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Summary

The conference “Integrating Urban Heritage in Urban Planning Processes” took place on 24 March 2021 in the context of the 10th anniversary of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL Recommendation). The event was organised by the City of Prague in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre to share and discuss the proposal of its Metropolitan Plan.

The online sessions discussed a significant variety of case studies and practices focusing on the integration of heritage and historical values into processes of urban development. The pressures of urbanisation and inadequately planned urban development, the urgency of responding to sustainable development and Climate Change, as well as the ongoing sanitary crisis are challenging historic cities to address complex issues related to housing and mobility, while also conserving valuable heritage. On this occasion, several urban heritage experts, site managers, city professionals, and national focal points, contributed to the discussion presenting different suggestions, plans and mechanisms employed to include practices to further sustainable development and engage local communities.

The conference was structured around the involvement of different cities that shared their experiences underlining the cultural, social and economic values of urban heritage, its preservation, renovation and new construction carefully integrated with the historic structures to ensure continuing protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property while furthering sustainable urban communities. A particular focus was given to sustainable development in line with the goals set by the 2030 Agenda and New Urban Agenda.
After the opening speeches by Mr Petr Hlaváček, Deputy Mayor for Urban Development of the Prague City Hall and Ms Hana Třeštíková, City Councillor for Culture and Heritage Care of the Prague City Hall, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, Deputy Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, addressed the importance of integrating urban heritage in urban processes, as a fundamental tool for social cohesion, cultural and economic development in the framework of the HUL Recommendation. Conservation was highlighted as a central instrument for sustainable livelihoods that needs to be centred on local communities to ensure that heritage management processes engage with change and stability over time. In particular, she explained the methodology developed as the Fukuoka Outcomes for implementing the HUL Recommendation.

Through the analysis and discussion of the practices adopted in several historic cities located across Europe and their approaches to critical issues specific of their urban context, the conference was a great chance to share tools and suggestions during an enriching day of exchange.

Access the video recording
Rationale and overall purpose
As more than 55% of humanity lives in cities, and more than 60% will live in them by the year 2021, cities and settlements have grown rapidly and exponentially, often inadequately planned, over the last few decades and will very likely continue to do so. At the same time, many cities and settlements have evolved over centuries and are rich repositories of history, heritage and identity. Their diversity of forms reflects the historical encounters, environments and influences that each city or settlement has lived.

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre is the Secretariat of the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage governed by the intergovernmental World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Cities Programme is one of the six thematic programmes approved and monitored by the World Heritage Committee since 2001. Today, 313 cities inscribed on the World Heritage List are part of the World Heritage Cities Programme. These properties are inscribed for their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) that makes the heritage valuable not only to that country or city but to all of humanity, and hence must be protected as a joint effort. With this in view, the properties must ensure the conditions of authenticity and integrity (Fukuoka Outcomes), while at the same time taking into account the local attributes of urban heritage identity.

The 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL Recommendation) was adopted by the UNESCO’s General Conference on 10 November 2011. The key findings of the Second Member State Survey on the Implementation of the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation (HUL Recommendation) had been that it needed to be implemented as an urgent and necessary tool for resolving the conflicting demands of heritage conservation and urban development towards more sustainable cities. This was necessary both for those cities that have properties inscribed on the World Heritage List as well as those that do not.

With increasing threats from poorly planned urban development, World Heritage Committee decisions have identified the need to better address urban pressures for development in and around World Heritage properties (Decision 41 COM 7; Decision 43 COM 7.3). They also emphasised the crucial importance of implementing the HUL Recommendation for World Heritage cities (Decision 42 COM 5A). The World Heritage Committee has also noted in recent years that increasing pressures in and around numerous World Heritage properties pose major threats to their value, and cited the need for the application of more effective and durable conservation and management of urban heritage inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Committee called upon State Parties (41 COM 7) to integrate the role of culture in sustainable urban development, in order to achieve vital goals for heritage and the environment (notably, SDG 11 / Target 4). 2021 marks the 10th anniversary of the HUL Recommendation, which provides a perfect opportunity to reflect on how this Recommendation has been implemented and integrated into sustainable development plans in World Heritage cities.

Such experiences are especially relevant in the context of the Metropolitan Plan for Prague, Czechia. In April 2020, the City of Prague planned to host an international workshop as suggested in the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission that took place from 25 to 29 March 2019 (read the report WHC.21/44.
Previous Committee decisions for the World Heritage site of the “Historic Centre of Prague” had already addressed the visual impact of high-rise buildings in the World Heritage site and the effects of new construction projects on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) (31 COM7B.94, 35 COM 7B.89). Other decisions also addressed the assessment of infrastructure projects (33 COM 7B.96, 34 COM 7B.82). The proposed activity will focus on these different issues and look for practical examples that could support the better integration of urban heritage management in urban development processes.

Objectives
The conference will revolve around the ways urban heritage values are integrated into urban development processes and how different cities have developed various mechanisms and tools. As a result, the activity will underline the practical, economic and cultural values of traditional constructions, renovations, new constructions, and ways of assessing and ensuring their positive impact. A focus on sustainable development in the framework of the 2030 Agenda and New Urban Agenda is also at the centre of this activity.

Format
Technical: 1-day Zoom conference
Working languages: Czech, English and French with simultaneous interpretation.
## Agenda
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Welcome and opening speeches

Jiří Jaroš (host)
Welcome to Prague. Welcome to the Centre for Architecture and Metropolitan Planning in Prague. My name is Jiří Jaroš, I work here at IPR, and I will be the host for this workshop. This workshop is called Integrating Urban Heritage in Urban Planning Processes.

As you know, Prague is a really old city, and this really old city has a very new Metropolitan Plan. This workshop will be about dialogue between old and new, and we need to find the dialogue. We need to find how to cooperate with planning, how to find a future of Prague and preserve the heritage of Prague, its beauty. The programme for today is clear, we will start with some introductory words and presentations and case studies and, after that, there will be a discussion. If you have any difficulties, please reach us on the phone or chat. We will start with the first introductory words of Hana Třeštíková, Deputy Mayor for Culture in Prague. Welcome, Hana. I am really happy you are here with us, I am looking forward to your introductory words.

Hana Třeštíková City Councillor for Culture and Heritage Care, Prague

Hello everybody. I you do not mind, I will switch to Czech. I understand there is a professional translator who will help me with translating the exact meaning to English, so, if you do not mind, I will switch to Czech.

Welcome everybody. I would like to say hello to all my colleagues from Prague, Czech Republic and to all our colleagues from abroad.

I am here in the Town Hall of Prague close to the Old Town Square, the very centre of Prague. I am sorry we could not meet in person because we have tried to organise the workshop several times; unfortunately, the situation does not allow us to do so. Still, I am happy that we can meet at least online and that you are participating in a large number and I am happy that thanks to the online conference we can welcome so many foreign experts whose opinions and experience we respect deeply and I am happy we can cooperate at least in this way.

As far as I know, Prague is a city on the territory of which there is probably one of the largest monument preservation zone inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The reserve itself has an area of almost nine square kilometres. Together with its protected zone, it comprises almost one hundred square kilometres. In addition to the monument’s outstanding global value, Prague is also the capital of our country; it is the centre of our country and an authentic live city where we can have a pleasurable life.

The inscription of Prague on the World Heritage List in 1992 is the result of the great tradition of the Czech monument preservation programme. It gained a strong position in the Czech Republic between the world wars during the Communist regime, when it gained a lot of great experts who could not work, for example, for universities for political reasons and because of that they found a job in the monument preservation of heritage institutions. The heritage protection and preservation has kept its great tradition. There are many institutions functioning even now in a situation where each project in a preserved area needs
For example, yesterday, during a meeting of the City Council of Prague we dealt with the concept for one of the main Prague waterfronts close to the National Theatre, where we have a revitalisation programme. We expected many reactions from car drivers mainly because we are to restrict the traffic there. However, most of the criticism came from cyclists because there are cycling tracks which are not covered with asphalt, they are paved, and that is because of the requirements from the heritage preservation institutions. So this is the normal day-to-day life of our city. I am convinced that the task of myself and my colleagues is to find a consensus that will ensure the right balance between everything that needs to be taken into account. Of course, we take care; our interest is heritage preservation and protection. Also, we care about the interests of the population, climate or sustainable traffic. We are looking for this balance in all projects on all levels of urban planning, of the top-level or medium level of plans or studies, but also on the level of public spaces.

I am happy that today people see examples from abroad that cover all the three levels – the spatial or land use planning, but also more detailed plans for specific public spaces and I am grateful that we can cooperate with UNESCO and thus gain inspiration to fix the issues in Prague. I believe that your experience will help us find ways to protect our heritage and integrate this protection into our land use planning in a smooth way. I will be present during the whole morning session today. I am looking forward to all the presentations and also I am looking forward to the discussion. Thank you very much for the time being.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you very much, Mrs Třeštíková, I am really happy that I hear those words. Now there is a time for Petr Hlaváček, First Deputy Mayor for Development and Metropolitan Planning in Prague. Welcome, Mr Hlaváček, I am really happy that you are here with us.

Petr Hlaváček Deputy Mayor for Urban Development, Prague

Thank you, Jiří. Dear friends and dear colleagues, let me welcome you to this conference on the historical heritage of Prague. In the context of the events which brought the whole society to think over many things. This brings some benefits because probably we would not be able to gather together such a great number of specialists.

The original aim was to discuss how to regulate the height of the city buildings. In this COVID period, we have adjusted the topic because as you know, Prague is preparing a new zoning plan which is creating some rules for the whole area of the city where more than 1,200,000 people are living. The Metropolitan Plan determines the boundaries for the constructions throughout the city, not only in the protected areas. We discussed the matter with representatives of the Ministry of Culture and we came to a very valuable consensus.

The second thing or the second conclusion which we reached during the discussion of the plan is the scope of the Metropolitan Plan, which serves the whole city, not only the historical centre, but also the modern parts of the city, the housing estates where a greater percentage of our inhabitants live. We came to the conclusion that we need some more detailed documentation for the preservation zone and, based on our agreement, we are
preparing now the bidding documentation for the production of the more detailed documentation. We are preparing also some documentation for the political decisions to be taken in this respect. Regarding the details of the planning documentation, they are very important for the development of our city, but they should not replace the binding opinion of the monument preservation bodies.

I am looking forward to your presentations, to your comments, and to your case studies. As Hana Třeštíková mentioned, in this period we are pursuing some ambitions to reduce the traffic in areas of the waterfront. Of course, the results are very disputable because some people prefer just the individual traffic, and when we say that we have been limiting the transport or traffic in one of the nicest waterfronts in the world, this causes great discussions. Of course, we have some other projects related to the areas which are outside of the historical centre. We are now facing the need to discuss all the aspects of the development projects, as we are coming to the conclusion that there should be some modern concert hall built up in that area. Prague really needs to have such a universal concert hall which would be of different shape compared to the existing traditional theatres and concert halls. I am very thankful for the discussions which are held and the consensus reached. We will be also glad to discuss the topic of the more detailed documentation with you because these are the plans we will work on in the near future. Thank you.

**Jiří Jaroš**

Thanks to Deputy Mayors of Prague Petr Hlaváček and Hana Třeštíková for their words. Let’s welcome Jyoti Hosagrahar, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO.

**Jyoti Hosagrahar, Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre:**

**HUL Recommendation Approach to integrating Urban Heritage in Urban Processes**

Thank you, thank you very much. First of all, on behalf of UNESCO I would like to thank Mr Petr Hlaváček, Ms Hana Třeštíková, deputy mayors. Thank you very much for your excellent collaboration with UNESCO for this very important conference. I would like to take the opportunity also on behalf of UNESCO to welcome all the participants for this very important conference on integrating urban heritage in the planning processes.

The historic centre of Prague was, as you know very well, was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992. Then, the World Heritage Committee at its forty second session in 2018 expressed great concern about the number of large-scale development projects proposed within the buffer zone of the property and its setting, as well as the lack of specific regulations on high-rise developments that may substantially impact the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. Previous Committee decisions for the World Heritage site of the Historical Centre of Prague had already addressed the visual impact of high-rise buildings in the World Heritage property and the effects of new construction projects on its OUV.

The World Heritage Committee has noted also in recent years the increasing pressure in and around numerous World Heritage properties that pose threats to their value. The Committee welcomed the effort of the State Party to have finalized its management plan and its processes of consultation and finalization of the Metropolitan Plan, as stated in the State of Conservation Report of the State Party of Czechia in 2020. The Committee of course attaches a lot of importance to the last decisions, and so we welcome the initiative of the City of Prague to collaborate with us in organising this international workshop.
Why are we preserving and how do we preserve urban heritage? We are witnessing today the largest human migration in history, with more than half of the world’s population living in urban areas and soon to be significantly more than half. Rapid uncontrolled urbanization frequently results in social and spatial fragmentation and in a drastic deterioration of the quality of urban and rural environments. Urban heritage, including its tangible and intangible components constitutes a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas and fosters economic development and social cohesion in a changing global environment. Historic cities and traditional settlements have often developed resilient features that contribute towards adapting to challenges like climate change, including controlling carbon emissions and mitigating its impact on our communities and built fabric. As the future of humanity hinges on the effect of planning and management of resources, conservation has become a strategy to achieve a balance between urban growth and quality of life on a sustainable basis.

The integration of urban heritage in the urban planning processes is essential to harness the potential of heritage to contribute to sustainable development in cities and, in short, a sustainable people-centred management of cultural assets. Modern urban conservation policies, as reflected in existing international recommendations and chapters, have set the stage for the preservation of historic urban areas. However, present and future challenges require the definition and implementation of the new generation of public policies, identifying and protecting historic layering and balance of cultural and natural values in urban environments. In the course of the past century, urban heritage conservation has emerged as an important sector of public policy worldwide. It is a response to the need to preserve shared values and to benefit from the legacy of history.

However, the shift from an emphasis on architectural monuments primarily to a broader recognition of the importance of social cultural economic processes and in the conservation of urban values should be matched by a drive to adapt the existing policies and create new tools to address this vision. Conservation and urban heritage should thus be integrated into general policy planning and practices and those related to the broader urban context.

The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape was adopted ten years ago, so we are also celebrating in 2021 the tenth anniversary of the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape as it was adopted in 2011 by the General Conference of UNESCO. UNESCO’s approach to managing the Historic Urban Landscape is a holistic approach by integrating the goals of urban heritage conservation and those of social and economic development. This approach sees urban heritage as a social cultural and economic resource for the sustainable development of cities. It is an additional tool to integrate policies and practices of conservation of the built environment into the wider goals of urban development with respect to inherited values and traditions of different cultural contexts. It is a soft law to be implemented by member states on a voluntary basis and applies to all historic cities, not only to World Heritage cities.

The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape defines the Historic Urban Landscape as an area understood as the result of the historic layering of cultural and natural values extending beyond the notion of a historic centre or ensemble to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting. The setting also includes the site’s topography, geomorphology, hydrology, natural features, its built environment, its infrastructure, the historic and contemporary built environment, the spaces and gardens, land use patterns, spatial organisation, perceptions and visual relationships, as well as other elements. It also
includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to its diversity and identity.

The approach of the Historic Urban Landscape looks at historic urban areas as composed of layers of history, economic social and spatial relationships between built heritage, natural environment and the local communities. These layers include natural, cultural, tangible, intangible, universal and local heritage values present in any city and these heritage values should be taken as the point of departure in the overall management for development of the city, or in the case of World Heritage properties it is the OUV, the Outstanding Universal Value, that is the point of departure. The layers of history and value are reflected also in the physical layers, that is the archaeology and the interpretation and the reading of these layers, which could be over time – diachronic – or could be synchronic – at the same time going across space. So the archaeological remains are fundamental in a sense to understanding of a place. The approach creates a shift from monuments to the urban fabric as a whole. Very often, historic cities have been seen as large-scale monuments, an ensemble of structures, but really it is much more that. The HUL approach is also a way to consider the city as a process that is characterised both by change and stability over time.

I want to share with you the outcomes from an expert workshop organised in Fukuoka, Japan, in January of 2020 on the methodology for implementing the Recommendation. One could look at it in terms of eight key actions.

• The first is establishing a governance structure – management system – for the World Heritage property that coordinates agencies, institutions that are the stakeholders that are primarily involved, that could include heritage conservation, urban development, regional development, tourism, transport, housing authorities, all of those the deputy mayors mentioned, the legal regulations and so on. All of this forms the governance structure, which needs to be interdisciplinary and across different sectors.

• The second direction of action is understanding and assessing the sustainable development status needs and priorities, to carry out a preliminary assessment of the sustainable development status, reach a consensus with stakeholders on what the key priorities are and implement the UNESCO Culture|2030 indicators to assess the condition of sustainable development.

• Inventorying, very detailed registries, mapping, surveying of all of the tangible, intangible and natural resources, all of the elements that need to be protected and the different ways in which they may need to be protected. Identifying attributes of urban heritage and a brief description of the local significance is also very important.

• Assess the key vulnerabilities of the attributes of the OUV, looking at the attributes of the urban heritage identity in relation to change.

• The integration and coherence of the different sectors, all of them coherent towards the same shared set of common objectives.

• Ensuring that the OUV and urban heritage values are recognised in designed development programmes and detailed projects.

• Coherent set of priorities and actions are developed.

• Out of this, priority actions and projects are identified for conservation and sustainable development so that they could be approached in an integrated way. Heritage impact assessments are proposed for interventions that have or that could have a potential impact on the OUV and may need adjustments as necessary.

[Identifying] the attributes of urban heritage identity is a way to look at urban heritage values beyond the OUV, to understand the larger context, the local context. One could look
at it at different scales to be able to understand and protect the city’s identity in terms of:

• the wider context, skylines, hills, natural features, the hydrology, topography, views, spatial patterns,
• the second level is at the level of the city itself, which is urban elements, it could be the axes, the city walls, streetscapes, street sections, could be water systems, vistas, panoramas, spatial organisation, block sizes – all of these have a certain pattern that needs to be identified if they are specific and need to be protected.
• the level of the monuments or individual buildings, in terms of the scale, the material, the form, the colours, textures, the craftsmanship, the design qualities, the heights...
• further to this, the intangible elements of festivals, music, markets, community, congregation, the sense of ownership, spatial practices, all of which give life to the city and to the space.

All of these materials that I have discussed are online at the World Heritage Cities Programme website. We invite you also to subscribe to the Urban Notebooks, which is our monthly newsletter. We also want to recall the importance of the 2030 Agenda, and the UNESCO 2030 indicators which could be implemented at the national level and at the urban level. I want to leave you with a number of other resources that you may find of interest on the World Heritage Cities Programme and the New Urban Agenda, the Culture Urban Future publication, the UNESCO 2030 indicators, and Urban Notebooks.

Thank you very much and wish you very successful discussion today. Thank you.

**Jiří Jaroš**

Thank you very much. That was Dr Hosagrahar, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO. Thank you very much again. Now I would like invite here Michal Leňo and Jiří Dejl, my teammates from the Office of the Metropolitan Plan at IPR Prague.

**Michal Leňo, Prague Institute of Planning and Development:**

**The Metropolitan Plan of Prague**

Good morning, I am going to speak about the Metropolitan Plan, which is the new Land Use Plan of Prague.

First of all, I would like to show you the map of Prague because a significant part of the land use planning in Prague is the protected heritage area. The Metropolitan Plan is based on four key principles:

• a return to the centre,
• layered city,
• stability of the environment, and
• looking for the potential and new opportunities and possibilities for development.

These principles are overlapping and we are trying to write the proper balance within the Metropolitan Plan. Of course, it is based on the unique topography of Prague and the Historic Urban Landscape in which these principles are overlapping and therefore we need to look for the proper instruments. Regarding the cultural heritage protection in the Metropolitan Plan, our partner on the national level is the Ministry of Culture and from the viewpoint of the Building Act, there is an obligation to agree on a common opinion with the Ministry of Culture.
As Mr Hlaváček said, in the last two years, we were looking for the consensus with the Ministry of Culture. Based on that, the Metropolitan Plan has been adapted significantly and the agreement with the Ministry of Culture reflects the UNESCO mission recommendation of 2019. The opinion of the Ministry of Culture can be divided or was divided into nine key topics and two additional topics. Many of these topics reflect the recommendation of the UNESCO mission. We are going to mention and analyse these topics.

Each land use plan contains the concept for the protection and development of values. This part of the Metropolitan Plan, based on consensus with the Ministry of Culture, was extended to cover separate parts for the cultural monuments including historic heritage and also a protected area, so that these can be reflected in the whole of the document. The key points are preserving the historic structure, the height hierarchy and its structure from the viewpoint of the skyline of Prague.

The first topic - definition of the heritage areas in the plan and in the drawings, which also reflects the UNESCO recommendation. For this purpose the coordination drawing has been completed, has been supplemented with individual historic monuments, historic sites... In the centre of Prague, you can see how many there are. This also shows the borders of the heritage zones, protected zones. As far as the tools for regulating the height, one of the UNESCO recommendations was to look an alternative for the grid squares and, based on the consensus with the Minister of Culture, this has not been eliminated but the regulations concerning the individual protected zones were modified. The height regulation is regulated by the number of floors. This covers a square grid, a grid of squares of one hundred by one hundred metres covering all the territory of Prague. The key modification here is determining ranges of floor areas. Here we extended the ranges so the ranges are overlapping now, so we can react to the unique character of Prague’s built areas. We added one more to be able to regulate the areas in a better way.

This tool has been adapted for the heritage protected areas because there we need to react to the mass of the built areas, so we also need to modify the regulation in this respect. Apart from adapting the tool, we also adapted its application to the individual zones so
the individual squares in the grid were adapted and modified. This was the subject of discussions during the last two years and I would like to thank for that the Ministry of Culture because they were a partner for us in this respect, and we could discuss all the issues with them.

This is an example or illustration of the unique structure of Prague. Here, the highlighted squares are those that were modified based on the discussions and based on our search for the consensus. The Metropolitan Plan also determines evaluation of towers, another topic which has been discussed. The Metropolitan Plan determines places where so-called towers can be located, but this has been adapted based on the consensus with the Ministry of Culture. At the same time of the Metropolitan Plan contains individual panoramic regulation drawings. These are the key ones, where you can see all the specific towers. Let’s have a look at three specific examples as they have been adapted based on the search for the consensus in 2018. You can see the current situation, where we modified not only the extent but also the heights relative to some specific conditions. All of this was done based on the consensus with the Ministry of Culture.

Apart from these regulation drawings and layout drawings, the Metropolitan Plan also determines views based on panoramic photos, which are divided into types: skylines or panoramas, which is the bird’s eye view of the city and the others are called vedutas. Based on the consensus with the ministry, we selected these localities, for each photograph there is a special site and in which direction the photo should be taken. What is being reviewed through these photographs? It is the localities of the towers and key horizontals, which are the purple sites, and the black dots show the places from which the views have been taken. Based on that, we defined the space, the area to be evaluated. It is a five kilometre area and within that area all the projects are being assessed. You can see it covers the area of the Prague Heritage Zone (Heritage Reserve). Using the photos we can evaluate and assess all new development projects within the area of the Prague Heritage Reserve. Another topic which has been debated and which reflects the UNESCO recommendation are more detailed plans, more detailed scale. The Metropolitan Plan has a drawing of metropolitan priorities, so we determined these priority places in regard of which more detailed drawing, more detailed plans should be elaborated, should be made and described by way of more detailed land use plans. Thank you for attention.

**Jiří Jaroš**

Thank you very much, Michal. Thank you for your presentation. This was the first block of this part of the workshop. We heard words from deputy mayors of Prague, deputy director of UNESCO World Heritage Centre and Michal from the Office of the Metropolitan Plan.

Now it is time for case studies from Lyon, Bordeaux and Porto. Maybe you joined us later, so I just remind that this is the workshop “Integrating Urban Heritage in Urban Planning Processes”. We are talking about the dialogue between the past and the future in Prague in the context of a new Metropolitan Plan, which is this new zoning plan of Prague. You can ask a question if you would like to be involved in the discussion that will be held after the case studies. You can use a chat feature, write your question into the chat and we will be answering them lately in a panel discussion and a global discussion which you can find in the programme. You can find also a phone number that you can contact us if you have technical difficulties or you can ask us for advice right here because we are here for you and we would like to bring you the best experience of this workshop.
Now it is time for three presentations, three case studies. The first case study will be from Lyon held by Philippe Lamy. He is in charge of urban heritage of the city of Lyon and he will talk about the historic site of Lyon and the zoning plan. Mr Lamy, welcome.

**Case Study I LYON, Philippe Lamy: Historic Site of Lyon and the Zoning Plan**

Hello everybody. I am here to represent the city of Lyon. We are honoured to be part of this conference. Thank you to Prague for invitation for this conference. I would also like to thank Ms Třeštíková, the deputy mayor, Mr Hlaváček, the deputy mayor, as well as the other representatives of the City of Prague. I represent Mr Sylvain Godinot, who is in charge of ecological transition and city heritage.

The City of Lyon has some 500,000 inhabitants. The whole metropolis has 1,400,000 inhabitants on an area of a 134 km². The area of the classed part of the city – inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1998 – it has some 423ha. It was the perimeter of the city in the 18th century before it expanded beyond its original limits.

Lyon shows a wonderful example of archaeological continuation. You can see different urban fabrics from different periods of time. Also, the architectural forms are very diverse in Lyon. Lyon is now a mosaic of five different quarters or different parts of the city dating from Renaissance to the eighteenth century. The city centre remains a dynamic part of the metropolis, of the city with a dense network of inhabitants.

Lyon is situated where two different rivers meet, on a confluence of two rivers and on one hill. The geographical morphology of Lyon is very particular. In Lyon, different regions meet, and it is also the point where different architecture and cultural styles meet as well. I will speak about the integration of urban heritage into urban planning processes. In 2019, Lyon reviewed its plan, and we fixed ourselves four different challenges: metropolitan challenge, economic challenge, challenge of solidarity, and environmental challenge.

The urban heritage is a vector of attraction, that attracts people into the city. Here you can see Grand Hôtel Dieu, which is an important palace that was renovated three years ago. It makes some fifty five thousand metres squared, which makes it one of the biggest renovation projects in France. There is the historic centre, the symbolic core of the urban heritage. Here we try to pursue projects of renovation and reuse of different buildings. We also try to give a second life to the open public spaces. We also understand the urban planning process as a means of giving new life to different parts of the city and we try to respect at the same time the diversity of these parts. We try to respect also the vegetative qualities, typology of quarters and we try to conserve the most particular parts of the city and the harmony of the urban fabric.

I will speak about four different values. We try to respect the UNESCO World Heritage property. This part of the city is protected also in the new urban plan, the new urban document. As I have said, this part that is protected in the plan has a surface of 750 hectares. We try to have a holistic, a general approach for the whole area. Of course there are some specificities for every quarter. We also try to bear in mind the future, the possible future developments in these quarters. We have also a detailed list of heritage sites, you can see them in pink colour.
Here you can see the Renaissance part of the city. These plans are at a detail scale to take into consideration the specificities of different parts of the city. We have been collaborating with Bernard Gauthiez from Université Lyon 3, who has analysed the historical development of the urban landscape of the city. So this was the diachronic approach, and for the synchronic approach we have a detailed analysis of all these parts of the city. These analyses can serve also in the future for urban planning.

Let’s now speak about the blue and the green plans of the agglomeration. The blue spaces, the blue parts are the aquatic spaces. The green parts are the parks that have been created in the 1980s and go all the way to the city centre, thanks to the fact that we wanted to have harmony, balanced living conditions in the city, and we wanted to keep the biodiversity. We have taken into consideration the biodiversity and the ecosystems of the green and of the blue plan. We have worked also on ecological services. This has been a key factor in the approach. The green plan is based on the natural preservation of forests. We have also introduced new green spaces in the city.

The third tool is based on a type of morphological analysis of existing fabrics. We have developed this approach in order to adapt the city to contemporary challenges. This has enabled us to integrate the different spaces and to respond to the extension needs. This has enabled us a city development based on the preservation in terms of quality.

The fourth tool enables the protection of the heritage aspect of the districts. There are of course different state tools for the main monuments and heritage, but there are also some smaller elements of heritage which we should not forget. We have to take into account the context of the changing landscape of the city when we are developing the city of tomorrow. You can see a description of the built element of the heritage. This is the basis of the inspiration for new buildings. We wish to respect the identity of every district, of every neighbourhood and to encourage innovation, creativity and the respect for existing heritage. We want to use the dialogue among all stakeholders based on shared knowledge. Each of these heritage perimeters has its identification file, including all its details and characteristics that reveals the heritage characteristics of the whole. Here you can see an example of a renovation which included the renovation of some industrial buildings.

These are the tools we are using for building the city of the future. In June 2020, we have elected a new city council and the main objectives are the following: developing an inspiring city rather than an attractive city. That is an approach to the heritage that takes into
account the negative effects of excessive tourism or over-tourism. Here you can see our oldest neighbourhoods with a high density. You can see also the greenery and the blue elements. We have to take into account climate change, the transition has to be ecological. We have to see heritage as a non-renewable resource. This is very important. We all know, we will all agree that the destruction of this heritage is irreversible and it is all the more important to protect it.

And finally we want to develop a multi-faceted city, not a vertical city, which you can see on this map. The city is based on several secondary centres, not just one big centre. These are the objectives of the current city strategy. Soon, we are going to review the heritage plan, which will be focused on an ecological transition of the districts.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you very much, Mr Lamy. Thank you for your presentation. It was very deep and I am very happy that we had a chance to hear it and see it. Next presentation is from Anne-Laure Moniot from the Department of Town Planning, Heritage and Landscape of the Directorate-General Regional Development in Bordeaux. Welcome.

Case Study II BORDEAUX, Anne-Laure Moniot: Bordeaux, Port of the Moon

Hello, first of all many thanks to the City of Prague, to the mayor and the deputy mayors. I am happy to take part in this conference because I am learning many interesting things that I will be able to apply in my city of Bordeaux.

My name is Anne-Laure Moniot, I am an architect. I currently work for Bordeaux metropolis and I am in charge of the programme Bordeaux, Port of the Moon. The management of the Bordeaux heritage is based on the UNESCO approach as I will show in my presentation.
Bordeaux is a European city on the Atlantic coast. The agglomeration has 750,000 inhabitants. Bordeaux is connected to Paris by fast train. It takes just two hours by train. There is also an airplane connection, there is a big airport in Bordeaux. The city of Bordeaux was founded on the banks of the river Garonne. The World Heritage Bordeaux, Port of the Moon is about 1,800 hectares. We are applying the HUL Recommendation to the heritage and to the surrounding zone. We have written regulation for this heritage site.

Let’s start by a few pictures. Bordeaux has 2,000 years of history. There was a port, port of the moon, in the eighteenth century, which was one of the largest in France. There is also a layering of different historical and culture layers, the first port dates back to the tenth century. Then, in the 18th century on the left bank of the Garonne River, a port was constructed. During the Second World War there were several bombs that exploded in Bordeaux which changed the landscape.

In the 1990s, in 1995, the situation in some parts of the city was already catastrophic. The buildings deteriorated and the result of that was the urban landscape that you can see on the picture, on the photo, which luckily enough is not the situation today. So there was heavy car traffic, there were many cars parked in public spaces, which was not very agreeable. In 1995, there was a huge urban project launched by the town hall, and it was an important project.

We have implemented an important system of public transportation, mainly by means of tramways. So it is the same as we have seen in Prague’s example, we have tried to put the car traffic out of the city centre. At the east, there are also some social buildings that had impact on the city landscape. As you can see, the changes between the two photos, there are new green spaces in the city. Here you can see the map of tramways, which connect the city centre to the outer periphery. Thanks to this new transportation system, people are reconsidering going by car into the city centre. Here you can see a photo that was recently taken. You can see that in the historic centre, the historic buildings are residential as well as commercial. Here you can see the two photos side-by-side. You can see that the car traffic has been removed from the city centre and the public spaces were freed, thanks to the tramway system. We also have contracted a company for the lighting of the monuments. The plan addressed also public spaces, green spaces, institutions and more.

In 2007, Bordeaux was listed on the World Heritage List, that was a nice compensation for the effort that has been made. Here you can see the perimeter of the inscribed area: the whole historic centre that is marked by the red line on the map. This part of the city is marked as a national monument on the national level, on the French level. The city plan includes an even larger perimeter that goes well beyond the historical centre. We have also taken the debates on urban heritage one step further and we have organised a biennial on architecture and urbanism. In French we have two different words, we have heritage – patrimoines, which means everything that we have at our disposal, not necessarily historical.

One of the slogans that was created during these debates was that there is no heritage without a shared history. During the reflection and discussions with the city of Porto, which solicited Bordeaux’s advice, we created this thought map. The objective was to mobilise all the interested parties whose action can have some impacts on urban heritage even without realising it. This new instrument is a part of the urban management. It says that we have built-in and non-built-in fabric in the cities and that is the basis for development, for conservation and for preservation.
We have carried out large-scale studies on history and geography, taking into consideration anthropological aspects. This allowed us to organise debates in different neighbourhoods, which has an added value for the inhabitants, for the everyday life. Now they know different interpretations, not only the technical one. We have also collaborated with experts.

The urban plan, which tries to develop the city while respecting its DNA, is a collaborative cartography between different services of the town hall. The goal is to mobilise different experts from different fields, to make them talk together, to make them discuss different possible outcomes. Unlike Lyon, we do not have a perimeter that is isolated, but we have 750 hectares that cover the oldest part of the city as well as the parts from the 18th and 19th century. Thanks to cartographic documents and aerial photos, we identified very precisely, for instance, this building, which is of interest, so should not be torn down. We wanted to prolong its life, we wanted to adapt it. We can also identify buildings that are not of any particular interest and can be torn down, can be rebuilt, and we also can, thanks to this procedure, identify its possible height. On the plan, as you can see, we also have green spaces. Here you see an aerial photo that was taken quite recently. There was a new project in this place and you can see how the new building fits in the built-in environment while respecting the height limit for the neighbourhood. Therefore, it is a tailored solution.

Thank you very much for your attention. If you have any questions, please ask. Once again, thanks to the Prague team for this opportunity. Thank you.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you. Thank you very much, merci beaucoup. That was Anne-Laure Moniot from Bordeaux with the presentation titled “Bordeaux: Port of the Moon”. We continue to the last case study, from Porto. Welcome to CAMP.
Good morning, my name is José Sequeira. I will be presenting first. I represent Porto Vivo, a municipal company where I am responsible for the affordable housing programme. First of all, thank you for the invitation addressed to the City of Porto and thanks to UNESCO, to the team of the World Heritage Cities Programme and the team of the City of Prague. Congratulations for your organisation of this event and compliments to my fellow speakers.

In our presentation, we will start by presenting some data from the city and the historic city centre, regarding population and the state of conservation of the buildings. We will connect this [data] with the affordable housing programme that started in 2020, and we will look also at our mobility and transportation plan. This will be connected with the presentation by my colleague Ana Leite Pereira.

Porto, as many of you know, is the capital city of the Portuguese northern region. It is the second most important city in the country. In spite of its historic relevance, with more than two thousand years of history and the fact that it still is a major business hub, the city lost almost one hundred thousand inhabitants in three decades between 1981 and 2011, along with a decrease in the elderly population. This is data from the census of 2011. This year is another census years, so we will have an update of this data during this year. Porto is one of the coastal cities that in fact lost population, which is a reverse trend when we see an increase in the population living on the coastal line of Portugal.

The historic city centre of Porto is a territory of five square kilometres, which was proclaimed a UNESCO World Heritage site back in 1996. In the city centre, we find many derelict and ragged buildings in need of repairs, as it is also the case in the east side of the city.
In this map, from a survey dating back to 2019, we can see the housing units in the city centre, in red those that need repairs. 74% of the municipal housing is located in the historic city centre, which is run by Domus Social, the municipal cabinet that manages social housing, and by Porto Vivo. Porto Vivo is a municipal company that is responsible for the affordable housing programme. This is a strategic area of development in the city.

By affordable housing, the UN clarifies that it is housing that a household can pay for, so while still having money left over for other necessities like food, transportation and healthcare. That means that what is considered affordable depends on a household’s income. The graphs show that housing prices increased faster than overall inflation rate since 1996 in OECD countries, alongside with healthcare. In Portugal, 28% of the population with rents at market price present housing expenses of over 40% of the value of disposal income. The median value of rents in Porto increased 32% between the period of 2017 and 2020. We still need to unveil the impact of the pandemic in the renting market, but recent data suggests that the prices did not drop as one could have expected.

As previously referred, Porto Vivo is a municipal company that started in 2004, first with responsibilities and powers of coordination and management of urban rehabilitation. It recently gained responsibilities over the programme of affordable housing. This programme includes actions over municipal properties that are being converted to affordable housing, addressing the necessities of the middle class. In order to scale up, it is also looking at private properties that can be rented by the municipality in order to be sub-rented to the middle-income families with at least 20% discount. This is the programme “Porto con Sentido”.

We have to say that, first of all, the rent market is not really developed in the country and has no tradition. More than 70% of families in the country own their house, while renting a home did not represent much of the market, though this trend is changing now. “Porto con Sentido” is the name of the programme by which the municipality rents private houses to rent back to families with lower rents. In order to attract homeowners, there are benefits, like the total exemption of taxes over property income in the case of 5-year contracts, and the exemption of municipal property tax. Rents can be anticipated up to two years and there is the possibility of renting homes needing repairs if the works are completed within one year. We are also preparing a new tender for buildings that need structural works that can last up to three years. We make an agreement to rent the home when they are completed, which gives a strong compromise to the investor and to the property owner.

That is it from my side. Maybe I can develop more these ideas further into the debate. I give the floor now to my colleague, Ana Leite Pereira. Thank you.

Ana Leite Pereira
Hello. Thank you for the opportunity. I will talk a little bit about mobility and accessibility.

First we have to know the territory. The historic centre of Porto was built on top of the hill, allowing control of the riverbanks and the lands around the city, as you can see here. Then they extended through the medieval wall, to the other parts of the city. Due to this irregular territory, the buildings took organic forms with a disorderly appearance, very close to each other. This resulted in a very narrow road network typical of medieval cities. The absence of significant transformation in the landscape leads to a set of sloped streets that represents
a negative factor for the pedestrians. In fact, there are areas where car circulation is not allowed and you can only access by stairs, as you can see in these examples. This is not the only issue that we have to solve unfortunately: we have a lack of parking for residents, the use of public space, the intervention on the Luis Bridge, the decrease of car circulation in the historic centre... The vision for the mobility focuses on increasing the offer of space dedicated to the pedestrians and soft modes [of transportation], increasing and improving the offer of public transport, without forgetting the parking management policy.

With a reduced capacity in most arteries, action will be taken to favour the increase of space for pedestrians and soft modes, and reducing the appropriation of space by cars. One of the strategies was to create conditional car access zones. In order to improve mobility and accessibility, some streets will be rehabilitated to become pedestrian, enhancing the value of the public space and local commerce.

Another way to promote comfort and continuity of pedestrian paths are the reinforcements of assisted pedestrian connections with mechanical infrastructure such as mechanical stairs and elevators. These infrastructures will help to overcome the problem of mobility and improve the sustainability too. Another action was the creation of temporary pedestrian zones that helped to retain social distance between people during in this pandemic crisis. For now, they are only active on weekends.

Soft modes of transportation like bicycles and scooters are increasing, an option of transport particularly preferred by the younger generation. It is important to reinforce the cycle paths, establishing a network of routes equivalent to other modes. In the historic centre, a bicycle- and scooter-sharing service was recently created to promote this type of eco-friendly transport.
Another project is the rehabilitation of a disabled railway branch. It will allow this part of the city to be reconnected to the western part, where its largest railway station is located and where the municipality is derelict at this moment. This project will provide a green line to the line of the river.

Public transportation is a priority. Today, the offer of public transport in this area is very affected by congestion of the car traffic. In the historic centre we have different types of transport. For example, we have a public bus line, the train line, the tram line, and the railway cable that allows the connection between the higher and lower levels of the city. The extension of the metro line will create better conditions for the mobility and reduce the carbon footprint of course. Currently, tourist buses are subject to specific regulations, limiting their passage within the historic centre and allowing these buses to park in pre-defined locations. It is also important to mention the strategic connection between Porto and the Gaia bridge. We are studying at the moment the actions to take care for reduce the road pressure in these points here. Improved accessibility and the connection between different types of transport is a priority. Minimising the carbon footprint is a goal. The public bus transport network is acquiring a new eco-friendly bus.

Parking, as you can see in these photos, is a big problem in the city. The historic centre of Porto has a diversified offer of surface and underground car parks. Even so, it is unable to respond to current needs, and it is necessary to allocate a larger parking quota for residents and reduce the access to temporary parking.

I finish the presentation, and once again, thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Jiří Jaroš
Well, thank you both, thank you very much. So these were case studies of Lyon, Bordeaux and Porto and now we can move on to our discussion. You will be able to ask questions in our chat.
Panel discussion

Jiří Jaroš
Now I welcome Rozálie Kašparová, an architect from IPR, my colleague. She will help the discussion. She will be here for you and I will be in the backstage with your questions so she will be able to see every question here on her tablet. Please ask us a question, please use this opportunity. We will be really happy to answer them and all our speakers too.

Rozálie Kašparová
Welcome again... Thank you very much. I hope you are enjoying the morning. For me, the presentations were very inspiring and I personally have a lot of questions. Let me introduce three new panellists, apart from the speakers we have already heard. It is Elizabeth Vines, the conservation architect and urban designer and a partner at McDougall and Vines in Australia. Thank you very much for joining us from so far. I see it is night there.

Elizabeth Vines
It is nearly nine thirty at night, so quite late for me.

Rozálie Kašparová
OK, we will wish you a good night’s sleep after this programme for sure. Joseph King, an architect and urban planner, director of the partnership and communication ICCROM in Rome.

Joseph King
Thank you, thank you very much for inviting me to this very interesting series of presentations. Thank you.

Rozálie Kašparová

Russell Galt
Hello, thank you very much, I will just turn my video on in a minute. Thanks.

Rozálie Kašparová
Perfect, thank you very much. As we are already discussing, it is apparent that the society came to result that we need to preserve cultural heritage. Sometimes, the challenge is [to understand] what we need to preserve, the details of it, what the most important [elements are] and the basis of the cultural heritage. That is why we struggle sometimes to agree. I hope this discussion, and today in general, will also serve as a platform for us to solve [this question] and maybe open our eyes to new ideas.

It is our task as urban planners, to become a mediator in the discussion among the public and the current way of lifestyle (how we require cities to be built now and how we need to use them) and the professionals and conservationists that protect culture heritage.

Let me start with the new three guests: from your perspective or experiences, what have been the main challenges in [balancing] culture heritage [and] modern lifestyles? We have discussed today traffic, affordable housing, ecological issues when it comes to climate
change, or the micro-climate in our cities... What are the main challenges to tackle and that have been successfully [addressed] in some places?

Elizabeth Vines
I have been very impressed with what I have heard this morning, and I would like to compliment the level of detail that the planners for Lyon, Bordeaux and Porto. Really responding to Goal 11 of the SDGs, where you did talk about the city being sustainable and your emphasis on minimising the carbon footprint.

As an architect I am always interested in the success or otherwise of the insertion of new buildings. Philippe Lamy talked about new buildings needing to respect the identity of the district, but at the same time to encourage innovation, creativity and respect. I really enjoyed those words that he used. A huge challenge for us in Australia is this idea that architects should reflect the context in the design of their buildings and the examples that were shown, for example the one in Bordeaux that Anne-Laure Moniot showed, where a single-story building was demolished and a two-storey building was inserted... The key issue was about the colour, the materials and the height. I see that in all the cities that we have discussed, the challenges, but the strong position that has been held, on the urban context, and the issue about height. I have always thought that height is a key issue. I am from Adelaide in Australia, which is a historic city but in fact, sadly, it does not have a level of protection that World Heritage cities do, and our key issue is that it is development and jobs at any cost that runs...It is all about the economy and jobs, rather than taking a long-term picture about the kind of city that we want. So, for me a huge challenge is this issue about retaining heights, the existing character, retaining the existing identity but not stultifying development, showing developers that there is an alternative to intrusive development that destroys the context.

I feel very strongly about the SDGs, we have only got nine years until 2030, where 193 countries have signed up to try to achieve these goals. Particularly Porto discussed that, about minimising carbon footprints, the eco-friendly bus, the conflict between needing to provide parking and accessibility for residents, but I remember in Porto actually driving my hire car into an underground car park. There is always this conflict about car access and liveability of cities, and I see all of the cities that have been discussed really facing up to these problems.

I was intrigued about Prague on the evaluation of the towers. I was well aware about the issues, about conflict of high development and needing to really address that issue and all the regulation drawings showing the heights, the vistas, the panoramas are very impressive. I am learning a lot by the way that you are describing your problems.

One of the things I have not heard much discussion about has been the responses and the resilience around COVID. We have seen in Australia – I mean we are much better off now than Europe and we have come out the other end – but what we saw in COVID in cities like Melbourne and Sydney, which are big cities of four and five million people, cities being able to re-establish new cycling and pedestrian networks because people were staying at home. One of the challenges that cities now have is making sure we just do not go back to business as usual after this pandemic. Sadly, there are huge challenges and conflicts because now people feel less inclined to go via public transport because of the transfer of the virus. Where we saw cities emptied of cars, which was so refreshing and people riding bikes and walking, this is now coming back as people are using cars again and in some
cases being much more careful about public transport. I think that the virus has given new challenges for cities and as we open up again – and I wish you all well over there because I recognize that Europe, many parts of Europe have had a very difficult time – I really hope that we can learn some of the good lessons from what has happened with COVID. For example this meeting! You know, here we are! There is a hundred and twenty of us, chatting around the world in a way that we did not use to and it is so inclusive and so fantastic and I feel so privileged to be in on this conversation, so thank you for including me as a panellist. Now I will hand over for someone else.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you very much for a great introduction to the discussion and naming the hot topics of culture preservation. Joseph King, can also reflect on the biggest challenges and issues that are hard to connect with the culture heritage in a sustainable manner.

Joseph King
Thank you. Just to give a first comment on what Elizabeth just said: it is interesting, you talk about inserting new buildings into the urban environment and the whole process at UNESCO twenty years ago – not even ten years ago with the Historical Urban Landscape but twenty years ago with the Vienna Memorandum – was specifically to deal with: how do you insert new buildings into a historic environment successfully. Hopefully over the last twenty years we have learned a lot of lessons. I think there are some interesting ways of going forward on that based on what we have seen today.

If I have to think specifically about the challenges that we face, to me the biggest one in absolute is [involving people in decision-making processes]. We talk a lot about people-centred approaches to conservation now, and how to involve the public in these planning processes. I have seen a lot of really nice pictures and a lot of nice discussions of plans that have been made in these cities – and they are fantastic – but my question in all of that is, how have the people who are living there, working there, part of that environment, actually been involved in the decision-making? I have seen some really interesting things in relation to bicycles and pedestrians and urban transport and I think those are really valuable things... My question then becomes how these issues have been discussed and brought forward, in back-and-forth with the community. I want to be careful about that also, because there is no such thing as the community, one single community in a place. It is residents being brought into this process, business owners, people who have particular needs, older citizens or youth, men, women, different ethnicities, different ethnic groups in some places, some places are more homogeneous, some places are less homogeneous. So my question is how are those issues being dealt with in the plans that we have seen today? Because to me that is really one of the biggest challenges in most places.

The second one would be, moving away from the people side, the institutional side. Again I am interested to know what the cooperation has been between the various departments or administrations within a city or a region: how have the heritage people been talking to the transportation people, to the housing people, to the people that are responsible for the city services, removing trash, etc. I think that institutional back-and-forth is also an incredibly challenging area that we need to be looking at.

Then the third thing is – and I was really happy to see this with Lyon – the idea of the culture-nature and how can we link better together what is clearly important cultural heritage but how can we bring natural heritage values into it, let’s say, green spaces, care for the
natural environment, even within an urban environment... It may not be natural heritage in the sense of a World Heritage property, but nevertheless there is natural heritage associated with every single city that I know of. In Rome, the Tevere, the Tiber River, runs through the heart of Rome and is a natural resource. It has been changed considerably over the years by people but it is still a natural resource. Another big challenge that we have is pulling those issues together. I will stop there and I will be interested to hear what other people have to say about this. Thank you for the opportunity to listen to these presentations and to make these comments.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you, Joseph. You summed it up perfectly, the current approach to the heritage preservation and conservation; that it is not just about the physical status score, it is not just about the built-up environment and what colour and how high the buildings are. You basically said what we deal with in our Office of Public Space every day, discussions with the public participation and discussions with other institutions. We work closely with our heritage preservationists very closely, sometimes we agree, a lot of times we disagree, but that is all part of the discussion and why we are here. The last new speaker, Russell Galt, if you can reflect on what is been said and your biggest challenges.

Russell Galt
Thank you very much and hello everybody. My name is Russell, I work for IUCN, the International Union for Conservation of Nature. It is great to be here with you today. I have thoroughly enjoyed the discussion so far.

This discussion, this debate, is very timely. Across the world, cities reeling from the fallout of COVID-19 and the impacts probably have barely come to pass. We can expect the full fallout perhaps to arise at a later stage, but certainly it is changed the way that we view cities. Many cities that were previously regarded as bastions of affluence and perhaps bastions of resilience have appeared somewhat unfit for the future. I think it has revealed a lot of stark inequities in the distribution of urban nature across cities, and we can and must do better. The good news is that there is a much higher demand now across the public for green space, for nature and I think there is a recognition by politicians that indeed cities are not just concrete and steel but they must be very much living, breathing, functional ecosystems that are conducive to supporting both human and wildlife.

I want to just reflect on an article that has been published in the IUCN PARKS Journal. It is a review of how urban park managers have responded to the COVID-19 pandemic. It highlights a number of challenges that have arisen, but also opportunities, some of which were certainly reflected in this morning’s presentations. I just want to pay tribute to my colleagues Joe Hopkins and Greg Moore, the members of the World Commission on Protected Areas who have co-authored this paper. Essentially they found that, having interviewed urban park managers working in local governments across the world, that there has been an excessive demand for outdoors, parks and open space and that this has actually placed enormous pressure on the facilities during the breaks in the lock down, when people were allowed to venture into the parks. Many of the visitors were not used to visiting parks, so they were behaving in anti-social ways, dropping litter, starting fires and doing things that would not normally be done. The park managers had to re-pivot from primarily providing recreational and conservation services to actually dealing with people, to managing citizens. There are many great examples across the world captured in this particular paper that point to the innovative measures employed by park managers to respond.
A big concern for many park managers is the forecasted funding declines in budgets. We know that many local governments are still reeling economically from the fallout of COVID-19 and perhaps there is worse to come. It is absolutely critical that these parks are prioritised as critical public health infrastructure. We at IUCN are actively promoting this notion of access to nature being a fundamental human right, access to a clean, safe and wildlife-rich environment becoming a fundamental human right. If that were to be recognised in urban planning, we would see very different forms and patterns of urbanization emerge across the world.

I just want to congratulate all the speakers. I was very inspired today and I recognise the immense challenges that city officials face. I think the innovation, resourcefulness and tenacity that many of the speakers today have exercised is admirable. Thank you.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you very much. As you said, the management of public spaces in general and parks are challenges everywhere. I can see that it really differs from city to city, how much funding goes new projects, parks and squares, and how much money actually goes to the sustaining what we already have and managing it well and in the way it serves the community and the people, not just the physical manner. Thank you, thank you for adding this to the package of the crucial issues. I now would like to give the word to the people in our panel.

Anne-Laure Moniot
I would to respond to what Joseph King has just said about the challenges that we are facing as well in Bordeaux. First of all, the engagement of the public. As for the regulation of the plots, mostly the owners are private owners, and we had to invest a lot of effort into communicating with these owners. It also involved students and young professionals. We called for ideas in 2006. The question was how to develop the typical small houses we have in Bordeaux called échoppes. These houses have usually a small garden in the back and they are part of the soul of Bordeaux. We received eighty responses and we selected among these some solutions suggested by architects that preserved the quality of the architecture while respecting the needs of the owner. The historical documentation showed that traditionally, there were transformations on the ground floor, introducing big glass windows for different purposes and also some transformations of the roof.

We have used the ideas that we have received from architects and now we have a new city council with a strategy focusing on the mitigation of climate change, including the permeability of the ground. This is related to the environmental aspect and the heritage, because heritage includes the buildings and the surrounding spaces. There is always this question. Some people agree that nature and architecture can co-exist but then there are some people who are more radical, who do not want trees in public spaces because the tree would hide the façade of a building.

I think we have to take into account the particularities of each situation and of the context. You have also mentioned another challenge which is close to my heart. It is a project that is our priority, which is how to engage the different stakeholders, the different services. At the beginning of our efforts, we realised that we need a common vocabulary. The stakeholders often have different mother tongues and there is a problem of translation, and often even if they have the same mother tongue, people of different professions and specializations do not understand each other, they do not necessarily have the same terms and words and then you have the public, who uses simpler words. We have organised a big meeting to
melt the ice and to find this common vocabulary, we have put all the stakeholders together progressively. It is true that it is not easy at all because we need this shared culture. Thank you.

**Rozálie Kašparová**
Thank you, thank you very much. The common vocabulary, it is also perfect how to sum up a lot of the problems I think we have with city development and not just when it comes to cultural heritage. We as architects can be sometimes weird and prudish about how we say things. We also discussed that at IPR we would put on the website actually a “vocabulary” of what we are talking about, what we mean by the words, what we mean and maybe help us to develop some new, more, or actually old ones, some more normal ones.

A quick comment on the trees versus the façades in the historical centre. We saw in the Bordeaux square that you added three new trees in the old parking lot, that is actually a very common Prague thing that we have also beautiful squares filled with cars serving as parking lots and then we want to revitalise them, we discuss how many trees and if any there should be. How was it in the Bordeaux, particularly this thing, thank you.

**Anne-Laure Moniot**
On these small urban squares, as soon as it was possible we have added some trees and often it is difficult. I am in favour of three-dimensional urbanism because it is not just about just planting trees, we need to know what is underground, under the ground, because there are many things hidden in the ground that we need, different networks. That is another question, that was just a parentheses.

We have introduced trees on these small squares and now we have a programme called Let’s Plant a Million Trees. We have a working group from this project. It is a specific ambitious plan. One of my colleagues who is in charge of this is a person who encourages us not to buy small trees, young trees, but to collect trees, if there is a tree that has to be removed, let’s take it and plant it somewhere where it is needed, and I think it is amazing that we have a colleague who can do something like that and suggest it.

**Rozálie Kašparová**
That is true, the question is how the tree can be moved and established in the new environment, that is always the question discussed with the landscape architects. We also have the programme of the one million trees... We see the cities are very similar.

Let’s just go to the questions. Jan Jehlík is asking, he is a professor at the school of architecture in Prague, if you have any bad examples, when it did not turn out well, when you were not satisfied and maybe why and what were the issues. If anybody from the panel could comment on any projects that you were not, in the end, pleased with that much when it comes to the cultural heritage of course.

**Elizabeth Vines**
I can get back to my comment about letting go of constraints about the height and making sure that equity in the city in relation to land value is addressed during the process. In Australia, a different context to Europe, there is emphasis on economic development, which is not sustainable, on the demolition of buildings and rebuilding at higher levels. However, once you let go your framework about height, you have lost it for good. We did that four years ago in our city and you just cannot reclaim it back again.
I was very interested in Prague attempting to do that, there seem to be some areas where you are boldly saying, “No, we are going to reduce the height limit back down to a more contextual height,” and I had a question about whether there was an outcry about that proposal, which seems very recent, but I think is very admirable. I think where it goes badly for me, again as an architect, is that if you just give in to the pressure of the developers, who after all want to make profit on land, it is so hard to reclaim [building height regulations] and you lose the intrinsic character of your city.

Joseph King
One of the really bad examples – and this is an obvious one for people who know World Heritage – is Dresden, which was removed from the World Heritage List because of the decision to build the bridge in a very critical part of the river.

The issue there is that the decision was made before all of the discussion happened and before all of the potential consequences of doing that kind of development [were understood]. It was meant to be a transportation improvement, but in the end it was deemed to have an incredibly negative impact on the heritage values of that particular place. Part of the problem was that at the time that they did the referendum – and people voted for that bridge – I do not think all of the potential impacts of a project like that were explored, and so people did not really know completely what they were voting on.

The issue of development projects and actually doing impact assessments, something that the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre mentioned in her presentation: the idea of doing impact assessments actually really looking at the positive and the negative impacts of the development project on the historical urban landscape. It is really crucial to do that before decisions are made, while the projects are actually at their earlier planning phases, rather than waiting until it is too late, when the project is designed already and you are at the last stages of it and now suddenly you want to run in and do an impact assessment. If that impact assessment is not good, it is too late to change it. I think there is an example of what we need to be thinking about for the future.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you. The deputy mayor Petr Hlaváček wanted a word.

Petr Hlaváček
Thank you. I would also like to make a very short comment. I liked all the presentations very much. I like the approach of the City of Lyon, which in fact comprises the economy, historical heritage and transport issues all connected into one project or one issue. I would like to thank for the great opportunity to consult the topics which we are working with.

We adjusted our plan in such a way that it regulates more significantly the areas where today already some high-level buildings have been erected, so we are protecting the horizon of Prague, which is arising from the morphology of the landscape.

The Prague preservation zone covers a wider area. In the core Metropolitan Plan we have the basic height regulation, which is applied through the whole city and then we regulated with the detailed regulation regarding certain areas or spots which require the deeper regulation. Beyond this regulation, we are creating the more detailed documentation in the areas where a more significant construction project is to be developed. I would like to ask you as the experts whether you consider such an approach as the reasonable one or
whether you would propose us some other approach or other system, which will be even more beneficial for the city.

**Rozálie Kašparová**

Great question. Who is willing to answer, who has an opinion? On the grid scheme, we have the overall grid scheme which sets the heights in the city and then in the particular problematic or discussed areas we agreed on like one square by square on the perfect, the kind of “perfect number”. The height regulation is a big question. Any reflection on the system that we made up and if it is sustainable? Would you suggest anything?

**Elizabeth Vines**

I must say I did not really understand it because seeing your street grid was like this, but your other grid was like that, [they are not aligned, they have different patterns]. I cannot really comment on it because I do not really understand it, but what I do compliment you on grappling with is that planning cannot be generic across the city and that it has to be street by street and carefully analysed and I think what we are needing to fight against is a more generic code, a generalist approach to planning to make it quicker, simpler, easier and it never works, it has to be the specific neighbourhood by neighbourhood, street by street. I compliment you on the detail but I do not really understand it without having had it explained.

**Rozálie Kašparová**

I understand the system is quite hard to grasp in such a short time. Maybe if colleagues from the Metropolitan Office want to add something to that. Anyone who wants to comment on the height, maybe someone who knew the concept from before.

**Philippe Lamy**

I wanted to say that we have some type of morphological analyses thanks to which we tried to build the city of tomorrow. Sometimes we attempt to increase the density of this fabric. But we try to respect as much as possible what already exists. So respect the landscape which would fit in the world of today and with the life of today and of tomorrow.

Then, we have these high buildings, these towers, so buildings of some two hundred meters that have some fourteen, fifteen levels. We built these buildings in the part of the city that are meant to be reconverted, but in the historic areas, the regulation is very strict.

**Anne-Laure Moniot**

The question of the height is very dependent on local traditions. I am very impressed by what was said by the deputy mayor of Prague. Just to give you an example of Bordeaux. We have organised a dialogue group with the experts in heritage and with neighbourhood experts. We call this the local Committee UNESCO Bordeaux and it is really a space for dialogue, so those who are in charge of development can express their good reasons for [taking certain decisions]. They can express this to the experts on heritage and they too can explain their own good reasons and the goal is to preserve the outstanding universal value. The idea is that if someone wrote to the World Heritage Centre that there is a problem, we have to be able to justify why we have taken this architectural or urban decision. This is a debate that takes place as early as possible, at the start of the project or before the project, before any money is invested.
Rozálie Kašparová
To be clear, does this group of experts fit within the city, within the city hall or under the councillor for urban development or the mayor, or is it an institution like us, that is more expertise-wise but still works for the city? What is the power of decision of this group? Is it more a recommendation or a debate and then the decision is made by somebody else?

Anne-Laure Moniot
The task of the group is to give an opinion and to exchange opinions and it gives opinions to the mayor who has to sign the projects usually. It is a consultative value. The Committee is totally independent. It gives a written opinion which is handed over to the state service and there is a follow-up of the transformations in the city.

Rozálie Kašparová
How respected is the suggestion of this group? Does the politicians or the public actually is willing to go against that or the developer or is it mostly follow through?

Anne-Laure Moniot
In most cases, it is respected. Sometimes, there are new realities that come to the surface and there is a revision of the process, of the project. There is some new data or new realities. In general, it works very well.
As a tool, it has helped a lot in the process of urban development and heritage preservation. However, it has not always worked. In the buffer zone there was a football stadium, and next to it there was a sports centre, a swimming pool which could have been renovated. There was a tribune that was demolished, as we were not able to explain why this was not a good idea nor to convince the actors that there was a value to this tribune at the stadium. But there are victories, many victories on the other hand. For example, the installation of a waste water treatment plant on the bank of the river. The association of local experts and residents helps to contribute to the ongoing debate.

Rozálie Kašparová
It is always about the multi-professional discussion and getting all the professions needed in the urban planning and urban development to come through. Joseph, you were waving.

Joseph King
Just really quickly: two points. One, reacting to what you just said: it is important for us to collect good examples and not just bad examples. We have a tendency to forget good practice or successful examples and to focus on the bad. My first minor point is that we should work more toward collecting those [good examples] so that we can actually share them with others because what works in Bordeaux may also work in Lyon, with slight changes, or in Prague, Porto or anywhere else. I think it is worth it for us to [collect good examples].

The other point that I wanted to comment on are these processes starting even before the investment is made. I am not a developer, I am a conservation professional and I hope that my conservation friends do not hate me when I say this but every once in a while I think we have to put the hat on of the developer. You know, what does the developer want to do? A developer wants to invest money and get a return on investments. Before he puts his money into a project, he or she will decide “OK I can get a return on my investment of twenty percent or fifty percent or ten percent or whatever it is”, and then that will help them to make their decision: “do I invest in this or do I not invest in this?”. Sometimes, we come in a lot
later and all of a sudden we say “No, you cannot do this anymore”, so all of a sudden the investment is going down., for instance, from twenty percent to ten percent or five percent or nothing. I think we need to be as careful with that as possible. On the one hand, I agree with the first statement that Elizabeth Vine said, which is that you cannot set a blanket for the entire city. That I absolutely agree, it has to be street by street, it has to depend on the values that you are trying to conserve in different places within the city, on the one hand. On the other hand, we also have to put ourselves in the developer’s shoes and realise that they want at least a certain amount of certainty when they make their investment. These discussions have to happen as soon as they possibly can and not after it is too late and too much money has been put into the investment, in the development of the project and all those sorts of things. I just wanted to highlight those things because they came out to me quite clearly in the comments that have been made. Thank you.

Rozálie Kašparová  
Yeah, true, I can agree also that when on IPR the developers and investors come to us first just to discuss their aim to do something with a plot, it is usually much more successful, the result, and also the discussion actually flows better. We have all these plans and zoning plans and regulation plans and rules that we kind of want the public or the developers to use, but it still does not work without the discussion. We need to put the people from the different perspectives and fields together at one table and discuss what the plans actually mean in this particular place and space.

We have a good question here from Anna Vinklárková, Arnika... We have also just scratched the surface of the transformation areas in the bigger areas close to the city centre, for example. And she is asking: according to your experience from the project in your cities, what needs to be solved in these areas? We already heard some key issues: blue-green infrastructure, affordability, housing. How do you manage decision-making processes on such large development areas, let’s say fifty hectares, one hundred hectares, brownfields... How is the decision-making process in your cities, especially involving the point of view of the stakeholder of the “activist” or of the public?

Elizabeth Vines  
It is a very challenging issue. A key issue around cities and around large-scale development is leadership: leadership at the head of your local government and then the leader taking the advice from good professionals who know and understand about particularly urban design. I think this relates to the question that Vera has asked, from Prague, essentially about starchitecture. The two things are related because often you get leaders and visionaries who think that somewhere else has got their Gehry, and they need a Gehry building to put the city on the map. I think this can be problematic. It also sometimes shows lacking in confidence about what you have.

I am delighted in the last couple of days with the announcement of the Pritzker Prize winners this year. They are French architects whose mantra is never demolish. I have just looked them up because I had not actually heard of them and they seem to have a gentle touch. In one of the interviews, they were asked to design a new public square and they—with a big budget—and basically they came back and said what is needed is new gravel.

I think that we need to reassess this megalomaniac starchitecture in our cities and the question always becomes: who decides? Who decides on the master plan? How do you do master planning for these big interventions in your city? It is always inspired leadership sur-
rounded by good experts and having a confidence in understanding what makes your city unique. Let’s try and avoid this things of “we need to bring something in from somewhere else, an idea from somewhere else to make our city as good as somewhere else”. I think that shows a lack in confidence, and often less is more. Less is more.

Rozália Kašparová
When it comes to urban design, that is often the case, yes.

Elizabeth Vines
To get back to Russell, I am finding this with my despair about a lot of contemporary architecture – that actually if you hide it in green, if you plant the footpaths, if you put bike paths in front which have hedges and you distract the eye away from the very ordinary architecture, you can end up with still a very good city.

I think architects can be letting us down a lot, I am saying that against my profession. We tend to be just too focused on our own site and it is so important to be embracing the public realm and also to be making a monetary contribution to the public realm. If developers have benefited by the height and got some economic benefit, particularly in large-scale investments in cities, there should be a giving-back into the public realm. Often, that is done at a really micro level: bike paths, bike lock-up areas, seats, rubbish bins, trees... Get the private sector to develop and invest in those, and your city will be so much richer.

Russell Galt
If I may add a couple of comments to that, I very much agree with what is been said. However, I think there is this underlying tension between the need to radically transform and what the scientists are telling us we need to do if we want to address climate change in the next nine years, before we reach the irreversible tipping point. This has become very apparent in the preceding presentations: we need to transform rapidly.

We need to adapt to climate change, ideally infusing the built environment with nature to cool our cities, to reduce flood risk, to buffer storm surges, all those wonderful benefits that we can derive from nature in cities. On the other hand, we need to preserve the cultural heritage and the built environment. Often, these tensions manifest quite visibly in the city.

I am speaking today from the Dean Village in Edinburgh, another World Heritage city, and there is a bit of a debate about whether a fish ladder should be built on the water of the Leith, which is the river that meanders through the city. The fish ladder would be new and the weir, which currently prevents the fish from migrating upstream, is of course part of our heritage, so it would need to be reworked. There are also other debates, very much similar to what was described in Bordeaux. Local residents in the New Town of Edinburgh, which is a Georgian neighbourhood, opposed the planting of trees, because they think it will break the symmetry and elegance of the streets. And yet on the other hand, we allow Starbucks, and we allow cars, which were never there in Georgian times, so there is a little bit of contradiction in some of the arguments that are being spun.

This is a tension which I think can best be resolved with consultation, with communicating, or clearly communicating the ideas. Here in Edinburgh we are actually undergoing something of a facelift where, largely expedited by the COVID-19 pandemic and the need for safe spaces for people to get about the city while social distancing, the cycle lanes have been quite significantly expanded. The opposition that this has mustered is incredible:
there is fierce, vociferous opposition against even the expansion of cycle lanes. People are so entrenched in their ways. They insist on driving cars and having their parking access, which they have always enjoyed, even though of course we know all the harmful effects, the air pollution and the fact that cars and roads are subsidised from the public purse. I think that often just communicating clearly – and of course there is an onus on leadership, for the city to be able to explain the rationale behind many of these policies – can go a long way in allaying some of the opposition.

Philippe Lamy
We also have this problem, sometimes people even move to more ecological communities, which are usually situated on peripheries of our cities. What is important with this work on waste land is the analyses, it is also important to integrate these zones and these areas into existing cities and not to create something new, apart.

There was also the question of the height of buildings. I think that in, with the aim of stability and energy-efficiency, high towers are not the best solutions. There are better, more compact types of buildings that can ensure enough density and, at the same time, their energy efficiency is much better.

Rozálie Kašparová
Very good comment to the transformation. How do you deal then with the green-blue infrastructure which we can now consider the basis of the sustainable urban development, with connection to the urban heritage and topography?

Ana Leite Pereira
In the historic centre of Porto, the city is very dense. It is difficult to have green parks, but, in general, the new plan of the municipality gives lots of importance to green structures for the city. Specifically in the historic centre, we have the bank of the river, that we will work and give more space to pedestrians and work the green space there too. Besides that, we have a policy that increases the permeable area, encouraging the reactivate of the terrace, the background of the houses. In Porto, lots of them have precarious constructions. At this moment, we have tried to take off those constructions and make the terrain more permeable. In the scarp, you see all the landscape and see that a part of the river is a scarp, so this scarp will be green with cycle paths and we will have green corridors in the main arteries. In a zone of historic centre, we have some trains that are developed and we talk with the population and we agreed to make a public garden in this terrain. Some of this terrain is from the municipality, other is from the private owners. The municipality will acquire the private ones and make a garden, because effectively, the historic centre has a lack of green spaces and spaces for kids, for example. It is one of the points that the community complains.

Rozálie Kašparová
That is very common in Prague as well, probably in all the historical centres. One last question is from Dita Limová from the Ministry of Culture. I think it is really good one to test your presentations on the plans you showed us, so it is mostly focused on the speakers with the presentations. Can the plans that you showed us and the rules and regulations actually successfully hinder large-scale development projects, which do not respect the cultural heritage and the regulations. Are they not only successful in the positive motivation of the green infrastructure and describe how it should be done, but also actually cancel the projects, or really change the projects that are not according to the plan?
Elizabeth Vines
Well, I would just like to comment that detailed plans for your city should not be generic and they tend to try and make them more generic. We have just done that now in our city: we have thrown out our old neighbourhood plans to become much more generic and I think that when you lose the particular, you have less grounds on which to object to a development. Very detailed plans might seem a bit of a nightmare sometimes to get your approval, but at least there are lots of checks involved. When your plan has become much more generalised, you can then end up with development which is completely inappropriate. We end up in Australia in a fairly adversarial situation, where a developer comes in and if the local government refuses it, then it goes into a court process. The good court process will look with great detail at the plan and if the plan has these very particular analyses of what your character is, of what your height and density should be, you have got much more possibility of controlling the kind of development that you want.

I cannot speak for Porto or Lyon or the examples shown, but certainly from my experience in various cities, it really worries me when the old is thrown out for the sake of thinking that you need to become more contemporary and have a new plan and you lose a lot of the collective memory associated with what has been built up. I think in terms of controlling and wanting to make sure that the development is compatible, you need to have articulated what you want that to look like, and that – by necessity – needs to be a detailed plan.

Philippe Lamy
In Lyon, our urban document is primordial so we can modify it, usually there is one modification or one amendment per year and this is also followed by the public. The planning document is very detailed, very long. I can quote an example of moments where this regulation is kind of bypassed. It was the case of the prisons some years ago. The Ministry of Justice demolished a prison, which was part of the heritage and they just sold it to the person who offered the highest amount of money. There was actually a permission given for this demolition, but we managed to step into this process. Now there is a project that takes into account the historical continuity, and we managed to avoid the demolition in the end.

Anne-Laure Moniot
As for Bordeaux, we share the same principles of regulation for these projects. We try to define the project together with an architect for projects above a hundred and fifty hectares. We also check that this city from twenty-first century will complement the historical city, that there is another dimension that the project would bring.

There is a series of a huge urban projects near the port in Bordeaux, and it works very well. I remember that I was consulted by the city of Liverpool on this subject. Of course, these projects are not comparable to the developer projects which you were speaking about in other parts of the world. Because here maybe the approach is to be more authoritarian, Philippe, if I am not mistaken?

Philippe Lamy
Yes.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you. Petr Hlaváček wanted to comment on that.
Petr Hlaváček
Thank you for giving me the floor. I would like to add only that in this discussion we are discussing two layers, two different things. One is what is the practice today and then there is the level of the Metropolitan Plan, which will be adopted in two years’ period, because this is the deadline for us. In this Metropolitan Plan, as I mentioned, there is the certain basic level of height regulation and there will be some more detailed plans under it. The Metropolitan Plan also includes the green areas or the natural heritage places. They require more detailed analysis: we have to use the more analytical approach, to perform some zoning studies which will contain certain regulatory elements. The issue is that many of these land plots are in fact in the private hands and we are in fact interfering into their ownership rights but it is necessary to say that Prague is changing and the public discussions which we are striving to promote do not have the long-term tradition. That is why the majority of the development projects is communicated through the medium. It is necessary to realise that we have this Metropolitan Plan, which is the regulation tool, but its generation is the long-term matter. For me, what is important is that the path of the primary height regulation should be added with the more detailed one and it has to be based on detailed communication with the experts from various branches and various areas. Thank you.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you very much. I think that was a good sum-up to say that the Metropolitan Plan is the basis on which we build the more detailed plans that go into more analysis and the public opinion and the participation in the specific locations. It is a big challenge too, of course, a kind of plan detailed enough to be able to preserve the cultural heritage and still, and yet [allow] the kind of development that serves the community and includes the community. There is no cultural heritage to preserve when it is not serving and involving the community today. Thank you very much for the discussion, I think it was very fruitful, beyond my expectations.

Elizabeth Vines
I am not going to come back after the break because it will be 12:30 midnight for me and tomorrow I am up early because I am in fact the head juror on our architecture awards here in my city. I would very much like to hear about Lisbon and Naples and Krakow but that would by then be nearly 3:00 in the morning, so it is a little bit late. Thank you very much for including me in these discussions, it is been fantastic and I wish you will best for the rest of your discussion. Thank you.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you are much. Now I give the word back to Jirka.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you very much. Thank you, Roza and thank you all, participants in this discussion. It was very interesting and very deep insight into the problematic of Prague and our heritage. If you would like to share some messages or send messages to other participants you can use the chat. Thank you very much for the questions. Now it is time for a lunch break so you have two hours for relaxing. We will meet here again in 3 pm and we will continue with other case studies. There will be from Lisbon, Naples and Krakow and we will again have some interesting discussions. We will meet here again in two hours. So, if you have some questions, you can send them in the chat, but now I will wish you a few hours, a few hours of calm and relax. I am looking forward to meet you again. Thank you very much.
Jiří Jaroš
Welcome again. Welcome again to the second block of a two-day workshop called “Integrating Urban Heritage in Urban Planning Processes”. We are here in the Centre for Architecture and Metropolitan Planning, my name is Jiří Jaroš, I work here at IPR as a facilitator and moderator and I am involved in the participation process here in Prague. I will be here with my colleague Rozálie Kašparová, architect from IPR and a specialist on public space. She will be here during the discussions, so you will be able to ask her questions or send her questions and she will ask the participants of the discussion. We will start with case studies, first from Lisbon, second from Naples and third from Krakow. We will also see two videos. First is Lisbon, case study from Maria Ana Silva Dias, chief of division of municipal chamber of Lisbon and the topic is EU Rock Project: Marvila Local Identity. Please Mrs Dias, welcome to CAMP, I am giving you the word. Welcome.

Case Study IV LISBOA, Ana Silva Dias: EU Rock Project: MARVILA LOCAL IDENTITY – Territories of continuity / re-use of Culture Heritage

I wish to begin by saying thank you for the opportunity to give us for presenting this ROCK project. For us, it is a very significant project for a fantastic area in the city. It is a new approach to cultural heritage. Maybe, for us, it is a new way of planning. As we saw before, our presentation is a step back from the others because we are starting to rehabilitation this area. That is why it is so important for us to think of this new approach to cultural heritage. Before I start talking about the Lisbon ROCK area, it is important to share some guidelines of ROCK project.
ROCK project is a Horizon 2020 project with a focus on cultural heritage. Cultural heritage is the leading role of the project. It is most important to concern that these articulation with other topics. It is a new region of cultural heritage. It is a programme look more urgently at fundamental things around the cultural heritage. It is a project that understands the historic areas as dynamic areas, as living labs, where models of the urban revitalization start from the tangible and intangible heritage increasing a collective and citizen involvement. The ROCK project is a unique and powerful resignation and sensibility development but also economic growth starting from local essence of resource. The area of Lisbon ROCK, it is area between the city centre here, it is a concentrated area, and a new urban area, in the Parque das Nações. It is a completely new area. Between those there is a gap with a new territory. Not just for professional experts but also to involve local and public participation. It is very important because on one level we have the material, and on the other level we have the immaterial area. So it is important to connect both the material and immaterial heritage and that is why in this area, with this ROCK project, we start a living lab in the area.

The area is a small part of Lisbon with, as you can see, lots of buildings. Old buildings, most of them abandoned or reused, different reuse. It is an area that starts to become more living area, because the centre of the city is too expensive for the young people, so they just start to move to this area and to become a spontaneous way of changing. For the municipality, it is very important to feel this change, to feel the people that live there and to make like a “soft gentrification” with all the people, with the memories of the people who live there and with all the things that people want to have now, at the moment.

In this agenda, the ROCK project is ambitious. We would like to build a new part of the city, but building with people, with memories, with all the things that we think that is important for a new city. At the same time, it is very important to connect with the new and the old area of Lisbon because we have both. We have new areas and we have old areas and we have heritage, we have a lot of overlapping of cultural heritages with all the layers still there. As
we can see, the convents, the palaces, the industrial areas, and now the new areas. And this is also very important because Marvila, very near the city, the centre city, it has its own story, the values, all the things that became very important and different area. The river was one of the lines that connect the old city to the new city so it is important for the story of the Marvila. Those changes have become on the last century, they’re very recent changes of the territory. This was last century. And now we have a new area for people who live there and it is important because it is just changed. Although we have also the memories of the port as you can see. It is also the urban development was very quickly and as you can see the last century became very change a lot because it was religious convents and palaces and now have, like we can see here, now those palaces and farms were abandoned and occupied by families at the middle of the last century. Now, in the same area, in the same places have come new buildings. It is an opportunity to build something different. But we can never forget people were there. We have to organise this in an accessible way.

Also, we have these memories of agricultural activities, so we have a lot of places. It is very important because it is an urban place also with agricultural activities on last century and even now. People are also from the countryside, they want to live there at the same way. But it is an urban place so we have to keep these memories in a systematic way – and it is very important in our days – and but not forgetting those people. At the same time, we have factories that the last century were very busy factories and now we have change for creativity hub. As you can see it is a large area in the territory, so it is very important to keep it in change, because it was abandoned for years.
Step-by-step people came from the city centre to this area, Marvila, and start with restaurants, stores, art galleries, festivals, it was a spontaneous occupation of the space, of these empty places, that are important. And last but not least, one of the most important equipments in the place is a library. This library, it is where we start the ROCK project because it is where people come, it is a very important culture building and it is very important to the intangible and to the tangible heritage, so we start here with all this project and for us the most important question was is cultural heritage a physical and testimonial persistence of a territory? We believe so.

In this area, take place these memories that we keep about Marvila with all the people that lived and worked there for the last century. So we believe that with this recent context past that they had and with the fast different function that we will have, it is important to collect all these memories, to a better future, to keep the memory, to make a new territory and to analyse what is tangible and intangible. It is a new way of seeing how cultural heritage is important for a territory, and here it is so important and so present that we had to do this in the most fast way so we can have all the people here with the living lab trying to find identification of the territory, to find a way that they believe that could change the territory. That is a bottom-up process that is important. I am not saying that planning is not important – it is also important – but these people that live there, that fill the territory are also fundamental for the new planning or anything that we are going to do there. So we have got this bottom-up process with all the citizens and we have, at the library, the memories, the way they feel the territory, the way they want to participate, with the idea that this territory is going to change and they want to participate on this change.

We have some defined some points that are important in the area, like the urban voids, because we have a lot of empty places. With the ecological network, because agriculture is very important at the moment, we can do something with the green and ecological network. The territories of continuity mean that we have to connect with the rest of the city, with the city centre and the new parts of the city, because this was a gap. It cannot be, it is too close to the city centre not to be also a different point, a continuity of this area so we can, with local communities, try to not to have a very fast gentrification but the slowly gentrification because it will happen. So the idea is to be with the people and this process of gentrification.

Our goals and expectations for the future are ambitious. We want to be able to contribute for the development of the territory of course, for to understand and respect the territory identity. I think that is very important for the people who live there, for the people who are going to live there. And respect the cultural heritage of course, all these are overlapping of cultural heritage because it is very important, it is maybe unique place in Lisbon that we can see all this cultural heritage from the convents to the industrial areas. It is important to keep them all and to use it, to maintain the memories because with these memories we can build a new and better city. The ecological approach, I think, it is also important because we have empty outdoors/indoors areas. The reuse of empty historic buildings, like I said, with respect of cultural heritage. And of course to support and keep the contributions of the inhabitants. And creation of a new centrality, I think that is important because the city centre is so full with tourism and everything else, it is important to create a new centrality with the historic centre, a new historic centre. This access too between urban points, that cities are a continuous city, are an O, and that is important and did not happened before in Marvila.

ROCK, which stands for regeneration and optimization of cultural heritage in creative and knowledge cities is an Horizon 2020 European project that includes thirty-two partners and
thirteen countries. In Lisbon, the ROCK area covers the neighbourhood of Marvila and Beato, the former rural and industrial territory composed of multiple micro-neighbourhoods, which present complex geographic and social characteristics. Although the ROCK area stands near the historical city centre, public connections are rather limited, which adds difficulties to internal mobility and creates tangible and intangible barriers among communities. The implementation of local programmes for social housing have solved emerging problems and enhanced the quality of life. In parallel, important cultural heritage buildings such as old palaces and industrial buildings that have been abandoned are now in a fast process of rehabilitation by local and international investors, which risks to further increase the social barriers among people living in the ROCK area. In this context, and via ROCK project, the Lisbon municipality has invested in the creation of a living lab to approach cultural and urban issues by engaging local communities.

On that basis, two core topics were advanced. The first one, Urban Voids Ecological Networks, put several initiatives linking community participation, use of local heritage and innovation. The second one, focused on the local community’s identity, was conducted to the creation of the Marvila and Beato Interpretive Centre. Through a participative approach, in which the local community was called to intervene actively, the centre has been created at the Marvila’s library, aiming to gather knowledge about the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of this territory, making it available to the public in an appealing, playful and innovative way. In the creation of this interpretive centre, participative inventory methodology has been put in place. We have gathered in the organizing Committee residents from various districts of Marvila and Beato representatives of local institutions and associations, Lisbon municipality workers and researchers from the ICS University of Lisbon. These people, gathered in teams, surveyed the heritage elements of the territory, collected photographs, documents and films about their local heritage. They were also the ones who identified witnesses of the territory’s history, people whose memories are closely linked to local heritage of Marvila and Beato and those testimonials were generously shared with us. This collection of documents, images and more than two hundred testimony videos will be shared on the interactive equipment located at Marvila’s library and will be available online.

Thank you.

Jiří Jaroš

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your video and for your talk. That was Maria Ana Silva Dias from Lisbon. Next case study will be from Naples. I would like to welcome here Roberta Nicchia, municipality of Naples, coordinator of integrating urban development programmes and projects in the historical centre. Welcome here.
Good afternoon to everybody and thank you for inviting the city of Naples to this interesting initiative. My name is Roberta Nicchia, and I am an architect at the urban planning department of the city of Naples, as well as my colleague Irene Lettieri, who is also here with us.

I am currently working for a technical service whose mission is the [management] of the historical city centre, recognised in 1995 as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The criteria for this important acknowledgement were the influence exerted by the city on the rest of Europe ever since the antiquity and the fact that Naples is one of the most ancient cities in Europe and its contemporary urban fabric still preserves the elements of its long and eventful story. For example, the rectangular grid layout of the ancient Greek foundation town of Neapolis continues to provide the basic form for the present day urban fabric of the city, of the Historic Centre of Naples. Here you can see a plan of the contemporary city: with a red line is indicated the perimeter of the historic city that is the city built until the 19th century. In dark blue is indicated the area that has been recognised as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and in light blue its buffer zone.

With its almost 17 km², the historic city of Naples is [one of] the largest in Europe. Here you can see a comparison with other historic centres in Italy. Rome, for example, is the second largest with 15 km². If we consider both the core zone and the buffer zone, the surface of the area recognised as UNESCO World Heritage Site is almost 24 km², that is almost 23% of the whole surface of Naples. If we look at the demographic data, we see that almost 37% of the population of Naples lives in the UNESCO World Heritage site, that is 355,000 people. According to this data, the Historic Centre of Naples could be intended itself as a very densely populated medium-sized city.
If we look at data referring to the built heritage, we can see that there is a significant per-
cent of non-residential buildings. The historical centre is characterised by a wide range of
activities. We also notice a small but relevant number of abandoned or underused build-
ings. The large majority of the buildings was built before the 19th century. Moreover – and
this is an important point – it has been estimated that more than 40% of the buildings are in
a bad or very bad state of conservation. Naples’ historical centre is also full of monuments
of world significance.

According to 2019 data, the most significant increase in local economic activities was de-
tected in the tourism sector. Tourist presence has increased considerably if compared with
the previous year, but the historic centre is far from being a museum park for tourists. It is
still a very lively and vibrant city with all the problems that characterise the rest of the city.
We have already mentioned the high resident population density, the building congestion
and the bad conservation state of the historical [buildings], the lack of green areas. There
are also problems of waste collection and disposal, even if the situation has considerably
improved compared with the emergency state of eight years ago. There is a lot of private
car traffic. We also have the highest unemployment rates in Europe and this is one of the
causes for the widespread petty crime. At the same time, Camorra is still active with extor-
tion rackets and usury. While tourism has been an important factor of economic growth, on
the other hand the touristification of the historic centre is producing some negative effects
too, such as for example higher rentals for the resident population because of the increas-
ing bed-and-breakfast demand.

Here is a small scheme of the management system of the UNESCO World Heritage site.
The core of this system is a unit that was established last year by the administration. It is
specifically dedicated to the coordination and monitoring of the management plan of the
Historic City of Naples UNESCO World Heritage site. This unit coordinates the intervention of the different political counsellors and technical departments of the city of Naples, trying to overcome the still very sectoral organisation of the city administration. At the same time, this unit receives the inputs coming from the municipalities that are the decentralised articulation of the local administration on the territory. Furthermore, the unit involves the territorial stakeholders in participatory decision-making processes.

In 2011, the management plan was adopted by the city. It was intended as an integrated strategic plan that identifies key stakeholders, defines the general strategy, main axes of interventions, objectives and key projects for the enhancement of the UNESCO World Heritage site, as well as its governance structure as previously described. The operational methodology is based on three major points: conservation and protection of all the elements that define the historic centre as a World Heritage Site, activation of economic growth processes, and refunctionalisation of abandoned or underused areas and buildings. The aim is to improve the general liveability of the historical centre. What follows is a quick overview of the key interventions that the administration is developing in the historical centre.

The big project “Historic Centre of Naples: Enhancement of the UNESCO World Heritage site”, that we used to call more simply “UNESCO Big Project” is a project that has been financed with €100 million from the European Regional Development Fund. The intervention areas of this project have been indicated on the map with the colours of red and orange. As you can see, the Big UNESCO Project addresses exclusively the core of the historic centre, that is the ancient city, the Greek-Roman foundation town. The project consists of 27 interventions in total, 25 of which refer to monumental buildings, where the others are related to the redevelopment of the streets and other public spaces of the ancient town. Interventions on the monumental heritage are mainly related to the recovery and refuctionalisation of currently abandoned or underused monumental buildings and complexes for cultural, social and third-sector purposes. Some interventions are also aimed at the
re-opening and public use of urban archaeological sites. Other interventions of the Big UNESCO Project relate to the redevelopment of urban spaces, such as the streets and squares, that were in very bad state of maintenance; this was an important measure in view of the pedestrianisation of the historic centre of Naples.

Another typology of intervention addresses private residential buildings in the UNESCO World Heritage site, whose owners receive incentives and a facilitated access to credit in order to improve the state of conservation of the private built heritage of the historical centre. An important innovation is related to the mobility system, intended as a fundamental infrastructure for the redevelopment of the historical centre. You can see on the map in violet the areas of limited traffic, that is almost the whole ancient town, and the pedestrian areas in green. You can also see the new metro system realised to de-congest the ancient town from the car traffic. In yellow, you can see the new metro line. Each metro station was also an occasion for the redesign of the surrounding public space and spread art on the territory – in fact it is known as the metro of the art. Moreover, the excavations brought to light historical pre-existences and stratifications. For example, the Municipio metro station will also be an archaeological museum to show to the public the remains of the ancient Roman harbour.

Another typology of intervention is in the framework of the URBACT programme that I am currently coordinating. URBACT is the European territorial cooperation programme that aims to foster sustainable, integrated and participatory urban development in cities across Europe. In the framework of the project Second Chance - Waking Up Sleeping Giants, a network of European cities was working together on the topic of how to reactivate large abandoned building complexes. In Naples we focused on the Santissima Trinità delle Monache complex, a 17th century convent with a surface of 25,000 m². During the project, we co-designed with local inhabitants and stakeholders an integrated action plan for the reactivation of this historical building complex. The refunctionalisation and management of the complex also focuses on the urban regeneration of the historical neighbourhoods where it is located. An important point is also the active involvement of the local actors, not only in the core design of the reactivation strategy, but also in the management of the heritage asset itself. Here, in fact, an innovative public community governance model will be experimented in line with the Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, approved by the [Council of Europe] in 2005 and is better known as the Faro Convention.

In the framework of the URBinclusion project, the network of European cities worked together to combat poverty in deprived urban areas. In Naples, we focused on the historical area of Porta Capuana with the aim of implementing integrated urban actions to foster the empowerment of the local community by favouring the synergy between projects, actions and actors already active on the territory.

Finally, in the framework of the scenic State project, the city of Naples is transferring to other cities in Europe any innovative governance model that have been recognised as an URBACT good practice. This model consists in the collective management of essential urban facilities conceived as urban commons. In Naples, most of these urban commons are heritage buildings in the historical centre. The project aims at improving the public and community governance, with the idea that this will secure fair and open access to heritage, participatory decision-making, sustainability and preservation of heritage for the benefit of the future generations.
To sum up, let me share some final considerations related to the experience of the city of Naples in integrating urban heritage in urban planning processes. First of all, we can affirm that preserving the historical urban fabric with its tangible and intangible heritage is important, not only to protect its outstanding universal value, but also because the historical urban fabric can also be considered a fundamental asset for urban regeneration processes and for economic development. This has been particularly evident in our city in relation to the exponential increase in tourism in the last few years and the whole related economic sectors. On the other hand, we must be careful in avoiding mono-cultural local economies by favouring a more diverse urban environment in terms of economic activities, services and infrastructures first of all for the local inhabitants of course. We have seen for example the negative effects of the touristification of the historical city during the last year when the COVID pandemic stopped tourism and the local economy almost collapsed.

Moreover, reusing or recycling historical buildings and public spaces with new functions, in line with contemporary needs and expectations, is also an important strategy from an environmental point of view in order to avoid new constructions and soil consumption. This is a first choice in the case of Naples where the urban surface is almost saturated with buildings, but it could be intended as a strategy for all cities in line with the principles of reducing energy consumption and [mitigating] climate change.

The last consideration is related to the governance issue and it is about involving the local communities, not only in the decision-making processes, but also in the direct management of heritage assets. This in line with the already mentioned Faro Convention of 2005, that was ratified years by the Italian government. According to the Faro Convention, the inhabitants can get together into a “heritage community” with the aim of enhancing, for example, a specific historic building or complex or area, and then they can be involved by the local authorities in its management. In Naples, we are currently experimenting innovative public community governance models, with the idea that this is a key strategy to make local inhabitants more aware of the values of urban heritage and engage them in its preservation and enhancement. Thank you very much for your attention.
Case Study VI KRAKOW, Robert Piaskowski: Historic Centre of Krakow

Good afternoon, it is great to be in the same timing as my beloved Prague, beloved Naples, Lisboa, Lyon, Bordeaux and Porto. Thank you for having me here, it is great to speak about important issues amongst cities that are regarded as champions in urban landscape and heritage management.

First of all, I would like to ask, what we do in our town, it is about fostering the city as a museum or as a living habitat? The answer is really simple. I will show you a few examples of how we are trying to manage the complex environment around the heart of the historical city. A key question in the age of mass tourism but also in the world after, or with, COVID-19 is how to protect invaluable heritage assets, how to protect the social fabric of the city, how to ensure sustainable urban development, how to reconcile past and future, how to foster also this sense of belonging, sense of identity, which is an important issue for our towns.

Let me start with a few facts. In 1978, the historic centre of Krakow was inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List. The application was very simple: map of the historic centre, and one book with the story of the town. Since that time many new tools, documents have been developed. In 2016, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee adopted a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the historic centre of Krakow. The area covered by the inscription is approximately 150 hectares. Nowadays, it is less than 1% of the total city area. The three most important elements of the site are the old town with the main square, the royal hill with a cathedral, and Jewish Town Kazimierz.

This area of World Heritage is protected by legal conservation through entering both the urban layout and individual objects into the monument register. Items of lower value are included in the records of monuments. Since 1994, this area has also been covered by an
additional form of protection, named “monument of history”. A buffer zone was established around the area inscribed in the List and approved in 2010. It was largely established in the “monument of history” area. The zone coincides with the urban systems of 19th century Krakow and the former town of Podgórze, founded by Austrians in 18th century on the right bank of the Vistula River. It is important to imagine how important from this part of the Vistula boulevards are, the panoramic views on the city’s heart and royal hill. The buffer zone provides a wide range of protection possibilities with local acts, especially local zoning plans, cultural parks and management plans. The most important document, introducing the frame for the protection and heritage management is the “Old Town” local spatial development plan. This plan protects the city’s shape, skyline, panoramic views, architectural dominants, existing urban layout, with all of the residential, sacral and public buildings and functions, as well as scenic axes from different corners. The document introduces an archaeological conservation area around the settlement dating back to the Middle Ages. In order to prevent the depopulation of the historic centre, residential and service buildings were limited to the first two stories and basements. Parking lots, among others, were removed from the main squares of the city and parking spaces were reduced.

In recent years, Krakow has become one of the fastest growing cultural, academic and business centres, as well as an important tourism destination. We share with Prague the title of European Capital of Culture in the year 2000, since 2013 we are a UNESCO Creative City of Literature UNESCO. There are many milestones that make this place attractive for tourists. In 2019, before the pandemic, we reached 14,500,000 visitors – a lot for such a small town. Most of the tourists are coming for the heritage, for the ambiance, for the atmosphere of the city. However, monuments, historic landscape, and people, are an extremely fragile equation, as we know. Of course, being on top of the tourism ranks is a great success, we are very proud of being popular, but from the other hand, it has produced different problems. Prague, Budapest and Krakow has been ranked as world’s best stag party destinations, and all of this abuse of the public space is common in all of the historic spaces and towns I know. Noise, nudity, pub crawling, all those phenomena has been very problematic, as well as public promotion campaigns, artists playing with amplification, teddy bears and so on. Despite many attempts to stop this process, it is difficult to [do so]. It is difficult to live in such an area. On the market square of Krakow, the biggest medieval market square of Europe, we have less than six families. It shows the scale of the problem.

Regarding restoration and renovation, in 1978, in connection with inscription of the historic centre of Krakow in the World Heritage List, a special national fund for the restoration of national monuments in Krakow was established. It is attached to the budget of the chancellery of the president of the Republic of Poland: every year € 7 million are invested into revitalisation of the monuments of Krakow. All of the spendings by the municipality of Krakow, they [preserve] the historic part of our town and nation.

A set of actions aimed at slowing down the area of the Old Town are collected with the cultural park, adopted in 2010 to protect the existing monuments, layouts, all architectural forms, aesthetics, colour standards... We adopted specific guidelines for all of the aspects of this area, including illuminations, nature of events that are allowed, even the distribution of leaflets is prohibited, harassment, solicitation... Even for street artists, because we do not allow everyone to play in the historic area, they need to get special permission. Now, these Cultural Parks are growing after the success of the Cultural Park of Old Town, we established the Cultural Park of Jewish Town and soon the communist, centralist town of Nowa Huta. This is a very interesting case, a modernist contemporary town. The aim is
to protect the beauty of this architecture and to treat it as equally valuable as the historic centre. We also have regulations for transport: electric vehicles, Segways, scooters...

We have limited the number of events in historic areas. Before 2019, they were 157 days, with all of the preparations and settings, even 300 days on the market square. So, big mess and noise. Since 2019, only 20 events, of the highest quality and importance for the inhabitants, are allowed to be organised.

Inspired by Dubrovnik and Amsterdam, we developed a City Helpers team. At the very beginning, the plan was that they would deal with the pathological problems caused by tourism. Now, in the pandemic context, they will work more on engaging inhabitants, on the communication between tourists, residents and entrepreneurs. They will also protect tourists from dishonest traders, because this is another challenge.

In 2019, we established the Integrated Centre for the Management of Cultural Heritage in Krakow, dealing not only with all those regulations, but also running different programmes to support old professions, places with their important functions, bookstores, traditional craft, spaces with soul and traditions. This programme is extremely successful, especially for historical cinemas and bookshops. This centre is also financing different old trades contests, traditional nativity scenes contests, Easter trees contests, [activities related to] traditional craft, traditional functions, and also inspiring and continuing different traditional parades, different traditional feasts, intangible heritage in historic areas. Harmonisation and engaging all of the stakeholders, this is the main goal of the centre. Since we started to organise round tables gathering all stakeholders together, the improvement is really visible.

Another important issue is the connection between heritage and environment. After the
total ban on heating with coal and other solid fuels, the problem of smog of Krakow was solved immediately. The city is investing a lot in new green areas – 44 new parks are coming soon. [There is] a shielding programme for the poorest so they can heat their houses with electricity. Recently, Krakow was announced as one of the 10 greenest cities in the world, having 56 green areas in all of the metropolitan area.

Climate Quarter, a pilot programme in the Jewish district, is starting this year with all of the limited traffic zones. Roads will be changed into pedestrian and bicycle paths. A bicycle bridge over the Vistula River [will be established, as well as the] redevelopment of different squares and a return to market functions. Parking will be changed into squares with green and public functions. Sustainable transport – we are proud to have 250 buses, electric buses, in the town. [We are also carrying out the revitalisation of boulevards of Vistula River, an important place for inhabitants, where spend their free time as a popular sport area.

Recently, the city purchased an old university hospital district from the 18th century, 28 buildings. Now, we have a public consultation on the future function of this. It is just 500 metres from the World Heritage site, so it is important to keep this area in harmony with the centre. Krakow is a future-oriented city, so recently the city analysed the plan for a new business district, 9 km from the Old Town, that will be new city planned for 100 000 residents with even 50-story high-rise skyscrapers. Another challenge from the other side of the town in the place of a former steelwork factory, Nowa Huta, which is a very green area with beautiful lakes, there will be new city emerging. There is a new company developed by the city in 2014 investing into that abandoned area to regenerate this area soon.

To conclude, I wanted to stress that the problems of tomorrow cannot be solved with the tools of yesterday. Those tools should be tailored according to the situation, the specificity
of our towns and heritage should be recognised by the wider community and understood in the urban context. That will be the topic of the congress organised by the International Centre of Culture in June, to which you are all invited. The liveability of our cities, how to foster community engagement, will be topics in the OWHC Congress in ‘22 in Quebec City. The Organisation of World Heritage Cities is an organization presided by Krakow over the past 3 years. I wanted to promote this opportunity to exchange some good practices and learn from each other. Thank you very much.

Video presentation: Krakow
Cultural heritage. What is it really? Is it the arts and the architecture we are so keen to admire and enjoy feeling surrounded by? The many iconic buildings whose functions have evolved over centuries? Some are now monuments and were once home to people who lived happy or tragic or perfectly ordinary lives. The generations who built and redefined this city forever. Every time it came to one of history’s many uncharted crossroads and faced some unimaginably difficult choices.

What is cultural heritage? Is it the centuries of change and historical turmoil that have brought us where we are today? The trauma of past wars, invasions and conflicts that have left their indelible marks on who we choose and refuse to be and how we express ourselves creatively? Or is the energy of the people who have come here to stay, to live, to visit and revisit for generations? The collective story we all part of? The story we are proud to share with the world because that is who we are? Heritage is you. Your story.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you. That was Robert Piaskowski from Krakow. We have seen three case studies: Lisbon, Naples and Krakow. Every presentation was very insightful, I really enjoyed them.
Panel discussion

Jiří Jaroš
Now is time for discussion so we can move on to the topics of urban planning, urban processes, development in the context of these videos and these case studies. Here is Roza Kašparová, my colleague from IPR. Unfortunately, our director Ondřej Boháč is not able to join us due to health issues, we wish him well.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you, good afternoon. These presentations that were extremely inspiring for me. I would like to jump in and ask questions right away because I have a lot. The first one is for all of you, Ana, Roberta and Robert. You showed us examples of management plans and neighbourhood plans, urban design plans. I would really like to know, as an architect who works for IPR on the municipal side, who is doing these plans for you – do you do them in-house, as municipal architects, or do you do public procurements to find external architects? I think it is really valuable for us to see how to actually get this work done.

Maria Ana Silva Dias
In Lisbon we made the plans in the municipality. Master plan and some detailed plans in some areas. So everything is done internally.

Rozálie Kašparová
And how many people work on plans like these that you have shown, approximately?

Maria Ana Silva Dias
It is not exactly my area because I am an architect but I am in culture. We have a big team working on that. Culture is also inside of this team as it is very important for heritage. We are also involved in the planning for the master plan and some details, in the old city, normally. In Marvila too, because it is a different area but its heritage concept is important. We participated in a different way because, like I said, it is very important for the people who live there to participate. It started with that work, then with the planners and technical experts, we will make a plan inside of the master plan: an internal plan for Marvila and Beato.

Rozálie Kašparová
Thank you very much. So all in-house, that is interesting, in Prague we do not do that.

Robert Piaskowski
In Krakow, we have all of the department for urban planning in-house. It is very connected with architecture departments and the main architect of Krakow. All those three departments together with a conservation department are under [the authority of] the deputy mayor for sustainable development. However, the heritage department is under the cultural vice mayor, so it is not as integrated. It has a very flexible structure, more project-oriented. Our challenge is combining competences from different areas, discussing of the resolutions, results and so on. It works really well because we have noticed that the major challenge for the towns here is silo structure, that people do not know, working one municipality, what is the plan for some [other area] of the city. [It is important to] work together, even if some people they are not very oriented for urban planning - for instance, they are more about intangible heritage. It is important to mix perspectives all of the time. We try to have
always around the table representatives of civil society from different foundations and from universities. It is important because in Krakow we have 22 universities and three of them are very active in heritage issues, so we have a bank of ideas taken by university students or professors just to develop their diplomas on the topics important for the city. However, some of the plans are outsourced also, for example now we are working on the master plan for the World Heritage zone. It is surprising, but Krakow does not have this master plan. We would like to create this before the anniversary of the convention, which is in 2022. This project, in process, is outsourced, so completely outside of the municipality.

Roberta Nicchia
In the case of the city of Naples, when it comes to urban planning, the special plans are done internally within the administration. Special plans are internally developed by the urban planning department of the city. When it comes to urban regeneration issues, we have noticed in the past 10 years that there was a big problem of sectoral fragmentation of the interventions: the cultural plan or the socioeconomic plan of the city did not really go together with the urban special plan, for instance. Thinking about this, the administration established last year a special unit, which I presented: a unit especially dedicated to coordinate all the interventions in the different areas of the UNESCO World Heritage site and the Historical Centre of Naples. This unit should coordinate all the different plans, actions within the administration. We have been experimenting with this approach in the last years thanks to the URBACT programme. The URBACT programme is about developing integrated urban plans, so in this specific programme, we have already experimented this integrated approach within the administration. Then this approach was upscaled to the urban management plan of the UNESCO World Heritage site through this specific unit.

A different discussion is about urban projects, those projects that are architecture or engineering projects that have an impact on the neighbourhood: for example, the metro, the projects related to the metro stations, or the refunctionalisation of monumental buildings and complexes. In these specific cases, not urban plans or urban programmes, but specific projects, then the administration externalises these projects through public procurement procedures. At the moment, the administration does not do it internally, we do not have enough technicians within the administration to develop also this more executive part of planning.

Rozálie Kašparová
That does not surprise me at all, it actually surprised that all you can really internally create all these plans and management plans. Can you roughly estimate how many people are in these institutions? There is so many projects we are asked to do here on IPR and we just simply do not have enough people to even lead all these projects, even though we externally hire the team members.

Roberta Nicchia
I think that the urban planning department in Naples has almost 50 architects and engineers, but you have to think that we are divided in many different services, from the sewage system to the urban plans, so this not really so much for a city of 2 million inhabitants.

Rozálie Kašparová
Yes, that is not that much for sure. I really resonate with the sectoral fragmentation that you talked about because I think that is a big issue, especially with the bigger projects. When it
comes to even the World Heritage management plan or projects by the water. It is good to hear that you all try to put together as many professions together in the teams.

I would then also like to ask, how long did it take to actually see the results, when the management plan is approved? How long until it is visible in the streets in the quick wins? For example, [solving tourism issues] as you showed us Robert, but also prolonged changes, how long did it take for you to “clean” the historical centre?

Robert Piaskowski
It is a constant process because now we have almost 200 entities, which went on red due to COVID. This is an issue that we will deal again with of the transfer of the know-how knowledge that in historic, mono-functional spaces. This knowledge must be transmitted all of the time.

The visible success is after two years, this is when everyone really see the difference. We have all of the documentation, thousands of pictures before and after, it really shows an amazing process. Of course, this cultural park should be something which is evolving, because we have different challenges now. In the time when it has been developed, we had a problem with aesthetics and noise, now we have other challenges: how to keep “localhood”, how to avoid excessive clean-up, because if something is too clean, it attracts abuse also of the space. We consider the historic centre also as a laboratory for different experiments. For example, we put big pots with trees in the tourist area just to see how people will react, how they will relate to those little experiments. For example, in the Jewish Quarter, one of the traditional squares was closed for traffic. After protests, people discovered this wonderful green space, they can sit on the street.

It is also evolving and we need to get a system of monitoring. We have close collaboration with councillors, they are very active on the local level, activities with universities. There is really a young professional team at the Jagellonian University, they are great partners for everything, for instance, measuring the pressure of the tourism for specific park quarters of the town.

So two years is enough to see visible change, but to change minds it takes longer. People cannot think that regulations are like punishments or like “sheriff strategy”. They should share the same sense of the value of the historic areas. That is the most challenging issue to us, how to have the same story, how to share the same opinions about quality of the centre, how to work on the reputation of this space, how to bring back this space to the local communities. This is a longer process, much more difficult and we are just learning from our actions now.

Rozálie Kašparová
That leaves me to the question from Tomáš Drdácký, chairman of the [Prague] World Heritage site steering Committee: Which city department is responsible for the integrated management of the city centre and the cultural heritage in Krakow? What are the competences in relation to project approval in the legal processes. How does it collaborate with NGOs and inhabitants? Thank you very much.

Robert Piaskowski
Firstly, as a plenipotentiary of mayor for culture and heritage, I am a connector between all of the mayors and this issue. Going directly to your question, it is mainly the cultural
and heritage department of the city, because we have subsidies, grounds for communities, from NGOs. We distribute grants for restorations of monuments, for festivals, for conferences, congresses, so for all those soft tools to engage communities. This is an integrated centre, it is a concept, it is not a ready-made structure, it started from conferences, then from regular round tables and now it is a bunch of different specific projects which are most challenging for our town. For example, the issue of Segways and electric scooters, this is not an issue that can be solved by one department only. One department could manage the project asking all of the departments to provide data, to follow the timeline, to provide information. I do not want to say it is perfect, it is a struggle for territories also between departments, but it works. The most important challenge is the integration and communication between all of the departments of the municipality.

Many cities in Europe have town management offices. They are sometimes external to the towns themselves, it is a very British model. We are working on some ideas like this because, for example, the issue of “night mayor”, someone who is working on the nocturnal economy just to balance all of the side effects and harmful effects of the night economy. It cannot be solved through the police actions only or one department, it should be managed by some external bodies as well. This is what we are developing now. In some of the areas we have success, for example regulations on events. It is really impressive, because everyone wanted to have concert or festival on the market square. It is something in the minds that this is the most prestigious place, so to work with hundreds of organisers and then to select only twenty, that was a big thing. For Krakow, it is one of the biggest successes, because we have calmed down this space and it protects this space. Also, those events that are organised there, they have important value for local communities, they are not PR or television shows or sport events no more. Such things we develop in interdisciplinary team having representatives from different departments. The mayor of Krakow created special regulations so that all those representatives are officially in the round table, in that structure, and they can take decisions.

Rozálie Kašparová
That is very inspiring and a very holistic approach, I must say, it takes a lot of energy from a lot of people. I think that is how it just needs to be done if we want to have a sustainable holistic discussion.

There are more questions. To Ana from Joseph King. Firstly, he thanks you for the great, inspiring participation processes that you presented. The question is: was this a process that you had in mind beforehand and agreed with the population or did it come as you went along from the facts that you realised as you moved forward that?

Maria Ana Silva Dias
The library was very important for the area of Marvila. The population at the beginning did not want a library, they want something else, because it is a cultural equipment and they believed they do not need it, they need something else. It was very hard at the beginning. Then people realised that it is important to have this equipment there, so they start going to the library and telling the stories... In this area it is very common to have associations of people, because they want to sing or to dance, so there they were already associated and they knew already the stories. They just needed to have something from our side of the municipality to collect and to start to realise it is very important for the area for the future. So it was a process on two sides. One, because people wanted and because we want and we join it in the library, so the library was exactly that, the most important I think that we have done on the territory and from there, we start to collect and to know the population and
what they want and what they need and what is going to happen in the territory so it was on both sides. They wanted to share with us and we want to share with them. The stories.

**Rozálie Kašparová**

Thank you and another question from Joseph King to Roberta. The historic centre of Naples is only one of the four World Heritage sites in a very small geographic area. There is also the Vesuvius. Have you thought about looking at it as a larger part of this Historic Urban Landscape as a means of integrating approaches to conservation [to face] issues that may affect all of these places?

**Roberta Nicchia**

This is a very good suggestion for us because of course they are all very important World Heritage sites. I think that, as far as I know, there is no attempt to make a network of the UNESCO World Heritage sites in the Campania region. I think it is also because they have a very different nature. Caserta is the palace, a big, monumental heritage; Pompeii and Herculaneum are archaeological sites; Amalfi Coast is a cultural landscape... They have a very different nature, but I think that it could be interesting to make one management structure, for example, and also to understand how from the regional level they can build a network of UNESCO World Heritage sites, not only for management issues, but also for promotion of the sites. This is really a nice suggestion from your side, thank you.

**Rozálie Kašparová**

Yeah, I think a lot of people visit Naples and Vesuvius and the places around... So you [experience it] as a landscape, a cultural landscape, even though one is urban, one is nature. Last question, from Mr Kostas: How you would describe the level of the awareness among the population of your cities? Is it naturally in the population that they are taking care of the historical centres and they want to be it liveable as we have talked about, or is it something that we still need to work on and explain what is valuable, etc.? If so, how you do it?

**Roberta Nicchia**

In our experience in Naples, the governance issues is really at the base of everything. The awareness has been raised in the past years, so I think that the population is aware of living in a World Heritage site. I think also because of tourism, people are aware of that, not only for the UNESCO World Heritage label but also because people from outside come and recognise the value of the site.

I think that the problem is not about awareness raising but to give to the people the instruments to participate in decision-making and management. This is why we have been working in the last years on experimenting innovative public community management systems. This is a way to experiment how the local communities can join, can help the administration to co-manage these parts of the cultural heritage.

**Maria Ana Silva Dias**

From our side, local populations are very active. Sometimes, it is easier we have to change the plans because people go to the streets and they do not want to build something, they want the garden, for instance. Sometimes too much because when planning it is important, the opinion of the people, it is also important and to join both. It is very difficult sometimes but in Lisbon, we have always the population saying something, they have always something to say, so we have to work with them, it is necessary. They are very active.
Robert Piaskowski

[In Krakow it is] very, very intense. All of the investments, all of the green, great things the city’s developing are always under the consultation and discussions, especially on social media, so we need to be connected 24 hours, so you know very well how it works.

It is amazing to understand also that sometimes communities or activists, they are not against the local government. They are partners and sometimes local governments do not understand that. They think that the activists are inspired by some of the politicians, or lobby groups, when in fact those people like their neighbourhoods, they would like to protect their spaces. They are important partners on different levels. For example, we have got a very painful process, the city is investing into a new memory park of KL Plaszow, that was a Nazi labour camp, you may know from Spielberg’s list. The conflict around this space was incredible: developers, Jewish community, eco movements, councillors... It was an eight years process. But we have done it, it will be a nice case one day to present to all of you because it shows how important it is to speak to people. Otherwise it would not work. Even if the city imposes the investments, it is going straight like that and has all of the cards in the hand, it would not be success, because people will be against. People will feel deprived of something important and for people important was to keep that like it is, green space. They could walk with dogs or barbecue in the spring or summer. But it is a memory place and to speak to people about dissonant heritages is also another challenge.

Rozálie Kašparová

That is totally understandable. I think we have all learned past five ten years, however long the participation processes in your countries are being held, that architects and urban planners and all people involved in city development need to be actually very patient and have a lot of social and communication skills, and how to explain stuff. That is also what we talked about the vocabulary in the morning, having the common vocabulary. So I am glad that we agreed on this topic even with this culture heritage based workshop, because it is something that can be forgotten about when it is not just “what kind of park you want” and “what kind of functions and fountain you want in the square” but it is really... It should be in the core of the culture heritage preservation. I am glad that we discussed it.

Conclusions
Thank you very much of everybody for the discussion. We have one last presentation with conclusions we agreed here on IPR and together with UNESCO this afternoon. We would like to present that for one minute, and then we can have some reflection on that. We will ask for the final words of the political leadership and the governance, as we talked about it today, because that is the basis in the end of it all: when there is not good governance, we can do nothing.

The first one is to find a balance between heritage protection and urban development, cities need a wide range of planning tools that would enable them to address different types of challenges. That is just the basic that we all ran through today, different types, different scales of regulations and urban plans are the foundation of the agreement and the discussions that we can have then further.

Leadership and governance: successful urban planning needs political leadership and governance based on clearly articulated goals and priorities. No one can win it all, even though public space should definitely serve to all. This is a very interesting question for us every time we do any project in the public spaces and I think we have seen it today.

Discussion: starting years ago, continuing today. All the changes need to be thoroughly discussed with municipality representatives, experts and local communities. The sooner the discussions begin, the better. Establishing consensus on the strategy level at the beginning together with all stakeholders helps the further discussions. I think that before we can disagree on a lot of the details and we know we will, it is good to start with the basis that we actually agree on: what is the strategy, what is the vision, what is the goals of this project, plan, management plan, whatever. And then we can go further. Management plans that have been presented this afternoon need to be set up in order to protect both the cultural heritage and the quality of public space and life in historic cities. We cannot forget, it is not only about how the things look, but it is about what is happening in the physical spaces and how it is happening. I think the concerts in the big square in Krakow are very much a successful case.

Climate: climate change, improving blue-green infrastructure, reduction of car traffic are shared challenges of almost all cities today. In historic sites, those challenges are of even greater importance, but also more complicated, since protecting the existing historical and culture values cannot be diminished. Then the key issue is how to manage and put these together, working with the people. The open green spaces and nature must be part of the urban process and not only at the large-scale, landscape or parks surrounding cities.

The combination of plans is for us one of the key things that we will take from this day. We knew it even before the Metropolitan Plan, which is in its scale 1:10,000. It is crucial to work on more detailed plans that take into consideration the specifics and character of the locality or of the assignment in general. It does not always need to be a locality, it can be the management plan that is, for example, for a bigger neighbourhood.

The last one, share. Any new projects or development in the World Heritage Property must be put forward to the World Heritage Committee at the earliest to obtain their approval. Heritage Impact Assessments are essential for this.
What are the next challenges? We have discussed this briefly but I think it is all in the back of our heads, also because we are mostly all sitting at home today, that the COVID-19 pandemic represents a new challenge for cities. We will have to provide open safe spaces. We will also need to encourage people to use public transportation again and create walkable and bikeable cities.

Thank you very much for the very nice day, everybody. Have a nice day.

**Jyoti Hosagrahar**

Thank you, thank you very much. It is been a really rewarding session, morning and afternoon, the sessions have been very intense, very rich. Congratulations to all of the really wonderful initiatives that so many cities are taking. We are really delighted and I think it is really important, as Joe King said earlier, that we do gather and recognize good practices and take inspiration from each other and I think exchanging with each other and pointing out some of the things that are so important is really critical. I do not want to go one-by-one, to talk about each of the case studies because each of them highlighted different issues, but they also highlighted a lot of common issues faced by a historic cities, in terms of the development of the city, the management plan. So many of the points that have been raised, the involvement of the communities, the decision-making processes, the heights, materials, colours, functions, creating the balance between development and conservation, integrating green infrastructure into the cities and promoting sustainable transportation options.

There is a lot of learning that cities can do from each other. But the solutions in the end have to be place-specific to be useful and effective. As we just heard, we do have to look at different scales. We have to look at the large scale and the planning at that level, and then down to the more moderate scale, the middle scale you might say, of the neighbourhood and then closer still, looking at the specific street facade or on the visual integrity and so on of specific elements. Of course, the visual integrity is also at the very large scale if you have tall structures. All of these elements then become very really critical and we do have to develop more fine-grained plans at the neighbourhood level down to more detailed levels and regulations at more detailed levels.

I want to just take a moment to capture some of the many different points that were raised and many different examples that were shared. I want to take a minute to just focus on a couple of things. First of all, along with all of those conclusions of course I have to remind that the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape is extremely key and can be a very important guide, an approach that is very critical in this. The reason that I am reiterating this is because it is one of the very usual recommendations – or unusual aspects of heritage preservation – where we are not talking in isolation about heritage preservation. This is often the mistake because when we look at buildings, it is easy enough for us to isolate a building and talk about its physical aspects of preservation, different conservation techniques and so on. This does not work at the level of the city. A city is not a big monument: as you have shown through all the different actions that you are taking, it has to be approached very differently, which means the daily life of people, their needs, their aspirations, the mobility needs, the shopping needs, all of these things, the housing means, the affordable housing needs... All of these have to be an integral part of the way it is done. The management plan in the sense is not an isolated separate management plan, separate from the larger scale plan for the city master plan. And as Robert was saying earlier about Krakow, the fundamental challenge is to integrate the management plan into the larger
master plan – and this is really what Prague has been working towards. At the same time, the master plan often is kind of at a large scale, so we have to be able to take that large scale and work at the different scales that we talked about, the different attributes of urban heritage identity. The identity of historic cities is not just at the large scale or at the building’s scale, but at different scales, and to be able to identify all those of elements that need to be protected and then see how they can be worked into the larger development plan.

That is where the governance aspect becomes really key, because a lot of it is intersectoral, being able to ensure that when there is a project for creating a new garden or a new tall building or a new waterfront, that this decision-making process is part of the heritage management process, so the heritage, the OUV of the World Heritage site continues to be protected. If there is any potential of it having an impact, being close to the site or being within the site, then at the earliest this needs to be brought to the World Heritage Committee and an impact assessment has to be carried out so that, early-on, these adjustments can be made. If you wait until the very end to bring it to the Committee, or to notify the World Heritage Centre, then it becomes something that cannot be an integrated into positive action. It becomes more trying to have this kind of conflict and it does not need to be that way at all. I think that is the whole point of the HUL recommendation is that we do not end up having a conflict, but rather create a positive relationship between heritage conservation and urban development.

One can think of, as some of the great examples we saw of old buildings and public spaces, as having character, using the traditional architecture, the local identity, using local building materials and very detailed inventory. I think this was very key also and came across very clearly. And including all the people – heritage is something that is accessible to everybody, that everybody participates in, engaging with local people, and I think that this was very well put in saying that the people who are activists are not doing it against, they’re actually coming also from the same place of wanting to keep something meaningful but then trying to find a solution that works for the different interests. I think one of the things that the COV-ID situation has taught us is how much digital platforms can help access, make information more available for people so they can engage, so maybe this could be an opportunity. I think that the points raised by IUCN especially, but also by others, regarding the green and blue is a really key point about making the infrastructure green, making more mobility more based on biking and walking, reducing the car to the extent possible and looking also at making cities more climate smart or resilient because of the increasing sort of situation that are we are in where there is not only more extreme weather conditions, but we are seeing also this influx or increase of COVID and health issues so the issue of well-being and resilience is really front and centre now, so integrating our resilience and well-being of communities with heritage conservation. I think heritage conservation can be a very positive approach to seeing how the OUV can be very well conserved along with ensuring and as a way of ensuring that people are able to achieve their well-being goals.

With those points, I want to thank you all very much. I thank the City of Prague for this great collaboration and very valuable set of sessions today and I thank all the cities who have presented and all the cities who have participated. Thank you very much and to the experts, to the ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM experts, as well as Johans. We really thank you very much and I look forward to many more positive discussions. Thank you.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you very much for your words. Now is time for some words from Petr Hlaváček, First
Deputy Mayor of Prague. Mr Hlaváček, it is your time. Welcome back.

Petr Hlaváček
Thank you. I will be short because all the programme was very long and very intense. But I would like to thank all our colleagues from Lisbon to Krakow and I am looking forward to cooperating in future because it seems that we have established some friendships, some friendship relationships so have a nice rest of the day and thank you very much for the conclusions from the workshop.

Hana Třeštíková
Dear friends, thank you very much for today's inspiring programme. Among other things we have talked about how important it is to develop not only static plans like the land use plan and similar documentation, but also the system of governance and administration of the historical parts of cities and I am happy that at the end of the 2019 we approved the Management Plan for the Historic Centre of Prague, which was a result of long debates, hard debates, in which many institutions were involved, and I must say I respect all the hard work of all the institutions and stakeholders. Now there is a big challenge ahead of us how to revive, renew, restore the life in the centre of Prague after the pandemic because previously there was heavy tourism in the Prague centre which disappeared almost completely so we are now trying to make use of this break, of this interrupted tourism period to remove, to eliminate the Disneyland-isation of Prague starting with apartments that were used mainly by AirBnB. We want the local residents to come back, we want the small shops, small stores to come back, we want to renew the services for the Prague population and these are the challenges we are working on to strengthen the city so that it is liveable, so that the local communities can be created here and I could hear it from all the presenters, say, who said that the tourism declined considerably and we all share this experience and the negative aspects of this interruption of tourism. I hope that today's workshop will represent a new beginning for striving for new joint goals, for joining forces and becoming stronger after the crisis.

Let me thank everybody in UNESCO for cooperating on the preparations for the conference. Also I would like to extend my thanks to the presenters, to Jiří Jaroš and Rozálie Kašparová, they were excellent. I believe it was very difficult today, but they handled it perfectly and also I would like to thank to the department of monument conservation that is responsible for the area of monument conservation and who participated in the preparations of the workshop and mainly to our colleague Mrs Drápalová who also did a great job in the preparation. So thank you once again, let me to thank to all the participants for paying attention, for attending. As Petr Hlaváček has said, I believe this might be a new beginning of a long-standing friendship so thank you very much once again.

Jiří Jaroš
Thank you very much. Thank all for deciding to join this event and your will to participate in the future of Prague. Thank you again, thank you for inspiring presentations. We have spent a few intensive hours of sharing and discussing and that was very helpful for us. I hope we will meet again in life in our cities and we will be able to enjoy them as we usually do. Thank you very much. Enjoy this evening and I wish you the best. Good night.