le Corbusier, an Outstanding Contribution to the Modern Movement with the inclusion of Chandigarh (2016, (i), (ii), (vi)), as well as others not listed, such as Kolkata (Calcutta), and Chennai (Madras).
Comparisons are also made with Victorian ensembles, which are not inscribed on the World Heritage List. Mumbai is compared with Glasgow and Bristol, United Kingdom, and Ottawa, Canada.

Art Deco and early 20th century cities and groups of buildings are also compared, including Napier Art Deco Historic Precinct, New Zealand, on the Tentative List (2007, (ii), (iv), (vi)), and Asmara a Modernist City of Africa, Eritrea, inscribed on the World Heritage List (2017, (ii), (iv)), plus Miami Beach Architectural District, Florida, USA, and Bandung, West Java, Indonesia.

The comparative analysis concludes that no other city reflects better than Mumbai the urban re-engineering of a colonial city during the 19th and 20th centuries, and that Mumbai fills an important gap in the list of colonial cities and economic centres on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS notes that the geo-cultural comparators are from specific areas of the world subject to 19th and early 20th century colonial settlement by European imperial powers, where the climate required adaptation of European architectural principles to suit a different climatic zone and (in part) a local aesthetic language. Such parameters focus interest on central Asia, South East Asia and potentially parts of South America and Africa. In particular, the architectural responses in Mumbai reflect a mix of British imperial and Indian design language, adapted to suit a tropical climate.

Other Asian cities have a number of fine High Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings, though these are often individual buildings or smaller ensembles, such as Singapore, Jakarta and Bandung, Indonesia, with their tropical art deco style buildings. However, no city is characterized by this architectural style to the same degree as Mumbai which champions High Victorian Gothic architecture and also integrates this style with Indian design themes and artistic works.

Also, examples of architecture on a grand Neo-Gothic scale such as the parliamentary buildings in Ottawa or the library and environs in Melbourne are appropriately identified as are the centres of Delhi, Liverpool, Durban and Macau. Whilst the nomination of Georgetown in Malaysia relates more to its repetitive shop-houses, the questions relating to the valorisation of mixed colonial legacies are also relevant.

Based upon the comparative analysis by the State Party, Mumbai remains the most intact, authentic mid-19th to mid-20th century assemblage of buildings reflecting imperial rule and commerce, adapted in detail and design to suit the local tropical climate and culture.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis has justified consideration of this property for the World Heritage List.

Justification of Outstanding Universal Value
The nominated property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons:

- Individual clusters of Victorian or Art Deco buildings may survive across the world, but the Mumbai ensemble is collectively unparalleled, with the dramatic confrontation of the two styles across the Oval Maidan;
- The Victorian buildings are amongst the finest and most cohesive group of 19th century Victorian Gothic buildings in the world;
- The Victorian assemblage was amongst the earliest examples of public private partnerships in colonial India, as the urban scheme for public buildings was funded by philanthropists belonging to different communities and faiths;
- The Art Deco buildings are one of the largest and most homogenous assemblages of Art Deco buildings in Asia and the world;
- The 1920s land reclamation set the stage for Art Deco in India, with the modern construction technology of reinforced concrete and Art Deco features in contrast to the carved stone of the Victorian buildings across the Oval Maidan, creating the spectacular coastal promenade, Marine Drive – the Queen’s Necklace;
- The nominated property created a formidable architectural dialectic that influenced the narrative of modernism in Asia, with a distinct architectural genre, Western in form and Indian in spirit as an example of shared heritage; and
- The urban ensemble, which embodies international modernist trends of the 19th and 20th centuries, remains intact up to the present, as its buildings continue to be used.

ICOMOS considers that the justification provided by the State Party includes valid arguments. However, ICOMOS is of the view that the overall narrative and rationale of the nomination is lacking coherence and in need of reformulating despite the additional information submitted on 5 September 2017.

ICOMOS considers the additional information submitted by the State Party on 13 February 2018 offers a convincing rationale by emphasizing the territorial aspect of the nominated property, each with its distinctive architectural style: “Together these two developments represent the developments in urban planning that led to the expansion of a city along its western sease, first through the demolition of its fort walls and creation of a Victorian enclave by filling the moat and then through land reclamation from the sea to create an Art Deco development. Together, this urban ensemble creates a distinct entity – of an urban response to the growth of a trading colonial city by the sea – wholly unique in its dramatic juxtaposition of the two distinct architectural groupings facing each other across the historic maidan.”
ICOMOS considers that the proposed Outstanding Universal Value is better expressed by focusing the justification to emphasize the territorial aspect of the nominated property as an ensemble created by two waves of urban expansion that are manifested by two distinctive architectural styles, namely Victorian Neo Gothic and Art Deco styles and by renaming the property accordingly. This would justify the grouping of the two developments built in two different styles, while excluding excellent examples from these two styles which are located outside the boundaries of these two developments as well as the exclusion of other buildings of other styles that are important in the narrative of the historic development of Mumbai.

**Integrity and authenticity**

**Integrity**

The State Party holds that the assemblage of Victorian Neo Gothic and Art Deco buildings retains a high degree of integrity in visual, spatial and planning terms, with the Rajabai Clock tower as the visual high point and the Oval Maidan, which is a unifying element and a centrepiece to view both the Victorian and the Art Deco groups of buildings. Moreover, it is argued that it retains its integrity as a planned urban development in an Asian colonial city.

ICOMOS notes that a considerable number of significant buildings of both Victorian Gothic and Art Deco styles are located within the buffer zone and not within the nominated property.

ICOMOS considers that by emphasizing the territorial aspect of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the property as expressed in the additional information submitted on 13th February 2018 and as explained above, the nominated property includes the entirety of the two waves of urban expansion and the majority of buildings that were built within the two expansions in Victorian Neo Gothic style and Art Deco style.

ICOMOS notes that the visual integrity of the nominated property may be compromised by the speed of urban growth in Mumbai resulting in high-rise buildings in the proximity of the nominated property, especially where the buffer zone is particularly tight.

ICOMOS considers that the conditions of integrity have been met, but careful monitoring of urban growth in the vicinity of the property should be ensured.

**Authenticity**

The State Party holds that the assemblage of Victorian and Art Deco buildings meets the conditions of authenticity in terms of architectural form, decorative motifs, design, scale and material, and that they also retain their original use. The Oval Maidan retains its authenticity as an open urban space and Marine Drive retains its setting as a sea-facing Art Deco development.

ICOMOS notes that even if individual buildings may have experienced modifications, their living nature, form and design are still authentic in general; in particular, the use and function of each building remains almost unchanged in both the Victorian district and the Art Deco district. However, there are no actual written records available in terms of the history of additions and/or modifications of each building.

ICOMOS considers that the conditions of authenticity have been met.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity have been met, but the wider settings of the property are vulnerable to urban pressure developments.

**Criteria under which inscription is proposed**

The property is nominated on the basis of cultural criteria (ii) and (iv).

Criterion (ii): _exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;_

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that both Victorian Neo Gothic and Art Deco buildings of Mumbai are examples of shared heritage as they express a distinct architectural phenomenon that is Western in form and Indian in spirit, which contributed to the cosmopolitan culture of Mumbai as intended by their city planners and builders. They remain today in their original functions as a manifestation of the uninterrupted vitality of the urban scape. They were built with modern materials, techniques and structural systems in two architectural styles in two consecutive periods that were central to the development of modern architectural forms.

The Victorian assemblage of grand public buildings created an Indo-Gothic style by blending Gothic Revival elements with Indian elements, with adaptations in response to the local climate by introducing balconies and verandas.

The turn-of-the-century buildings created a transitional phase by blending European planning with Mughal and Indo-Islamic features, creating a fusion that became known as Indo Saracenic style.

Mumbai's Art Deco buildings of iconic cinema halls and apartment buildings blended Indian design with Art Deco imagery and created a unique style that became known as Indo-Deco. Its influence spread through the Indian sub-continent until the adoption of architectural modernism by Jawaharlal Nehru for the then newly independent India.
ICOMOS considers that both the Victorian Gothic and the Art Deco ensembles exhibit an important exchange of European and Indian human values over a span of time. The additional information submitted by the State Party on 13 February 2018 clarified the connection that ties these two ensembles, styles and types of buildings as they are both parts of the two major urban expansions of the city at the end of 19th century and beginning of 20th century.

ICOMOS considers that this criterion has been justified.

 Criterion (iv): be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the Victorian and Art Deco ensembles reflect the developments in urban planning over two centuries, with the shift from fortified colonial town to a cosmopolitan city in the map of global commerce.

ICOMOS acknowledges the significance of each of the two styles and ensembles of buildings and the quality of their contrast facing each other across the Oval Maidan.

The two ensembles represent architectural styles, phases in the advancements of construction materials and techniques, urban planning philosophies and historical phases which are distinctive, facing each other across the Oval Maidan. They stand witness to the development of Mumbai from a small coastal fort to the preeminent colonial city of the British Empire, a global financial capital and the ‘Gateway to India’ in East Asia.

The additional information submitted by the State Party on 13 February 2018 clarified the connection that ties these two ensembles, styles and types of buildings as they are both parts of the two major urban expansions of Bombay that led to the development of the city to become the internationally important mercantile city of the twentieth century and up to the present.

ICOMOS considers that this criterion has been justified.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the nominated property meets the criteria (ii) and (iv) and the conditions of integrity and authenticity.

4 Factors affecting the property

Development pressure in and around the nominated property is unprecedented, according to the nomination dossier. Despite the protection offered by the 1995 Development Control Regulation for Greater Bombay no. 67 (DCR 67), the redevelopment byelaws DCR 33 (7) and (9) allow for reconstruction and redevelopment of ‘cessed buildings’. The pressure for façade alterations and changes to ground floor level is very high because of the commercial activities of the city of Mumbai and the closeness of the nominated property to the business district.

According to the additional information received from the State Party on 13 February 2018 in response to ICOMOS’ Interim Report, both the property and the buffer zone enjoy two layers of protection. Firstly, the blanket protection of the two notified Heritage Precincts; the Fort Precinct and the Marine Drive Precinct. Secondly, the 100-meter protection zone of Grade I buildings along the Oval Maidan side of the Property adds another layer of protection.

Environmental pressures are a combination of salt-laden sea breezes and urban air pollution. This threatens particularly the decorative features, which are carved from limestone, on the facades of both Victorian and Art Deco buildings.

Disasters that may affect the property are defined by the nomination dossier as heavy rainfall and flooding, earthquakes, cyclonic winds, and fire.

Torrential rainfall affects the infrastructure and may lead to flooding in a few areas of the buffer zone. In addition, Mumbai is located in an area of moderate risk of earthquakes, according to the Geological Survey of India. Also, the threat from cyclonic winds may affect in a limited way the outskirts of the buffer zone.

The risk of fire is critical for timber-framed buildings in wards A, B and C, with narrow irregular alleyways in the Fort Area with little or no access for fire engines.

ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are development pressures and environmental pressures, particularly torrential rain and to a lesser extent the threat of earthquakes. The property is also threatened by the risk of fire.

5 Protection, conservation and management

Boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone

The total area of the nominated property is 66.34 ha. The total area of the buffer zone is 378.78 ha and is defined by the two Heritage Precincts: the Fort Precinct and the Marine Drive Precinct.

The eastern border of the Fort Precinct is the sea and its western border is the Esplanade. The delineation of the Fort Precinct follows the traces of the original extent of the historic Fort, which was demolished in the 1860s. On the east, the borders follow the historic Naval Docklands and the business district. Its northern boundaries include the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus) and the Crawford Market (Mahatma Jyotirao Phule Market).
The Marine Drive Precinct is bordered on the south by Madame Cama Road. Marine Drive and the western seaboard of the Arabian Sea form the western boundary for the precinct. The eastern boundary is bordered by the Esplanade and extends along the original railway lines (Mumbai Suburban Western Railway). The northern boundary is the Malabar Hill.

The Fort Precinct functions as the buffer zone for the nominated property and for another World Heritage Site, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus).

ICOMOS notes that the eastern boundary of the buffer zone along Marine Drive cuts through the middle of a circular-shaped road network that is an integral part of a single urban plan, and that the southwestern corner of Marine Drive has no buffer zone, which means the nominated property just faces an area of high-rise buildings.

ICOMOS notes a strip of buildings that is included in the buffer zone but lies between the two heritage precincts and is thus not protected.

The additional information submitted by the State Party on 13th February 2018 explained the rationale for the delineation of the boundaries as they follow the boundary of the Marine Drive Precinct and that the Vidhan Sabha buildings and high-rises of Nariman Point were a much later development and built before notification of Marine Drive Precinct as a heritage precinct.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the boundaries of the nominated property and of its buffer zone are adequate.

Ownership
The ownership of the buildings of the nominated property follows different patterns: either public, private or mixed. The function of the building is often dictated by whether it is privately or publicly owned.

Most of the Victorian buildings are public buildings, owned by the Central Government or the State Government of Greater Mumbai, or by the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai. Banks and corporate buildings are owned by Corporatations and Banking Corporations. Other buildings are owned by trusts or private companies. The Art Deco apartment blocks are owned by private owners or society ownership. The land is leased from the Collector of Mumbai for 99 years, starting from 1940. After the lease period is up a revision will be required from the government. Private buildings ownership is guided by the Bombay Rents, Hotels and Lodging House Rates Control Act of 1947.

Protection
The legal protection of the property and buffer zone is based on the statute of the Government of Maharashtra, most importantly by the Heritage Regulations for Greater Bombay 1995, Regulation No. 67 (DCR 67). Under this regulation, buildings of the nominated property are listed as Grade I, IIA, IIB or III.

According to the modification of 25th January 2009 the two precincts of the Fort Precinct and the Marine Drive Precinct are protected as heritage precincts. Most of the area of both the nominated property and the buffer zone falls within these two heritage precincts.

ICOMOS acknowledges the additional information submitted by the State Party on 5 September 2017, stating that the Marine Drive Precinct was notified as a heritage precinct by resolution no. TPB4315/28/CR-12/2015/UD-11, dated 15 May 2015.

All repairs and developments must be screened by the Heritage Conservation Committee, including all proposed changes of cessed buildings.

Further layers of protection are offered by policies under several Acts.

As modern developments of the 19th and early 20th centuries, no traditional protection mechanisms exist for the buildings of the nominated property or the buffer zone. Nevertheless, institutions of the civil society, such as the ‘Marine Drive Residents’ Association’ and the ‘Oval Trust’, act as watchdogs for the protection of the built environment.

The effectiveness of protection measures is supported by Government Notice No. TPS-1812/3067/CR-42/UD-13, dated 30 April 2015 (Heritage TDR), which implies that floor area can be transferred to other areas, outside the heritage precincts, in order to keep the floor area ratio of the heritage precinct at 1.33 net, in effect detouring the development to outside the heritage precincts. Five cases have benefited from the Heritage TDR to date, totalling 2091.74 square meters.

ICOMOS considers that the nomination dossier is missing the detailed explanation and record of the mechanism and effectiveness of implementation of DCR67 and to what extent are they effective for the buildings that are not listed (Grades I, IIA, IIB & III), both in the nominated property and the buffer zone.

In response to the Interim Report, the State Party presented a list of eight cases that were reviewed by the Heritage Conservation Committee and indications of the different decisions and recommendations of the Committee. However, these examples remain indications that are not detailed or backed by documentation of the relevant buildings, the proposals and the implemented interventions.

ICOMOS notes that the nomination dossier doesn’t clarify the impact of the CESS Act on the cessed buildings within the property and how the protection of these buildings differs from the rest of the buildings within the nominated property and its buffer zone.
In response to the Interim Report, the State Party clarified that “all proposals for alterations or modifications of CESS buildings shall be presented to the Heritage Conservation Committee.”

ICOMOS further notes that all the above protection measures do not cover the strip of buildings in the buffer zone that lies between the two precincts.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the legal protection in place is adequate. ICOMOS recommends that the inventory be complemented to include architectural-level documentation and detailed records of the conservation state and history of each building.

Management

Management structures and processes, including traditional management processes

The nomination dossier mentions that the nominated property will be managed through the existing mechanism based on Section 52 of the Greater Mumbai Development Plan by the Heritage Conservation Committee, which was created by DCR 67. The Site Management Plan identifies nine objectives and presents an action plan consisting of 13 actions, with an indication of the stakeholders or agencies involved for each action, and whether it is an ongoing, short-, medium- or long-term action.

ICOMOS notes that the site management plan that is presented with the nomination dossier does not include an organizational chart or an explanation of clear tools for implementation.

Policy framework: management plans and arrangements, including visitor management and presentation

ICOMOS appreciates the strong commitment on the part of local community groups. However, the actual work of the Heritage Conservation Committee is not detailed, despite the fact that it has been actively functioning for many years.

ICOMOS notes that apart from the members of the Heritage Conservation Committee, whose role is advisory, the nomination dossier does not clarify the staffing levels, expertise or training for the personnel who actually carry out the work and the implementation of the Committee’s decisions.

ICOMOS notes that the additional information submitted by the State Party on 13 February 2018 in response to the Interim Report names the members of the Heritage Conservation Committee and the technical staff. However, no organizational chart or clarification of the expertise and roles were included.

Furthermore, interpretation, presentation and visitor management of the nominated property are either outdated or not clearly outlined in the nomination dossier.
Involvement of the local communities

There is a strong involvement of local communities such as the ‘Oval Trust’, and ‘Marine Drive Residents’ Association’. Professional bodies such as the Urban Design Research Institute, and the Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Vastu Sangrahalaya (formerly the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India) are also active players in conservation movements.

ICOMOS notes the positive involvement of the local communities in the protection of the nominated property and the preparation of the nomination dossier.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the management system is adequate. ICOMOS recommends that the site management plan is extended to include an organizational chart showing responsibilities and decision-making processes, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the management action plan, including resources, staffing and training, and a management tourism strategy.

6 Monitoring

Ten indicators are identified by the nomination dossier to monitor the state of conservation of the nominated property, with the identification of periodicity and the location of records pertaining to four objectives: Conservation; Public Services & amenities; Buffer zone management; and Risk management.

ICOMOS notes that, in general, the indicators identified by the State Party are appropriate. However, a more precise periodicity is recommended. Some indicators are not directly measurable and may need more specific indicators, such as “survey of larger buffer area to check the state of buffer zone” and “Infrastructure monitoring”.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the monitoring could be considered adequate, but could be improved by introducing more indicators and specifying more precise measurable indicators.

7 Conclusions

ICOMOS acknowledges the significance of the ensemble of the Victorian Gothic institutional buildings and the ensemble of the Art Deco residential, commercial and entertainment buildings of Mumbai, each in their own right.

The justification for the Outstanding Universal Value should emphasize the territorial aspect of the nominated property and its significance as two waves of urban expansion of the city that transformed it into a modern mercantile cosmopolitan city. The name of the property should be changed accordingly. The property meets criteria (ii) and (iv) and conditions of integrity and authenticity.

The 2013 inventory of nominated ensembles should be complemented to include architectural-level documentation and detailed records of the conservation state and history of each building.

The site management plan should be extended to include an organizational chart showing responsibilities and decision-making processes, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the management action plan, including resources, staffing and training, and a management tourism strategy.

8 Recommendations

Recommendations with respect to inscription

ICOMOS recommends that the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, India, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).

Recommended Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

Two waves of urban development of Mumbai in the 19th and 20th centuries transformed the city from a fortified trading outpost to the first city of India. The first expansion included the construction in the 1880s of a group of Victorian Gothic public buildings and the creation of the Oval Maidan.

The second expansion was the Backbay Reclamation Scheme in the early 20th century, which offered a new opportunity for Bombay to expand to the west with Art Deco residential, commercial and entertainment buildings and the creation of the Marine Drive sea front.

Today the Oval Maidan offers a spectacular ensemble of Victorian Gothic buildings on its eastern side, and another impressive ensemble of Art Deco buildings on its western side as a testimony to the modernization phases that Mumbai went through leading to a modern independent India in 1947.

Criterion (ii): Both the Victorian Gothic and the Art Deco ensembles exhibit an important exchange of European and Indian human values over a span of time. The Victorian assemblage of grand public buildings created an Indo-Gothic style by blending Gothic revival elements with Indian elements, with adaptations in response to the local climate by introducing balconies and verandas. Mumbai’s Art Deco buildings of iconic cinema halls and apartment buildings blended Indian design with Art Deco imagery and created a unique style that became known as Indo-Deco. Its influence spread through the Indian sub-continent.
Criterion (iv): The Victorian Gothic and Art Deco ensembles reflect the developments in architecture and urban planning over two centuries. The two ensembles represent architectural styles, phases in the advancements of construction materials and techniques, urban planning philosophies, and historical phases which are distinctive and facing each other across the Oval Maidan. Both ensembles are the creation of the two major urban expansions of Bombay, which led to the development of the city to become the internationally important mercantile city of the twentieth century and up to the present.

Integrity
The assemblage of Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings retains a high degree of integrity in visual, spatial and planning terms with the Rajabai Clock tower as the visual high point and the Oval Maidan, which is a unifying element and a centrepiece offering to view both the Victorian and the Art Deco groups of buildings. It retains its integrity as a planned urban development. The wider settings of the property are vulnerable to urban development pressures.

Authenticity
The assemblage of Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings meets the conditions of authenticity in terms of architectural form, decorative motifs, design, scale and material. They also retain their original use. The Oval Maidan retains its authenticity as an urban open space and Marine Drive retains its setting as a sea-facing Art Deco development.

Even if individual buildings may have experienced modifications, their living nature, form and design are still authentic in general; in particular the use and function of each building remains almost unchanged in both the Victorian district and the Art Deco district.

Management and protection requirements
The legal protection of the property and buffer zone is based on the statute of the Government of Maharashtra, most importantly by the Heritage Regulations for Greater Bombay 1995, Regulation No. 67 (DCR 67). Under this regulation, buildings of the property are listed as Grade I, IIA, IIB or III. The property and its buffer zone fall within the two heritage precincts: Fort Precinct and Marine Drive Precinct.

The property is managed according to Section 52 of the Greater Mumbai Development Plan by the Heritage Conservation Committee, which was created by DCR 67. The Site Management Plan identifies nine objectives and presents an action plan consisting of 13 actions, with an indication of the stakeholders or agencies involved for each action, and whether it is an ongoing, short-, medium- or long-term action. It should be strengthened to include an organizational chart, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the management action plan and a management tourism strategy.

Additional recommendations
ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party gives consideration to the following:

a) Complete the 2013 inventory to include necessary documentation at architectural level, including conservation state and conservation history for each building, which will be necessary for effective management of the property,

b) Ensure the protection of the property from development pressures, paying special attention to its wider settings and maintaining the visual dominance of the skyline by the Rajabai Clock tower,

c) Undertake urgent conservation of the grade IIA building, the former Watson’s Hotel (known at present as Esplanade Mansions),

d) Ensure revitalization of the Art Deco Eros Cinema, which is in a fair state of conservation but no longer functions as a cinema,

e) Back the actions of the Heritage Conservation Committee by documentation of the relevant buildings, the proposals and the implemented interventions,

f) Extend the site management plan to include an organizational chart showing responsibilities and decision-making processes, the legal provisions of the management of the property, an implementation mechanism for the management action plan, including resources, staffing and training, and a management tourism strategy;

Moreover, ICOMOS recommends that the name of the property be modified to become: “The Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensembles of Mumbai”.
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The Elphinstone College and David Sassoon Library along with the Watsons Hotel