

ICOMOS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES
CONSEJO INTERNACIONAL DE MONUMENTOS Y SITIOS
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ СОВЕТ ПО ВОПРОСАМ ПАМЯТНИКОВ И ДОСТОПРИМЕЧАТЕЛЬНЫХ МЕСТ

Our Ref. GB/EG/1468bis/IR

Charenton-le-Pont, 21 December 2023

H. E. Ms Kerstin Pürschel
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Germany to
UNESCO
9, rue Maspéro
Paris 75116

World Heritage List 2024

Moravian Church Settlements (Germany / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland / United States of America) – Interim report and additional information request

Dear Ambassador,

As prescribed by the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* and its Annex 6, the Advisory Bodies are requested to submit a short interim report for each nomination by 31 January 2024. We are therefore pleased to provide you with the relevant information outlining issues related to the evaluation procedure.

The ICOMOS technical evaluation mission to the “Moravian Church Settlements” was carried out by Mr. Nils Ahlberg (Sweden) between the end of July and beginning of August 2023. The mission expert highly appreciated the availabilities and support provided by the experts in your country for the organisation and implementation of the mission.

On 4 October 2023, an additional information letter was sent by ICOMOS to request further information regarding history and development, maps and plans showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone, the delineation of buffer zones, and legal protection. Please convey our thanks to all the officials and experts for the additional information you provided on 3 and 5 November 2023 and for their continued cooperation in this process.

At the end of November 2023, the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel evaluated the cultural and mixed properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List in 2024. The additional information provided by the States Parties, together with mission and desk review reports were carefully examined by the Panel members. This process will conclude in March 2024.

We thank you and your Delegation for your availability and your participation in the meeting held on 24 November 2023 with some representatives of the ICOMOS Panel. The exchanges during this meeting were of great help for the third part of the ICOMOS Panel meeting. During this last part of the meeting, the Panel has identified areas where it considers that further information is needed.

Therefore, we would be pleased if the States Parties could consider the following points:

Comparative analysis

ICOMOS acknowledges the comparative analysis provided in the nomination dossier and the annex on the Moravian Church settlements and Moravian Church missions' inventory, which gives a broad context and shows at the same time the extent and diversity of the phenomenon of the Moravian settlements. It

is clear from the comparative analysis that, in addition to the proposed extension comprising three settlements, there are other sites which comply with the parameters adopted and the criteria established for comparison but which, for various reasons, are not included in the current nomination.

Nevertheless, the proposed extension is presented as a complete ensemble illustrating, together with Christiansfeld, the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements in a comprehensive manner. At the same time, the States Parties mention that there might be additions to the nominated property in the future. ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could comment on this issue and provide additional information on potential future extension that would enrich the illustration of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements.

Description of the nominated property

Herrnhut, Bethlehem and Gracehill, the three nominated component parts, in combination with Christiansfeld, illustrate different facets and stages of development of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements, which is considered in the nomination dossier as part of the justification for inscription. The description of the colonisation process and spatial development of *“an unparalleled international network of ideal settlements planned and constructed by the Moravian Church in Europe and North America”* (nomination dossier, p.13) and the individual settlements within the network seem crucial to understand the phenomenon.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could provide a summary explaining the most important principles, motives, directions and developments of the Moravian settlements, in order to better understand the broader context of the individual nominated settlements. Additional information on the structure of the network and the links between the settlements within the proposed extension, and more widely with other settlements within the represented network, as well as information on typological groups, would provide a better understanding of this network, both historically and from a contemporary perspective.

“The continuation of Moravian Church activities and traditions” (nomination dossier, p.13) is recognised as one of the attributes supporting the value of the nominated component parts and of the nominated property as a whole. At the same time, it is claimed that *“[t]he continuing presence of Moravian Church communities in each settlement ties the historic structures to the ongoing life of the larger Moravian Church community”* (p.13). On page 15 of the nomination dossier there is a reference to “intangibles” but the information provided is limited. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive additional information on Moravian traditions present within the nominated property, especially those that are not directly related to the practice of religion by the communities in the nominated component parts, as well as a presentation on “distinct traditions” present in the three nominated component parts. Information on continuing practices and existing traditional craftsmen skills would also be of particular interest.

In addition, ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could consider to provide additional information on the heritage features mentioned below, to present a more complete and understandable picture of the historic Moravian Church Settlements:

- For Herrnhut:
 - Pilgerhaus built in 1864 for visiting missionaries;
 - Common Laundry House from 1788 (now called Alte Rolle).
- For Bethlehem:
 - Second Single Brethren’s House built in 1744;
 - Schnitz Haus erected in 1801 for cutting and drying apples;
 - Monocacy Creek, a tributary of the Lehigh River.

ICOMOS would also appreciate to receive information on other existing buildings or sites constituting Moravian heritage that are included within the boundaries of the nominated component parts or their respective buffer zones. Information on their protection and how they are included, or planned to be included in the presentation of Moravian heritage, would also be of interest.

Boundaries

ICOMOS notes that the partial character of the inventories and the lack of urban studies make it difficult to understand the layout of the nominated settlements, their development and, consequently, the proposed delineation of the boundaries, especially as they appear to have been conceived according to different approaches. ICOMOS would therefore welcome a brief explanation on the rationale underlying the delineation of the boundaries of the nominated component parts.

In addition, ICOMOS would also like to know whether the States Parties would consider some possible clarification or revision of the proposed boundaries to include all key elements of the historic spatial structure of the settlements, particularly:

- For Herrnhut:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could clarify the boundary delineation at the northwest end, around the Ethnographic Museum and its modern extension.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS notes that a different approach to the delineation of the boundaries was applied in the case of Bethlehem which, as it is understood, has its source in the national legal framework and requirements for World Heritage nominations. Nevertheless, as it has an impact on the integrity of the nominated component part, ICOMOS considers that the inclusion of the Second Single Brethren's House as well as the Schnitz House is crucial, and would like to ask the State Party to consider revising the proposed boundaries to include the mentioned buildings.

It is argued in the nomination dossier that topography had an impact on the location and layout of the settlement in Bethlehem. Therefore, it would also be important to include the Monocacy Creek as well as other buildings, gardens and functional areas located currently beyond the National Historic Landmark District boundaries which have an impact on the legibility of the history of the settlement (its presentation) and support the value, integrity and authenticity of the nominated component part.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could provide practical and functional justification for the delineation of the boundaries through existing buildings, as well as clarification regarding the boundary between the Moravian building cluster/complex and the God's Acre. This information would help to better understand the rationale behind it.

According to the historic maps provided with the additional information sent in November 2023, the green area adjoined to the God's Acre to the east seems to be part of it. ICOMOS would appreciate clarification in this respect.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider the possibility to extend the boundary of the nominated component part down to the River Maine, along the whole northern boundary or at least in front of the Central Square to include the area which form an important view along the central axis.

Protection of the settings and delineation of buffer zones

ICOMOS acknowledges the clarifications provided on the delineation of the buffer zones. In light of this information, changes to the proposed boundaries of the buffer zones would be advisable, as follow:

- For Herrnhut:

Taking into account the importance of the Berthelsdorf Manor complex and its historic and functional connection with the village of Berthelsdorf, ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could consider extending the buffer zone of this part of the nominated component part to the north as well as to the southeast and east.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider extending the proposed buffer zone to the south down to the Lehigh River, as well as the possibility to extend its west boundary further out.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider a small enlargement of the buffer zone to the west side of the south angle of the buffer zone, as well as the inclusion of the trees along the south side of Galgorm Road (northern boundary) and Nursery Road (south-eastern boundary), and to expand the southwest and north boundary further out.

ICOMOS would also be pleased if the States Parties could provide additional information on the mechanisms for planning and controlling changes in the settings of the nominated settlements, particularly in relation to important views and functional relationships within the landscape contexts.

ICOMOS would be grateful if the States Parties could provide a response about whether each of the above-mentioned suggestions of modifications to boundaries/buffer zones could be implemented. Please provide revised maps for all completed and planned revisions to the boundaries and buffer zones, including the timeline for completion if these processes are ongoing by the deadline established for ICOMOS to receive additional information.

Development projects

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS welcomes the information provided on the “Skyline West” development project. It would be helpful if the results of the Heritage Impact Assessment of this project could be provided for evaluation. Information on the mitigation measures proposed in case of negative impacts would also be of interest for ICOMOS.

- For Gracehill:

The Wrightbus factory is located in the immediate vicinity of the nominated component part and there is no designated buffer zone between it and the settlement established. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive the results of the Impact Assessment of the current and future impacts of the factory on the Moravian settlement of Gracehill.

State of conservation and conservation measures

ICOMOS considers that a conservation programme based on inventories and technical analyses which include built heritage, green areas and open fields shall be developed and implemented to ensure the preservation of the values of the nominated property, as well as its authenticity and integrity. It should encompass both the principal attributes as selected and described in the nomination dossier, as well as other key heritage features within the proposed boundaries. ICOMOS would appreciate if additional information on existing comprehensive conservation programmes and maintenance guidance developed for the nominated component parts could be provided. In case this is work in progress, information on a timeframe for their development and implementation would be welcome.

ICOMOS notes that cement mixture mortar and plastic paint were used. The replacement of windows, doors and other details by copies or new types is also apparent in all the nominated component parts. ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could comment on this aspect.

- For Herrnhut:

The Berthelsdorf Manor complex, its buildings, green spaces and open areas (public realm), have suffered from neglect for a long time and, in some cases, are still not in a good condition. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive detailed information on its current state of conservation, including inventory and technical assessment supported by a relevant conservation plan or programme. Similarly, a relevant conservation plan or programme would be appreciated for Vogtshof and the forest park behind the building.

Management

ICOMOS would appreciate to receive indications as regards the timeframe for the completion and adoption of the individual local management plans.

In addition, ICOMOS considers that the impacts of climate change need to be understood and sustainably managed. As such, ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could elaborate on how climate change will be managed in each of the nominated component parts.

We look forward to your responses to these points, which will be of great help in our evaluation procedure.

We would be grateful if you could provide **ICOMOS** and the **World Heritage Centre** with the above requested information by **28 February 2024 at the latest**, the deadline set out in paragraph 148 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* concerning additional information on nominations to be received. Please note that any information submitted after this statutory deadline will not be considered by ICOMOS in its evaluation for the World Heritage Committee. It should be noted, however, that while ICOMOS will carefully consider any additional information submitted within the statutory deadline, it will not be possible to properly evaluate a completely revised nomination or a large amount of new information submitted at the last minute. ICOMOS would therefore be grateful if the State Party could keep its response concise and respond only to the above requests.

We thank you for your support of the World Heritage Convention and the evaluation procedure.

Yours faithfully,



Gwenaëlle Bourdin
Director
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit

Copy to Saxon State Ministry of Regional Development
 Permanent Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
 to UNESCO
 U.K. Government, Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Cultural, Diplomacy
 Permanent Delegation of the United States of America to UNESCO
 Office of International Affairs United States National Park Service
 UNESCO World Heritage Centre

ICOMOS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES
CONSEJO INTERNACIONAL DE MONUMENTOS Y SITIOS
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ СОВЕТ ПО ВОПРОСАМ ПАМЯТНИКОВ И ДОСТОПРИМЕЧАТЕЛЬНЫХ МЕСТ

Our Ref. GB/EG/1468bis/IR

Charenton-le-Pont, 21 December 2023

H. E. Ms Anna Nsubuga
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of the United Kingdom
of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to
UNESCO
British Embassy
35 rue du Faubourg St Honoré Paris
75383 Paris Cedex 08

World Heritage List 2024

Moravian Church Settlements (Germany / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland / United States of America) – Interim report and additional information request

Dear Ambassador,

As prescribed by the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* and its Annex 6, the Advisory Bodies are requested to submit a short interim report for each nomination by 31 January 2024. We are therefore pleased to provide you with the relevant information outlining issues related to the evaluation procedure.

The ICOMOS technical evaluation mission to the “Moravian Church Settlements” was carried out by Mr. Nils Ahlberg (Sweden) between the end of July and beginning of August 2023. The mission expert highly appreciated the availabilities and support provided by the experts in your country for the organisation and implementation of the mission.

On 4 October 2023, an additional information letter was sent by ICOMOS to request further information regarding history and development, maps and plans showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone, the delineation of buffer zones, and legal protection. Please convey our thanks to all the officials and experts for the additional information you provided on 3 and 5 November 2023 and for their continued cooperation in this process.

At the end of November 2023, the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel evaluated the cultural and mixed properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List in 2024. The additional information provided by the States Parties, together with mission and desk review reports were carefully examined by the Panel members. This process will conclude in March 2024.

We thank you and your Delegation for your availability and your participation in the meeting held on 24 November 2023 with some representatives of the ICOMOS Panel. The exchanges during this meeting were of great help for the third part of the ICOMOS Panel meeting. During this last part of the meeting, the Panel has identified areas where it considers that further information is needed.

Therefore, we would be pleased if the States Parties could consider the following points:

Comparative analysis

ICOMOS acknowledges the comparative analysis provided in the nomination dossier and the annex on the Moravian Church settlements and Moravian Church missions' inventory, which gives a broad context

and shows at the same time the extent and diversity of the phenomenon of the Moravian settlements. It is clear from the comparative analysis that, in addition to the proposed extension comprising three settlements, there are other sites which comply with the parameters adopted and the criteria established for comparison but which, for various reasons, are not included in the current nomination.

Nevertheless, the proposed extension is presented as a complete ensemble illustrating, together with Christiansfeld, the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements in a comprehensive manner. At the same time, the States Parties mention that there might be additions to the nominated property in the future. ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could comment on this issue and provide additional information on potential future extension that would enrich the illustration of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements.

Description of the nominated property

Herrnhut, Bethlehem and Gracehill, the three nominated component parts, in combination with Christiansfeld, illustrate different facets and stages of development of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements, which is considered in the nomination dossier as part of the justification for inscription. The description of the colonisation process and spatial development of *“an unparalleled international network of ideal settlements planned and constructed by the Moravian Church in Europe and North America”* (nomination dossier, p.13) and the individual settlements within the network seem crucial to understand the phenomenon.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could provide a summary explaining the most important principles, motives, directions and developments of the Moravian settlements, in order to better understand the broader context of the individual nominated settlements. Additional information on the structure of the network and the links between the settlements within the proposed extension, and more widely with other settlements within the represented network, as well as information on typological groups, would provide a better understanding of this network, both historically and from a contemporary perspective.

“The continuation of Moravian Church activities and traditions” (nomination dossier, p.13) is recognised as one of the attributes supporting the value of the nominated component parts and of the nominated property as a whole. At the same time, it is claimed that *“[t]he continuing presence of Moravian Church communities in each settlement ties the historic structures to the ongoing life of the larger Moravian Church community”* (p.13). On page 15 of the nomination dossier there is a reference to “intangibles” but the information provided is limited. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive additional information on Moravian traditions present within the nominated property, especially those that are not directly related to the practice of religion by the communities in the nominated component parts, as well as a presentation on “distinct traditions” present in the three nominated component parts. Information on continuing practices and existing traditional craftsmen skills would also be of particular interest.

In addition, ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could consider to provide additional information on the heritage features mentioned below, to present a more complete and understandable picture of the historic Moravian Church Settlements:

- For Herrnhut:
 - Pilgerhaus built in 1864 for visiting missionaries;
 - Common Laundry House from 1788 (now called Alte Rolle).
- For Bethlehem:
 - Second Single Brethren’s House built in 1744;
 - Schnitz Haus erected in 1801 for cutting and drying apples;
 - Monocacy Creek, a tributary of the Lehigh River.

ICOMOS would also appreciate to receive information on other existing buildings or sites constituting Moravian heritage that are included within the boundaries of the nominated component parts or their respective buffer zones. Information on their protection and how they are included, or planned to be included in the presentation of Moravian heritage, would also be of interest.

Boundaries

ICOMOS notes that the partial character of the inventories and the lack of urban studies make it difficult to understand the layout of the nominated settlements, their development and, consequently, the proposed delineation of the boundaries, especially as they appear to have been conceived according to different approaches. ICOMOS would therefore welcome a brief explanation on the rationale underlying the delineation of the boundaries of the nominated component parts.

In addition, ICOMOS would also like to know whether the States Parties would consider some possible clarification or revision of the proposed boundaries to include all key elements of the historic spatial structure of the settlements, particularly:

- For Herrnhut:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could clarify the boundary delineation at the northwest end, around the Ethnographic Museum and its modern extension.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS notes that a different approach to the delineation of the boundaries was applied in the case of Bethlehem which, as it is understood, has its source in the national legal framework and requirements for World Heritage nominations. Nevertheless, as it has an impact on the integrity of the nominated component part, ICOMOS considers that the inclusion of the Second Single Brethren's House as well as the Schnitz House is crucial, and would like to ask the State Party to consider revising the proposed boundaries to include the mentioned buildings.

It is argued in the nomination dossier that topography had an impact on the location and layout of the settlement in Bethlehem. Therefore, it would also be important to include the Monocacy Creek as well as other buildings, gardens and functional areas located currently beyond the National Historic Landmark District boundaries which have an impact on the legibility of the history of the settlement (its presentation) and support the value, integrity and authenticity of the nominated component part.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could provide practical and functional justification for the delineation of the boundaries through existing buildings, as well as clarification regarding the boundary between the Moravian building cluster/complex and the God's Acre. This information would help to better understand the rationale behind it.

According to the historic maps provided with the additional information sent in November 2023, the green area adjoined to the God's Acre to the east seems to be part of it. ICOMOS would appreciate clarification in this respect.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider the possibility to extend the boundary of the nominated component part down to the River Maine, along the whole northern boundary or at least in front of the Central Square to include the area which form an important view along the central axis.

Protection of the settings and delineation of buffer zones

ICOMOS acknowledges the clarifications provided on the delineation of the buffer zones. In light of this information, changes to the proposed boundaries of the buffer zones would be advisable, as follow:

- For Herrnhut:

Taking into account the importance of the Berthelsdorf Manor complex and its historic and functional connection with the village of Berthelsdorf, ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could consider extending the buffer zone of this part of the nominated component part to the north as well as to the southeast and east.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider extending the proposed buffer zone to the south down to the Lehigh River, as well as the possibility to extend its west boundary further out.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider a small enlargement of the buffer zone to the west side of the south angle of the buffer zone, as well as the inclusion of the trees along the south side of Galgorm Road (northern boundary) and Nursery Road (south-eastern boundary), and to expand the southwest and north boundary further out.

ICOMOS would also be pleased if the States Parties could provide additional information on the mechanisms for planning and controlling changes in the settings of the nominated settlements, particularly in relation to important views and functional relationships within the landscape contexts.

ICOMOS would be grateful if the States Parties could provide a response about whether each of the above-mentioned suggestions of modifications to boundaries/buffer zones could be implemented. Please provide revised maps for all completed and planned revisions to the boundaries and buffer zones, including the timeline for completion if these processes are ongoing by the deadline established for ICOMOS to receive additional information.

Development projects

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS welcomes the information provided on the “Skyline West” development project. It would be helpful if the results of the Heritage Impact Assessment of this project could be provided for evaluation. Information on the mitigation measures proposed in case of negative impacts would also be of interest for ICOMOS.

- For Gracehill:

The Wrightbus factory is located in the immediate vicinity of the nominated component part and there is no designated buffer zone between it and the settlement established. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive the results of the Impact Assessment of the current and future impacts of the factory on the Moravian settlement of Gracehill.

State of conservation and conservation measures

ICOMOS considers that a conservation programme based on inventories and technical analyses which include built heritage, green areas and open fields shall be developed and implemented to ensure the preservation of the values of the nominated property, as well as its authenticity and integrity. It should encompass both the principal attributes as selected and described in the nomination dossier, as well as other key heritage features within the proposed boundaries. ICOMOS would appreciate if additional information on existing comprehensive conservation programmes and maintenance guidance developed for the nominated component parts could be provided. In case this is work in progress, information on a timeframe for their development and implementation would be welcome.

ICOMOS notes that cement mixture mortar and plastic paint were used. The replacement of windows, doors and other details by copies or new types is also apparent in all the nominated component parts. ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could comment on this aspect.

- For Herrnhut:

The Berthelsdorf Manor complex, its buildings, green spaces and open areas (public realm), have suffered from neglect for a long time and, in some cases, are still not in a good condition. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive detailed information on its current state of conservation, including inventory and technical assessment supported by a relevant conservation plan or programme. Similarly, a relevant conservation plan or programme would be appreciated for Vogtshof and the forest park behind the building.

Management

ICOMOS would appreciate to receive indications as regards the timeframe for the completion and adoption of the individual local management plans.

In addition, ICOMOS considers that the impacts of climate change need to be understood and sustainably managed. As such, ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could elaborate on how climate change will be managed in each of the nominated component parts.

We look forward to your responses to these points, which will be of great help in our evaluation procedure.

We would be grateful if you could provide **ICOMOS** and the **World Heritage Centre** with the above requested information by **28 February 2024 at the latest**, the deadline set out in paragraph 148 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* concerning additional information on nominations to be received. Please note that any information submitted after this statutory deadline will not be considered by ICOMOS in its evaluation for the World Heritage Committee. It should be noted, however, that while ICOMOS will carefully consider any additional information submitted within the statutory deadline, it will not be possible to properly evaluate a completely revised nomination or a large amount of new information submitted at the last minute. ICOMOS would therefore be grateful if the State Party could keep its response concise and respond only to the above requests.

We thank you for your support of the World Heritage Convention and the evaluation procedure.

Yours faithfully,



Gwenaëlle Bourdin
Director
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit

Copy to U.K. Government, Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Cultural, Diplomacy
Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO
Saxon State Ministry of Regional Development
Permanent Delegation of the United States of America to UNESCO
Office of International Affairs United States National Park Service
UNESCO World Heritage Centre

ICOMOS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES
CONSEJO INTERNACIONAL DE MONUMENTOS Y SITIOS
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ СОВЕТ ПО ВОПРОСАМ ПАМЯТНИКОВ И ДОСТОПРИМЕЧАТЕЛЬНЫХ МЕСТ

Our Ref. GB/EG/1468bis/IR

Charenton-le-Pont, 21 December 2023

Mr. Stephen Morris
Chief of Office of International Affairs
World Heritage Program Coordinator
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW
Room 2415
Washington, DC 20240

World Heritage List 2024

Moravian Church Settlements (Germany / United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland / United States of America) – Interim report and additional information request

Dear Mr. Morris,

As prescribed by the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* and its Annex 6, the Advisory Bodies are requested to submit a short interim report for each nomination by 31 January 2024. We are therefore pleased to provide you with the relevant information outlining issues related to the evaluation procedure.

The ICOMOS technical evaluation mission to the “Moravian Church Settlements” was carried out by Mr. Nils Ahlberg (Sweden) between the end of July and beginning of August 2023. The mission expert highly appreciated the availabilities and support provided by the experts in your country for the organisation and implementation of the mission.

On 4 October 2023, an additional information letter was sent by ICOMOS to request further information regarding history and development, maps and plans showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone, the delineation of buffer zones, and legal protection. Please convey our thanks to all the officials and experts for the additional information you provided on 3 and 5 November 2023 and for their continued cooperation in this process.

At the end of November 2023, the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel evaluated the cultural and mixed properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List in 2024. The additional information provided by the States Parties, together with mission and desk review reports were carefully examined by the Panel members. This process will conclude in March 2024.

We thank you and your Delegation for your availability and your participation in the meeting held on 24 November 2023 with some representatives of the ICOMOS Panel. The exchanges during this meeting were of great help for the third part of the ICOMOS Panel meeting. During this last part of the meeting, the Panel has identified areas where it considers that further information is needed.

Therefore, we would be pleased if the States Parties could consider the following points:

Comparative analysis

ICOMOS acknowledges the comparative analysis provided in the nomination dossier and the annex on the Moravian Church settlements and Moravian Church missions' inventory, which gives a broad context and shows at the same time the extent and diversity of the phenomenon of the Moravian settlements. It is clear from the comparative analysis that, in addition to the proposed extension comprising three

settlements, there are other sites which comply with the parameters adopted and the criteria established for comparison but which, for various reasons, are not included in the current nomination.

Nevertheless, the proposed extension is presented as a complete ensemble illustrating, together with Christiansfeld, the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements in a comprehensive manner. At the same time, the States Parties mention that there might be additions to the nominated property in the future. ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could comment on this issue and provide additional information on potential future extension that would enrich the illustration of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements.

Description of the nominated property

Herrnhut, Bethlehem and Gracehill, the three nominated component parts, in combination with Christiansfeld, illustrate different facets and stages of development of the phenomenon of the Moravian Church Settlements, which is considered in the nomination dossier as part of the justification for inscription. The description of the colonisation process and spatial development of *“an unparalleled international network of ideal settlements planned and constructed by the Moravian Church in Europe and North America”* (nomination dossier, p.13) and the individual settlements within the network seem crucial to understand the phenomenon.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could provide a summary explaining the most important principles, motives, directions and developments of the Moravian settlements, in order to better understand the broader context of the individual nominated settlements. Additional information on the structure of the network and the links between the settlements within the proposed extension, and more widely with other settlements within the represented network, as well as information on typological groups, would provide a better understanding of this network, both historically and from a contemporary perspective.

“The continuation of Moravian Church activities and traditions” (nomination dossier, p.13) is recognised as one of the attributes supporting the value of the nominated component parts and of the nominated property as a whole. At the same time, it is claimed that *“[t]he continuing presence of Moravian Church communities in each settlement ties the historic structures to the ongoing life of the larger Moravian Church community”* (p.13). On page 15 of the nomination dossier there is a reference to “intangibles” but the information provided is limited. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive additional information on Moravian traditions present within the nominated property, especially those that are not directly related to the practice of religion by the communities in the nominated component parts, as well as a presentation on “distinct traditions” present in the three nominated component parts. Information on continuing practices and existing traditional craftsmen skills would also be of particular interest.

In addition, ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could consider to provide additional information on the heritage features mentioned below, to present a more complete and understandable picture of the historic Moravian Church Settlements:

- For Herrnhut:
 - Pilgerhaus built in 1864 for visiting missionaries;
 - Common Laundry House from 1788 (now called Alte Rolle).
- For Bethlehem:
 - Second Single Brethren’s House built in 1744;
 - Schnitz Haus erected in 1801 for cutting and drying apples;
 - Monocacy Creek, a tributary of the Lehigh River.

ICOMOS would also appreciate to receive information on other existing buildings or sites constituting Moravian heritage that are included within the boundaries of the nominated component parts or their respective buffer zones. Information on their protection and how they are included, or planned to be included in the presentation of Moravian heritage, would also be of interest.

Boundaries

ICOMOS notes that the partial character of the inventories and the lack of urban studies make it difficult to understand the layout of the nominated settlements, their development and, consequently, the proposed delineation of the boundaries, especially as they appear to have been conceived according to different approaches. ICOMOS would therefore welcome a brief explanation on the rationale underlying the delineation of the boundaries of the nominated component parts.

In addition, ICOMOS would also like to know whether the States Parties would consider some possible clarification or revision of the proposed boundaries to include all key elements of the historic spatial structure of the settlements, particularly:

- For Herrnhut:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could clarify the boundary delineation at the northwest end, around the Ethnographic Museum and its modern extension.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS notes that a different approach to the delineation of the boundaries was applied in the case of Bethlehem which, as it is understood, has its source in the national legal framework and requirements for World Heritage nominations. Nevertheless, as it has an impact on the integrity of the nominated component part, ICOMOS considers that the inclusion of the Second Single Brethren's House as well as the Schnitz House is crucial, and would like to ask the State Party to consider revising the proposed boundaries to include the mentioned buildings.

It is argued in the nomination dossier that topography had an impact on the location and layout of the settlement in Bethlehem. Therefore, it would also be important to include the Monocacy Creek as well as other buildings, gardens and functional areas located currently beyond the National Historic Landmark District boundaries which have an impact on the legibility of the history of the settlement (its presentation) and support the value, integrity and authenticity of the nominated component part.

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could provide practical and functional justification for the delineation of the boundaries through existing buildings, as well as clarification regarding the boundary between the Moravian building cluster/complex and the God's Acre. This information would help to better understand the rationale behind it.

According to the historic maps provided with the additional information sent in November 2023, the green area adjoined to the God's Acre to the east seems to be part of it. ICOMOS would appreciate clarification in this respect.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider the possibility to extend the boundary of the nominated component part down to the River Maine, along the whole northern boundary or at least in front of the Central Square to include the area which form an important view along the central axis.

Protection of the settings and delineation of buffer zones

ICOMOS acknowledges the clarifications provided on the delineation of the buffer zones. In light of this information, changes to the proposed boundaries of the buffer zones would be advisable, as follow:

- For Herrnhut:

Taking into account the importance of the Berthelsdorf Manor complex and its historic and functional connection with the village of Berthelsdorf, ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could consider extending the buffer zone of this part of the nominated component part to the north as well as to the southeast and east.

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider extending the proposed buffer zone to the south down to the Lehigh River, as well as the possibility to extend its west boundary further out.

- For Gracehill:

ICOMOS would appreciate if the State Party could consider a small enlargement of the buffer zone to the west side of the south angle of the buffer zone, as well as the inclusion of the trees along the south side of Galgorm Road (northern boundary) and Nursery Road (south-eastern boundary), and to expand the southwest and north boundary further out.

ICOMOS would also be pleased if the States Parties could provide additional information on the mechanisms for planning and controlling changes in the settings of the nominated settlements, particularly in relation to important views and functional relationships within the landscape contexts.

ICOMOS would be grateful if the States Parties could provide a response about whether each of the above-mentioned suggestions of modifications to boundaries/buffer zones could be implemented. Please provide revised maps for all completed and planned revisions to the boundaries and buffer zones, including the timeline for completion if these processes are ongoing by the deadline established for ICOMOS to receive additional information.

Development projects

- For Bethlehem:

ICOMOS welcomes the information provided on the “Skyline West” development project. It would be helpful if the results of the Heritage Impact Assessment of this project could be provided for evaluation. Information on the mitigation measures proposed in case of negative impacts would also be of interest for ICOMOS.

- For Gracehill:

The Wrightbus factory is located in the immediate vicinity of the nominated component part and there is no designated buffer zone between it and the settlement established. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive the results of the Impact Assessment of the current and future impacts of the factory on the Moravian settlement of Gracehill.

State of conservation and conservation measures

ICOMOS considers that a conservation programme based on inventories and technical analyses which include built heritage, green areas and open fields shall be developed and implemented to ensure the preservation of the values of the nominated property, as well as its authenticity and integrity. It should encompass both the principal attributes as selected and described in the nomination dossier, as well as other key heritage features within the proposed boundaries. ICOMOS would appreciate if additional information on existing comprehensive conservation programmes and maintenance guidance developed for the nominated component parts could be provided. In case this is work in progress, information on a timeframe for their development and implementation would be welcome.

ICOMOS notes that cement mixture mortar and plastic paint were used. The replacement of windows, doors and other details by copies or new types is also apparent in all the nominated component parts. ICOMOS would be pleased if the States Parties could comment on this aspect.

- For Herrnhut:

The Berthelsdorf Manor complex, its buildings, green spaces and open areas (public realm), have suffered from neglect for a long time and, in some cases, are still not in a good condition. ICOMOS would appreciate to receive detailed information on its current state of conservation, including inventory and technical assessment supported by a relevant conservation plan or programme. Similarly, a relevant conservation plan or programme would be appreciated for Vogtshof and the forest park behind the building.

Management

ICOMOS would appreciate to receive indications as regards the timeframe for the completion and adoption of the individual local management plans.

In addition, ICOMOS considers that the impacts of climate change need to be understood and sustainably managed. As such, ICOMOS would appreciate if the States Parties could elaborate on how climate change will be managed in each of the nominated component parts.

We look forward to your responses to these points, which will be of great help in our evaluation procedure.

We would be grateful if you could provide **ICOMOS** and the **World Heritage Centre** with the above requested information by **28 February 2024 at the latest**, the deadline set out in paragraph 148 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* concerning additional information on nominations to be received. Please note that any information submitted after this statutory deadline will not be considered by ICOMOS in its evaluation for the World Heritage Committee. It should be noted, however, that while ICOMOS will carefully consider any additional information submitted within the statutory deadline, it will not be possible to properly evaluate a completely revised nomination or a large amount of new information submitted at the last minute. ICOMOS would therefore be grateful if the State Party could keep its response concise and respond only to the above requests.

We thank you for your support of the World Heritage Convention and the evaluation procedure.

Yours faithfully,



Gwenaëlle Bourdin
Director
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit

Copy to Permanent Delegation of the United States of America to UNESCO
 Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO
 Saxon State Ministry of Regional Development
 Permanent Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
 to UNESCO
 U.K. Government, Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Cultural, Diplomacy
 UNESCO World Heritage Centre