MERGING HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Creating Sustainable Archaeological Heritage Tourism in Cities

Carolien Fokke

Name and student number: Carolien Fokke, s1067095

Course: MA Thesis Heritage Management in a World Context

Supervisor: Dr. M. H. van den Dries

Specialisation: Heritage Management in a World Context

Institution: University of Leiden, Faculty of Archaeology

Place and date: Rotterdam, 15 December 2011

Address: Lijnbaan 36, 4461 HK, Goes

Email address: carolienfokke@gmail.com

Telephone Number: 06-44420621

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The idea for this thesis sprouted while I was reading articles for a course in Roman about urban planning and heritage management. I had always been interested in urban archaeology and the issues around it, but I had never quite been able to find the perfect angle to discuss the topic in depth. However, reading about the issues with archaeological heritage management and urban planning in the city of Rome while being in an excited, tourist state of mind about visiting the city, created a spark which slowly grew into an idea. Reading more and more about the opportunities offered by the ideas of sustainable tourism, while at the same time seeing the practical problems in urban archaeological heritage management, led me to investigate the possibilities of cooperation. It quickly became clear to me that some of the main stakeholders who had close encounters with urban archaeology were heritage managers and urban planners. Both represent a number of other stakeholders, and sometimes even the same stakeholders. Therefore, I believed that cooperation between these two stakeholders was key in the management of archaeological heritage in urban environments.

In light of the current economic crisis, the sustainability of tourism has become a central issue which I was very interested in. I soon realised that sustainable tourism was the key to creating cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners because of its focus on economic, social, and cultural sustainability. The interviews and excursions at the basis of this thesis provided me with the practical cases on which to test more theoretical concepts. I believe that the next step toward cooperation is not to be found in theories alone, but should be tested in practice. The strength of this thesis therefore lies in the practical examples it provides, and the suggestions for improvement of cooperation it offers on the basis of these investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION: MERGING URBAN PLANNING AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT – CREATING SUSTAINABLE HERITAGE TOURISM

Currently, many discussions within the field of archaeological heritage management seem to centre around the key-word 'cooperation'. Cooperation may take many different forms, for example the cooperation between First Nations peoples and museums, or between people from formerly colonized countries and the imperial powers that colonized them (Kreps 2006; Steven 2006). While in the case of these examples the need for cooperation between different stakeholders may seem obvious, there are also examples which at first sight may seem easier to deal with, but are in fact very complicated. Specifically, the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners concerning Roman archaeological heritage. Many previous Roman settlements now find themselves submerged by modern European cities which can especially cause problems in case of redevelopment of city centres.

1.1 Roman Remains and City Centres

The case of Roman remains in European city centres is especially interesting for three reasons: 1) it is relatively common to find Roman remains in European city centres, 2) many stakeholders are involved who often attribute very different values to this archaeological heritage, and 3) Roman remains are among the most popular archaeological sites in the heritage tourism industry. Therefore, urban planners looking to redevelop European city centres have a large chance of being confronted with the discovery of Roman remains. Once archaeologists find these remains many stakeholders, amongst which heritage managers, will become involved in the planning process. Since Roman remains are often big tourist attractions, it is interesting to investigate in what way the creation of sustainable archaeological heritage tourism can bring the aims of urban planners and heritage managers closer together.

Many stakeholders are involved in the struggle between archaeological heritage management, urban development, and tourism. Usually heritage managers wish to protect archaeological sites and monuments for the benefit of future generations (Schofield 2008, 27). However, heritage has many different values, listed beautifully by English Heritage (2008); cultural values, educational and academic values, economic values, resource values, recreational values, and aesthetic values (English Heritage 2008, 316). It is important to realize that each of these values can be important for a variety of stakeholders; archaeologists,

heritage managers, teachers, the tourism industry, locals, governments, urban planners, etcetera. A site can have a different significance to different people (Semple Kerr 2008). Sometimes, this can lead to conflicts between different stakeholders who are, or who want to be, involved with archaeological heritage (Semple Kerr 2008). Good examples are the conflicts known to arise between urban planners and heritage managers when it comes to urban development and archaeological heritage (Skeates 2000, 58). Dilemmas are varied and range from whether to conserve archaeological remains in modern cities, to how, why, and for whom to conserve them (Tunbridge 2008). In recent years, highly interesting attempts have been made to find creative solutions for the problem the discovery of archaeological heritage in cities can create during urban (re)development, which will be explored in this thesis.

The need for a cooperative strategy which is useful for all stakeholders involved with archaeological heritage in cities is evident. Perhaps tourism is the one factor which can bring a number of stakeholders much closer together, especially urban planners and heritage managers. While it is never right to slight any stakeholder, it must be recognized that in the current planning policies throughout Europe the municipality and its heritage managers, together with urban planners, form the most important stakeholders. Tourism is often both a cause of and a goal of urban development, creating economic welfare and offering recreational possibilities, while at the same time it is key in creating an awareness of archaeological heritage and its current role in societies. By combining both urban planners' and heritage managers' common involvement with the tourism industry, hopefully suggestions can be made about how to combine various stakeholders' interests by aiming at the creation of sustainable archaeological heritage tourism. Key theories are those concerning stakeholders, valuation, interpretation, experience, heritage tourism, and various forms of sustainability. The overall aim of this paper is to provide a good combination of theoretical background and the practice of managing archaeological heritage in city environments. The main question addressed in this thesis is: In what way can the cooperation between urban planning and archaeological heritage management benefit from the use of sustainable heritage tourism theories?

1.2 World Heritage and Heritage Tourism

An important element in the discussion about the management of Roman archaeological remains and urban development is that of heritage tourism. Archaeological and historical tourism are very popular these days (McManamon 2008, 461), and heritage tourism is a

leading sector of many national economies, as well as of the international economy (McCarthy 2008, 540). Roman remains are arguably one of the most quintessential types of archaeological remains, especially in Europe. Because of their fame and perhaps also because of their monumentality, they are subjected to large numbers of tourists every year. The tourism industry effects a great number of stakeholders, from local politicians to national governments, from archaeologists and heritage managers to urban planners, and from local communities to the tourists themselves.

While heritage tourism has a long history, it has more recently become intertwined with the World Heritage List, created by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). Perhaps it is an indication of the organisation of our current society that categorisations and lists are at the order of the day, even when it comes to our cultural heritage. However, it should be remembered that even in ancient times lists were created of buildings and monuments worth seeing, for example by the 2nd century BC Greek author Antipater of Sidon:

I have set eyes on the wall of lofty Babylon on which is a road for chariots, and the statue of Zeus by the Alpheus, and the hanging gardens, and the Colossus of the Sun, and the huge labour of the high pyramids, and the vast tomb of Mausolus; but when I saw the house of Artemis that mounted to the clouds, those other marvels lost their brilliancy, and I said, 'Lo, apart from Olympus, the Sun never looked on aught so grand.'
*(*Antipater, Greek Anthology IX.58*)*

There were also lists by the hand of the famous Herodotus (*Histories*) and mentions by Diodorus of Sicily (*World History*, I.5.65). These listings may have been the originals for what was later believed to be the list of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. This shows that great works of art and architecture have long played an important role in the history of the Western world, and in the creation of our society. In his article about World Heritage, the author Pocock makes an insightful statement concerning the difference between the Ancient World Wonders and the World Heritage List, pointing out that although the World Wonders have been acknowledged since classical times, the collective action or assessment of heritage on a world scale is a distinct feature of the present age (Pocock 1997, 260).

Aside from his connection to the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, Herodotus, allegedly the most famous ancient historical writer, is especially well known for his amazing accounts of foreign places and the beautiful objects he allegedly encountered there, although the correctness of his information is often disputed (Rutherford 2005, 104-105). Contemporary travel and early tourism may even have been generated by his and other

ancient writers' accounts of the wondrous buildings and the many beautiful works of art. Especially during the late 17th century that there was a rise in what was perhaps the predecessor of our current idea of heritage tourism in the form of the so-called 'Grand Tour' (Harrison 2010, 20-21). This was an almost standard didactic voyage throughout Europe usually undertaken by young Western upper-class men as a type of coming-of-age journey (Harrison 2010, 20-21).

It was during the high times of 'Grand Tourism' that the touristic value of ancient remains became more apparent, and early forms of heritage management came into being. People focused more on the conservation of heritage and its touristic attractiveness, for example in the case of the 'aesthetic ruin' (Zidda 2005, 1). This is clearly shown in paintings of that time especially those termed 'Italianate' (Slive 1995, 225-245) (Fig. 1). The most impressive remains of Roman times were left in the state they were found in, and city planning in for example Rome involved restructuring the city around the ruins, rather than over them (see Di Macco 1972).

While the city of Rome was evidently already greatly appreciated for its aesthetic and historical appeal in past times, it has still retained this appeal in modern times. Inscribed initially on the World Heritage List in 1980 as the 'Historic Centre of Rome', but in 1990 re-inscribed as the 'Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura'[1], Rome is recognised by UNESCO as including 'some of the major monuments of antiquity such as the Forums, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Mausoleum of Hadrian, the Pantheon, Trajan's Column and the Column of Marcus Aurelius'[2]. Still millions of people visit Rome every year to see the monuments mentioned here by UNESCO, and to experience the aesthetics and history of the ancient city of Rome and its modern reincarnation all at once. Rome is a prime example of a city with high touristic value, while at the same time having to cope with redevelopment of the city centre and management of its Roman remains.

1.3 Heritage and Urban Planning

The relationship between ancient ruins and urban planning and development changed over time. A good example is the city of Rome, where many of the ancient remains such as the Coliseum were re-used in some way to create new city spaces or buildings. For example,

---

[1] See UNESCO online: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/91
[2] See UNESCO online: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/91

during medieval times the Coliseum was used as a living area, and at one point in time a church was situated in the old amphitheatre (La Rocca 2007). However, the love for aesthetic ruins transformed and during neoclassical and neo-gothic times the focus changed from simply leaving remains out in the open to creating reconstructions and anastyloses (Zidda 2005, 2). A highly interesting and well-known example is that of the Palace of Knossos, Kreta. Here, the British archaeologist Sir Arthur Evans, who owned the site, started to excavate the remains of the palace in 1900 (Shipley *et al.* 2006, 490), and later he had it reconstructed as he believed it must have looked before it was destroyed. This resulted in one of the most remarkable reconstructions of ancient remains to be seen today, and one of the most popular touristic places at Crete today with more than 700.000 visitors in 2006 (Kyriakopoulos 2005, 16).

Because Sir Arthur Evans was the actual owner of the site, he could basically do what he wanted with it. However, today the more general question of who 'owns' heritage is a highly discussed one (see for example Carman 2005 and Cuno 2008) that might never be answered satisfyingly. The question of who should take decisions concerning the management of cultural heritage therewith becomes more and more difficult to answer as well – should decisions be taken by local communities, local or regional governments, national governments, or even international governmental bodies? Often a question of power, these questions are very hard, if not impossible to answer. Therefore, instead of trying to answer these unanswerable questions, this thesis considers the current situation in different cities in a variety of countries. Through contrasting and comparing these cases by a consideration of themes such as stakeholders, ownership, the dilemmas faced by heritage managers, the impact of World Heritage Status, and the influence of international legislation, some helpful suggestions can be made about how to cooperate in a useful way.

1.4 Heritage, Urban Planning, and Legislation

The main factor in the question of ownership of heritage is legislation. Legislation concerning heritage can be found on every level of society and since every society is organized (slightly) differently there are not many generalizations that can be made here. However, it should be remembered that legislation on different societal levels often overlaps and sometimes clashes. To take the city of Bath (United Kingdom) as an example, there is a large legislative framework which must be taken into account by all who work with the heritage in that city. Many acts and policies are relevant, and legislation in relation to the urban planning of this

heritage city crosses many levels. From the local city planners, to the regional government, as well as the national government and even UNESCO; all are involved with issues relating to the city's redevelopment. This is also the case in other cities across Europe, although in different forms. Since this thesis focuses on combining interests of urban planners and heritage managers with regard to Roman remains through creating sustainable tourism, the specifics of heritage legislation are outside the scope of this thesis. When necessary, they are mentioned for the case studies, solely to give the reader a general understanding of certain situations and the involvement of legislation in the decision-making processes concerning heritage.

In past decades several attempts have been made to come to international agreements concerning the treatment of archaeological heritage in combination with modern problems of re-development of urban spaces. The best known and arguably most important examples of these international cooperation attempts are the creation of the World Heritage Committee (hereafter WHC) and subsequently the World Heritage List (hereafter WHL) and the Malta Convention of 1992. Because these international conventions are both internationally important, their influence in different cities can be compared and contrasted which is an important part of this thesis.

While at first sight the WHL shows a different appreciation and assumedly an increasing awareness of the importance of safeguarding the world's cultural and natural heritage, the WHC has also had to deal with negative comments toward their ideas about the universal value of heritage. One of the more common accusations is that the World Heritage List displays a Eurocentric bias, and relies heavily on the monumentality of upstanding remains (Creighton 2007, 339). Furthermore, there is an imbalance between the natural and cultural heritage on the List, which has been mentioned as an indication of the WHC's view of heritage being homocentric (Pocock 1997, 262). While the WHC has attempted to address these issues by for example the creation of different 'types' of world heritage and specifically the 'cultural landscape'-type (Harrison 2010, 12), these problems are still relevant for the discussions in this thesis as will become clear throughout.

The 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage[3] is another important sign of cooperation on a more international scale. It is especially interesting for this paper because it focuses on Europe and archaeological heritage specifically, and was created as a reaction to the large construction projects in many European cities from the 1980s

---

[3] For an online version, see: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/html/143.htm.

onwards. It was basically an update of the London Convention of 1969 and was more attuned to current threats to European archaeological heritage, and specifically these big construction projects.[4] It is therefore an important factor in most urban development projects in European cities, and a good example of the way in which international attempts at cooperation actually are practiced. Its importance in various development projects will therefore be considered throughout this thesis.

1.5 Research Methods

The research on which this thesis is based consists of both a literature research and a field research. The literature research focuses on unraveling the history of the troubled relationship between urban development and archaeological heritage over time, and on finding out which creative and sustainable solutions for combining archaeological heritage and urban planning have already been employed in cities across the world. Furthermore, the importance of sustainable heritage tourism is investigated from economic, social, and cultural perspectives. Furthermore, theories behind the themes central to the discussion, such as stakeholders, valuation, interpretation, international legislation, and experience value are also explored and explained. The advantages and disadvantages of using some theories in practice are discussed, which leads to useful suggestions about how to combine urban planning and heritage management through encouraging sustainable archaeological tourism.

Next to the literary component of this research, there is a complementary field research. This field research consists of a comparison of three specific case studies. First the city of Rome, Italy, is discussed because of the extent of its Roman remains, and the large number of tourists which visit the city each year. While the city centre is designated as World Heritage, redevelopments have taken place in the past, and are taking place now. During field work in the city of Rome, several heritage managers were consulted and different viewpoints were gathered. This information plays an important role in the argumentation concerning the creation of sustainable heritage tourism. The second city to be discussed is Bath, in the United Kingdom. Bath has a city centre which comprises Roman remains and is designated in its entirety as World Heritage. In this case, the balance between different time periods is clearly visible, and urban planning in and around the city also struggles with this. On the basis of a particularly interesting interview with the World Heritage Manager of Bath, an insight is

---

[4] For the Valetta Convention, see: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Archeologie/default_en.asp.

given into the practicalities of cooperation between heritage managers, urban planners, and the many other stakeholders involved. The third and final city centre to be considered is that of Cologne, Germany. Cologne also has many Roman remains in its city centre, and as a fast-growing urban centre also struggles with the different aims of urban planners and heritage managers. While Cologne's city centre is not designated as World Heritage in its entirety, its famous cathedral is on the World Heritage List. Interestingly, in the past there has been an issue with urban planning in combination with the Cathedral's World Heritage Status. It is the purpose of the Cologne case study to investigate whether the World Heritage Status of the cathedral has any influence on the manner in which Roman remains are treated. Furthermore, an investigation of current redevelopment of the city centre and the development of a new museum provide interesting case studies. Interviews with heritage managers and project leaders have proven important to help understand the dilemmas of urban planning and Roman heritage in city centers that are considered World Heritage.

It is important to note that the three case studies show slight differences in the application of methods due to the possibilities at the time. The information from heritage managers in Rome was gathered during an in-class lecture and during an on-site excursion. While questions were asked to the heritage managers, it does not qualify as an interview. In the case of Bath, a semi-structured interview took place in the office of the heritage manager. This offered the possibility of taping the conversation (Appendix I) and of structuring the interview to my specific needs. The heritage manager in Cologne could only meet me on the excavation and construction site, which resulted in a combination of the two previous methods. The on-site environment did not allow for the interview to be taped, but the same questions were asked as in the case of Bath. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interview it was possible to add more specific questions about Cologne and about information gathered during the on-site excursion. While this partly impairs the possibility to compare the information gathered on the basis of the research method, it did allow for a more case-specific investigative approach. Therefore, the information gathered in each case is comparable in information value and does not necessarily weaken the main points made in this thesis.

The additional information gathered through these three interesting case studies is compared and contrasted in detail, and leads to a contextualization of the conclusions drawn from the literature research and theoretical overview. This gives a broader view of the situation than can be gotten from literature research alone, and shows examples of good practices as well as points of improvement while paying attention to detail and employing some of the theories and legislation discussed in the theoretical overview.

1.6 Outline of Thesis

The aim of this thesis is to compare the influences of the World Heritage Status on the possibilities for creative cooperative solutions concerning urban planning and sustainable heritage tourism in town centres with Roman remains. First, a theoretical overview (chapter 2) has been made to explore the theories that can be used to create a better cooperation and to improve the sustainability of tourism. Chapter 3 is a case study which focuses on the city of Rome because of the extent of its Roman remains and its WH status. Chapter 4 is another case study which centres on Bath because it attempts to balance the various features of the city, and because of its WH Status. Chapter 5 is a case study of Cologne because it has many Roman remains in its city centre, it is redeveloping parts of the city, but only the city's cathedral has a WH status. Each of these parts will consist of a historical overview of the relation between town planning and archaeological heritage management and tourism, and an indication of the future plans and what their implications might be. For each of these towns, an interview with a heritage manager serves as a source of information about the more practical side of heritage management in such an environment. Chapter 6 is a comparison of the findings, and an analysis of the research outcomes. This chapter provides answers to the main question raised in the introduction of this thesis. Eventually, in the final conclusion (chapter 7) of this thesis, indications are made about the direction of future research, as well as about the future of the practical side of archaeological heritage management in cities with ancient archaeological remains in their centres and a WH status.

1.7 Sustainable Heritage Tourism as the Key to Cooperation

While attempts are being made at improving cooperation between different stakeholders, for example through the creation of international legislation, it seems to be insufficient. For if cooperation remains divided between local, national, and international levels perhaps nothing will ever change. A good example needs to be set on theoretical, *and* practical levels. Focusing on how to combine the interests of urban planners and archaeological heritage managers specifically, the goals of sustainable heritage tourism are introduced as points of common interests for both parties.

2. THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

The purpose of this theoretical overview is to explore the theories surrounding the current discussion about the possibilities for cooperative heritage management. Focus lies on the relationship between urban planning and heritage management in the case of archaeological remains. The various values placed on heritage by different stakeholders are discussed in depth, as well as the influence of the 1992 (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Council of Europe 1992). The international aspect is dealt with by an investigation into the role of the World Heritage List on archaeological heritage management. A refreshing viewpoint is offered by referring to the theories of the 'heritagescape' (Garden 2009) and the 'experience economy' (Pine and Gilmore 1999). Eventually, sustainable heritage tourism is introduced as a unifying concept in the discussion between urban planners and heritage managers. This overview serves as the basis for the exploration of various practical case studies.

2.1 The Past in the Present

Cities have long histories which are very visible in the archaeological record. This can be both a source of information and a source of dispute in the present. At the basis of the discussion about the importance of the past in the present, lies the question whether the past is a non-renewable resource. This discussion has been excellently summarized by Holtorf (2008). He mentions four key beliefs that are often presented in the discussion about the past as non-renewable resource. Firstly, Archaeological sites and objects are authentic (of true antiquity), which makes them distinctively different from fakes and copies (Holtorf 2008, 125). Secondly, archaeological sites and objects are irreplaceable and non-renewable, because we cannot go back into the past and remake them (Holtorf 2008, 125). Thirdly, today many archaeological sites and objects are in danger of being destroyed, for example by changes in the ground-water levels, by deep ploughing, by wars, by industrial and housing development and also by the antiquities trade (Holtorf 2008, 125). Fourthly, the archaeological record is being saved by archaeologists today so that future generations can also appreciate the past, for which they are expected to be grateful (Holtorf 2008, 125).

For example, in many cities Roman remains are found when (re)development takes place. There is a lot of pressure on development in towns, and this means that although excavation usually does take place, it is often not very visible (Copeland 2010, 230).

Furthermore, once research has taken place at a site, the recovered structural evidence is usually preserved only by record and the site is then back-filled in order to re-use it (Copeland 2010, 230). There is a lot of focus on the assumed non-renewability of archaeological heritage, and therefore it is recorded and preserved and reburied in the least invasive manner possible.

However, there are also arguments against the view of the past as a non-renewable resource. In fact, it is only the assumption of antiquity which matters, not the actual artefact (Holtorf 2008, 126). Furthermore, there is an immense number of sites to preserve and records from rescue excavations to maintain, that it is starting to become too much to conserve (Holtorf 2008, 127). Also, the importance of original archaeological sites may be less significant for future generations than currently believed (Holtorf 2008, 127). Lastly, both today and in the past, cultural appreciation of the past is not extremely dependent on original ancient sites and objects (Holtorf 2008, 128). In fact, it may be stated that the past is a cultural construct experienced specifically at certain places and on certain occasions (Holtorf 2008, 128). If the past is considered as a construct, it is therefore always renewable in the sense that one can create the past using whatever objects are at hand to tell whichever story one wishes to tell.

The view of the past as a renewable resource is very valuable because it offers heritage managers the possibility to move forward and to look for creative solutions. While today many heritage managers focus on the protection and conservation of archaeological heritage *in situ*, the view of the past as a renewable resource opens up a whole new discussion. Holtorf states that: 'archaeological heritage management should be concerned with actively and responsibly renewing the past in our time' (Holtorf 2008, 130). Indeed, focusing on preservation of material that might not be needed in the future, while not focusing on the needs of current society and their experience of the past seems contradictory (Holtorf 2008, 130). The way the past is experienced in the present is what should be the focus of heritage managers today.

2.2 Stakeholders and Values: the Local Perspective

A crucial point to consider is not only the way in which the past is experienced in the present, but also by whom the past is experienced in the present. Today, there are many different stakeholders involved in any discussion of archaeological heritage. Although many current stakeholder discussions focus on the relationship between for example ex-colonies and their

Western occupiers, this is not the case when it comes to Roman remains, the focus in this thesis. Roman remains are regularly discovered during urban development projects in modern European cities. They can be considered as a clear representative of antique authenticity, and are recognisable to large amounts of people. However, it is important to consider the stakeholders that are most involved with Roman remains once they are discovered. Some of the main stakeholders are arguably found on a local level.

City centres, especially in Europe, are the most intensively lived-in public places (Ennen 1999, 15). Urban life, urban activities, and urban forms are all closely connected and continually change in order to adjust to changes in the way of living (Ennen 1999, 15). It is necessary, therefore, that all plans and ideas have a clear purpose and a focus on functionality and efficiency (Ennen 1999, 17). Function appears to dictate form (Ennen 1999, 19). A city cannot be a city if nobody lives in it. A city centre is assumedly the most lively place within a city, but also the one with the most extensive amount of heritage, both tangible and intangible. This is visible in the archaeological record. It is the multifunctional city centre in which many different activities strengthen each other, that guarantees that its character remains robust (Ennen 1999, 40). Archaeological resources such as Roman remains indicate that a city has retained its robust character for a very long time, and are therefore of importance for many local stakeholders.

If discovered during redevelopment works in city centres, it is often the developer who first comes into direct contact with the remains. If the country in which the remains are found is a state party to the 1992 (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Council of Europe 1992), it means that officially there is an obligation to excavate the remains. This means that both the national and the local government becomes involved in the process because they are the representatives of the law. National or local archaeologists may be called in to investigate the remains and to produce a report about the findings. However, since the building or redevelopment process is already underway at this point it is usually only rescue archaeology that takes place. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, have commercial archaeological companies that excavate these types of sites, which are under development, specifically. In connection to the 1992 Convention's 6th article (Council of Europe 1992), it is usually the developer who pays for these excavations. From a financial point of view, they are therefore the most directly involved stakeholders.

In the urban planning field, it is not uncommon to involve a variety of stakeholders in discussing the possibilities for (re)development of certain areas. Indeed, since the 1960s many

methods have been applied in order to improve the engagement of different stakeholders into planning projects (Mason 2008, 115). Methods may range from surveys and focus groups to public meetings (Mason 2008, 115). Although attempts have been made at cooperation, it is important to emphasize the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners here. Urban planners inevitably have to cooperate with heritage managers, which may immediately cause some problems because of the necessity factor. They usually see it as an obligation, rather than an opportunity. Frightened by the well-known 'preservation' trend in archaeology, developers may be afraid that they will not be able to continue their work quickly and without much additional costs.

Roman remains, especially visually attractive finds such as mosaic floors, are expensive to conserve. Therefore, back-filling (Copeland 2010, 230) provides developers with an easy and less expensive alternative to creating new plans that incorporate the display of the remains in one way or another. Often, some parts of the archaeological record are still destroyed after documentation has taken place. The choices about what to conserve (and in what way), and what to destroy are sometimes irreversible influences on archaeological research (Smith 2004, 8). However, it arguably also influences the public's perception of social, cultural, and historical identities. Once something tangible is lost, the intangible part such as memories, may eventually also be lost. Archaeological documentation hardly has any influence on the public, simply because they often do not have access to archaeological records because of either physical issues or knowledge issues. What is key in preserving the past is therefore not the tangible material per se, but the intangible memories and experiences of the past in the present. Specifically the experiences of the local stakeholders who are most closely involved with the archaeological heritage. These stakeholders would include local governments, urban planners, archaeologists, heritage managers, and local residents.

It is important to note that the various values attributed to heritage by these different stakeholders may differ immensely. For example, the interests and concerns of developers and tourist operators may intersect (Smith 2004, 8-9). The values attributed to heritage have been discussed on many occasions, and almost every author has their own idea about what those values are. Randall Mason has explored the methodological issues and choices around value assessment in connection to conservation planning in an insightful manner (2008, 99-124). He argues for a common typology of values in order to be able to evaluate different projects in a comparable way (Mason 2008, 102). Many typologies have already been created by different authors and organizations (Mason 2008, 102, table 7.1), which shows how different values are attributed by different stakeholders. It must therefore be stated here that it is impossible to

create a typology which takes into account all values possibly attributed by all stakeholders. However, what can be created is a typology which takes into account as many stakeholders' values as possible. An attempt to do this has been made by Mason, who designed a table which takes two major categories as its starting point: sociocultural values and economic values (Table 1; reproduced from Mason 2008, 103, table 7.2).

Sociocultural Values	Economic Values
Historical	Use (market) value
Cultural / symbolic	Nonuse (nonmarket) value
Social	Existence
Spiritual / religious	Option
Aestehtic	Bequest

Table 1: Provisional typology of Heritage Values. Reproduced from Mason 2008, 103, table 7.2.

In the discussion between heritage managers and urban planners it is indeed the difference between these two categories which often seems to create a problem. Therefore, what Mason suggests is of especial relevance to this discussion. These are not two different value categories, but simply 'two alternative ways of understanding and labelling the same, wide range of heritage values' (Mason 2008, 103). It must be stressed that all the sub-categories in each of the two main categories often overlap, and they are not necessarily distinctively individual categories (Mason 2008, 103). As Mason states, all heritage values are in some sense political, and therefore there is no separate category for political values (Mason 2008, 104). This is also the case in our discussion, and in the case studies this becomes very clear. Stakeholders on a local level have very specific values, as becomes evident in the case studies.

2.3 Stakeholders and Values: the Global Perspective

It is not only on a local or even on a national level that there are many different stakeholders with a variety of values. In the current globalized society the whole world can be considered a stakeholder when it comes to archaeological heritage. The World Heritage List is the clearest example of this. However, legislation that is practiced on a local level, such as the 1992 Convention (Council of Europe 1992), has an international basis. Furthermore, international tourists are also considered as important stakeholders. While international tourists may be

considered as the largest group of international stakeholders, it is the World Heritage List which attempts to represent the global community as a whole by assigning values to heritage all across the world. Furthermore, the international community as represented by for example the Council of Europe exercises legislative power through implementation of international conventions such as the 1992 Convention (Council of Europe). Together, these form some of the main points to be considered when discussion the international community of stakeholders and the values they attribute to archaeological heritage.

The World Heritage List has been the topic of much discussion over the years. It attempts to represent universal values for heritage sites. However, it is often pointed out that there are things that are inherently unbalanced on the List. For example, there is an imbalance between natural and cultural heritage (Harrison 2010, 11; Pocock 1997, 262). The World Heritage List has been referred to as displaying an 'undeniable Eurocentric bias' (Creighton 2007, 339). This is shown by for example the emphasis on the list of the monumentality of upstanding remains (Creighton 2007, 339). It should therefore not be considered as representing the whole international community. Furthermore, the uniqueness of sites is important for inscription, but with so many sites on the list already, the meaning of 'uniqueness' is diminishing (Pocock 1997, 266). To create a more balanced list, an attempt at relative evaluation is currently being made, for example with regards to Roman sites (Pocock 1997, 266). This evaluation is made by experts deployed by ICOMOS, another organization which depends heavily on Western values and ideas about conservation and preservation. This evaluation involves a move away from uniqueness to representativeness (Pocock 1997, 266). However, what may be representative for one part of the world may not be representative for another part of the world. Therefore, even this attempt at creating a more balanced list is inherently flawed.

It is crucial to note that the World Heritage List is an important political tool. This is partly because of the inscription process, which demands that a state government suggests national sites for inscription on the list, and this makes it easier for states to use inscriptions as a tool for shaping national identities (Creighton 2007, 343; Pocock 1997, 267). While heritage has always been used as a way to create and recreate identities, this has not always had a desirable outcome. In a way, the World Heritage List can be seen as the 'sum of scrutinized national heritages' (Pocock 1997, 266). Those nations with the most power in the political arena therefore have an advantage over those with less power. Furthermore heritage in general can be used to symbolize the social, cultural, and historical identity of nations, but also of smaller communities and even individuals (Smith 2004, 7). Because only nations have the

power to suggest sites for inscription, the opinion of smaller communities or individuals is not always considered. It is therefore an unrealistic ideal of UNESCO to declare something to be of outstanding universal value. Some types of heritage may have no value for some people, while it is highly valued by others. Arguably, there is no such thing as a universal value.

International values have also been captured in the 1992 (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, presented in Malta. Today it is often referred to as the Valletta Convention or the Malta Convention. The Convention knows a long history, and was based on a Convention signed in November 1970 which was developed in the aftermath of the destruction and consecutive redevelopment after the end of the 2nd World War (Trotzig 2001, 1). However, this first document was not signed by many states because it lost focus and therefore did not fulfil the needs of many states (Trotzig 2001, 1). During the 1980s there was what may be described as an ever growing amount of redevelopment taking place throughout Europe (Trotzig 2001, 2). During these redevelopments many previously undiscovered sites were found, and this caused many problems for both local city authorities and site developers (Trotzig 2001, 2). Since the legislation to protect cultural heritage in these types of cases was simply nonexistent in a large number of countries, another attempt at creating a Convention was made (Trotzig 2001, 2). The result was the (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage of 1992. It was especially geared towards the protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage in the context of both town and country planning operations (Trotzig 2001, 2). An important difference between the 1992 Convention and the earlier Convention, is that there is a bigger emphasis on the importance of the context of an archaeological site, and on the site being part of a larger archaeological and cultural landscape (Trotzig 2001, 3). This is a clear example of the international community, and especially a variety of international governmental agencies, standing up to defend their specific values by creating international legislation to be used on a local level.

For the discussion in this thesis, two points are important to mention explicitly. First, part of the goal of the 1992 Convention was to make other parties, such as planners and developers, share in the usefulness and excitement of new discoveries that are made during (re)development works, basically through creating better participation (Trotzig 2001, 3). Secondly, an important point made in the Convention is that in Article 6. This is concerned with the 'polluter pays' concept, which means that whoever causes destruction of an archaeological site, should be obliged to pay for the excavation (Trotzig 2001, 4). Although the initial wording was changed because it was considered too provocative by certain states

(Trotzig 2001, 4), article 6 still prescribes that in the case of (re)development, the necessary financial resources must be provided by the stakeholders in order to pay for rescue excavations (Council of Europe 1992). While excavation and documentation are central to these rules, there is no attention to the way in which this information may be shared with a larger amount of stakeholders than just scientists.

While it has been stated that it was a pity that changes were made in the draft that lessened the effect of the sixth article (Trotzig 2001, 4), it was important to do so. For example, Trotzig believes that it would have stimulated the developers to avoid ancient monuments (Trotzig 2001, 4). However, it has given rise to a large market in commercial archaeology which is more about offering the best price to developers, rather than about conducting thorough archaeological research. Still developers attempt to avoid ancient monuments if they are aware that they are there. But in the case of many city centres, there are bound to be archaeological remains there. If stronger language had been used, it could possibly have a caused an immense stagnation in the development of cities all over Europe. This would have caused immense problems for infrastructure, economic development, and sociocultural development. A deterioration of city centres would have been inevitable. However, there is one point which does not become clear in the Convention itself, and that is its supposed goal of making every stakeholder be able to enjoy and experience the archaeological heritage. The Convention causes planners and developers to only see the financial aspects of archaeological heritage in a negative way; they will have to pay for rescue archaeology. Therefore, instead of just speaking about the need to pay for scientific research, a solution should be sought to really create cooperation between developers and scientist to do something with the archaeological finds that is advantageous to both parties, and to as many other stakeholders as possible. This is unfortunately not taken into account by the 1992 Convention, which is one of its main shortcomings.

From the above it becomes clear that on a global level, the most powerful stakeholders are the ones who can decide about the way in which the archaeological heritage is treated. The 1992 Convention and the World Heritage List are both based on Western belief systems and values. However, in any discussion of heritage preservation it is important to consider the values attributed to heritage by different stakeholders. In this discussion, the main stakeholders are heritage managers and urban planners who work on a local level. Since the argument here is that sustainable tourism is key in creating cooperation between these two stakeholders, the main stakeholders involved with tourism are also part of the equation. The World Heritage List is of great influence on global tourism. To create the cooperation and

sustainability which is needed on a local level, the support of global, international stakeholders is also needed.

2.4 Heritage Tourism

In 2006 the World Tourism Organisation estimated that approximately half of all international trips each year involve visits to sites of cultural heritage importance (Dallen 2007, x). However, one of the most important considerations which needs to be made when one wishes to speak at all about heritage tourism is the identity of the heritage tourist (Dallen 2007, ix). For example, there has been a discussion of whether or not someone can be called a heritage tourist simply because he or she is visiting a heritage site (Dallen 2007, ix). Geographic division can take place on the basis of people being local residents, national tourists, and international tourists (Dallen 2007, xi). This corresponds clearly to the different levels of stakeholders - local and global - mentioned before. The most important distinction made here is the one concerning deep and shallow heritage tourists, the latter being much more personally involved with a site on a social level too (Dallen 2007, x). Indeed, it is important that a heritage site offers both of these types of tourists the experience they are looking for. This is when the layers of a heritage site become important.

There are some problems with the research which has been conducted in the field of tourism, summarized well by Stronza (2001). Although the article deals with heritage tourism from a more anthropological perspective, what she states about tourism research is still true. There are studies concerning the origins of tourism which focus on tourists, and there is research about the impacts of tourism on local communities (Stronza 2001, 261). However, it would be more beneficial to investigate tourism, its incentives and its impacts for both tourists and local communities (Stronza 2001, 261). This way, the views of both local and global stakeholders are taken into account. Specifically, Stronza suggests that alternative forms of tourism can generate social, economic and environmental benefits for local communities while at the same time creating a transformative experience for tourists (Stronza 2001, 261). Indeed, cultural heritage tourism is one of the ways in which areas which have seen a decline in their key industries (such as agriculture) have attempted to regenerate themselves (McIntosh 1999, 41).

Tourists seem at the moment to be looking for some form of authenticity in their experiences (Stronza 2001, 265). Some publications have attempted to capture the intangible aspect of heritage tourism by focusing on the consumption of an experience (McIntosh 1999,

43). However, the need for further research into tourists' motivations for visiting certain sites has been expressed as well (Chen 1998, 213-215). It is evident that different tourists may seek different things when travelling. Furthermore, some research has indicated that different age groups of visitors seek different experiences and benefits when visiting heritage sites (Chen 1998, 213). What has become more and more clear is that many tourists are not specifically looking for an educational experience, but visit places for more simple and general sightseeing reasons (McIntosh 1999, 45). This needs to be taken into account when considering tourism values. Specifically, heritage managers need to better understand that visitors derive a very personal and unique value from their experience at a heritage site (McIntosh 1999, 45). This should lead heritage managers to attempt to create an environment in which there is something to see or do for everyone, as well as different levels of for example education or simply aesthetic enjoyment.

It is the economic aspect that is the direct relation between heritage and tourism (Harrison 2010, 17), and urban development. Local residents are crucial in supporting historic sites financially (Dallen 2007, xi), and tourism often pays for the maintenance of heritage (Harrison 2010, 17). While tourism is often seen as creating a good basis for economic development, this does not always have to be the case. For example, in many countries the development of a tourism industry also introduced problems such as a large black market, overcrowding of sites, and pollution (Stronza 2001, 268). Another problem with tourism is the so-called 'commodification of culture' which refers to culture becoming a tradable good or commodity, based on its economic market value (Stronza 2001, 270). This may have a negative effect on the way in which local communities value their heritage on terms of its original sociocultural value (Stronza 2001, 270). However, this does not necessarily have to be the case. There should be both immediate and longer-lasting benefits of heritage visiting, which are both beneficial to the visitors and to the local communities (McIntosh 1999, 47). This is what sustainable tourism is useful for.

Heritage tourism can be considered as a standard collaboration between conservationists and commercial promoters (Jameson 2008, 59). It is often used as a way to enthuse people for the past and to turn it into a commodity at the same time (Jameson 2008, 59). However, unfortunately the motives of conservationists and commercial promoters are clearly not the same, which may cause issues (Jameson 2008, 59). The same is true for the values they, and also urban planners, attribute to heritage. To be able to find solutions to these issues, there are two specific theories which can create an environment for better cooperation: the 'heritagescape' theory (Garden 2009), and the 'experience economy' theory (Pine and

Gilmore 1999). These theories offer comprehensive and new manners in which to deal with heritage in places that are urban as well as important tourist attractions already.

2.5 Experiencing the Heritagescape

What is especially important in any discussion of heritage tourism and its possibilities, is the experience value of tourism and heritage. Because the experience seems to be a crucial value in both tourism and heritage, it is therefore important to consider this experience more in-depth. A highly interesting theory to apply here is that presented by Pine and Gilmore in their book 'The Experience Economy' (1999). They define four different experience dimensions: passive participation, active participation, immersion, and absorption (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30). Passive participation means that customers do not directly affect or influence the performance, whereas in active participation they do (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30). Absorption means that an experience is brought into the mind, while immersion means that a customer physically or virtually becomes a part of the experience itself (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 31).

These dimensions then connect to four different experience realms: entertainment, education, escape, and estheticism (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31). Entertainment only needs passive participation and absorption, education needs more active participation and absorption, escape requires active participation and immersion, and in estheticism people are immersed but passively participate (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 31-36). The eventual goal of anyone creating an experience for customers would be to involve each of the four experience realms, finding what Pine and Gilmore have termed 'the sweet spot' (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 43). This is also what heritage managers and urban planners in city centres dealing with Roman archaeological heritage should do. While urban planners are expected to be involved in the estheticism experience realm, heritage managers are expected to be involved with creating the education experience realm. Together, heritage managers and urban planners should attempt to create the right urban environment to accommodate the realms of entertainment and escape. However, this can only happen when they cooperate sufficiently.

Still, it may not be enough to just wish to provide tourists with a nice heritage experience. Like heritage itself, an experience may also become 'commoditized' (Pine 2002, 23). Of course, commoditization is not the aim since that is already happening in the case of individual heritage sites. What should be aimed for is a higher goal: that of transformation (Pine 2002, 24). 'With transformations, the economic offering of a business is the individual person or company changes as a result of what the company does. In other words, the

customer is the product!' (Pine 2002, 24). In the case of heritage, the deep heritage tourist could be the product. However, to be able to do this, it is important to understand what the customer wants – what they are looking for, aside from the experience? (Pine 2002, 25). There are many possible suggestions of what kind of transformation a heritage visitor may go through: from uncultured to cultured, from first-time visitor to knowledgeable patron (Pine 2002, 26). From a heritage management point of view, the aim is to eventually create a knowledgeable patron. The theory of the 'experience economy' will help in creating this.

Another interesting theory of recent years with regards to the way people experience heritage in an urban setting, is provided by Garden (2009). She raises a number of important issues concerning the 'heritage site', the first being that it is still unclear exactly what a heritage site is and does (Garden 2009, 270). Although a heritage site can be both a tangible place and a social space, it is difficult to design a methodology which takes both of these sides of the heritage site into account (Garden 2009, 270-271). With the idea of the heritagescape, Garden attempts to do this (Garden 2009, 271).

The heritagescape addresses the following issues:

1) it is structured enough to offer a replicable and transparent means of analysis, while at the same time it is flexible enough to accommodate the particular 'personalities' of individual heritage sites (Garden 2009, 274).

2) It does not aim to provide a single incontrovertible answer, but attempts to offer a measure, or a constant, against which individual sites may be evaluated both as specific places and in relation to other sites (Garden 2009, 274).

3) The flexibility of the methodology can easily accommodate other forms of analysis, such as visitor surveys, to supplement the methodology (Garden 2009, 274).

She suggests that other theories, such as the landscape theories, are inadequate when it comes to ongoing processes (garden 2009, 272). Obviously, ongoing processes are key in the discussion at hand, since city centres are forever changing and should be considered in a diachronic perspective. Instead, the heritage site as a landscape has mostly been considered as a synchronic concept, rather than a diachronic approach (Garden 2009, 274). This should be changed, especially in order to create more sustainable heritage tourism.

The three guiding principles, which are also important in our cases studies, are based around the ideas of (1) boundaries, (2) cohesion, and (3) visibility, which must all be present to actually be able to speak of a heritagescape (Garden 2009, 275). If all three are present, and 'robust' (operating in approximately equal proportions), this will help visitors to translate

these ideas into an experience that offers a sense of the site being both a place 'of the past' and a place 'apart' (Garden 2009, 275). This is what should be aimed for in any heritagescape, but this is especially important in city centres because they are inherently diachronic.

Heritagescapes are not static or frozen spaces, but they are dynamic, evolving spaces and this theory connects it to change as a process (Garden 2009, 288). A city centre, which shows changes most clearly in its archaeological record, depends heavily on showing the heritagescape to visitors as well as to locals. What the theory of the heritagescape does is that 'it moves the dialogue away from the individual heritage site and in this way the focus is drawn to the relationship with its larger landscape and with other sites' (Garden 2009, 289). This is what is needed to make as many stakeholders as possible feel that their values are being represented by what is done with the heritage. However, it is important to note that it is a logical historical outcome that individual historical attractions in restricted portions of the urban space at mostly what is found in European centres (Russo 2002, 21). While this is a logical situation currently, it is necessary to use the theory of the heritagescape to move away from this focus on individual sites.

2.6 Sustainable Heritage Tourism

Sustainable development is a term that has been drawing attention for many years now. There are many types of sustainable development, such as sustainable ecological development, sustainable environmental development, and sustainable economical development. However, in recent years sustainable tourism development has become a hot topic throughout the world. With the immensely increased globalisation which the world is experiencing at this moment, tourism has grown exponentially. In order to make it a more sustainable endeavour a number of suggestions have been made by different authors.

Mason traces the influence of the concept of sustainability back to environmental decision making, in which it has proven especially effective and influential as an organizing principle (Mason 2008, 121). Indeed, in the context of the environment, sustainable development usually is combined with sustainable economic development (Throsby 2002, 107). However, it is important to note that full sustainability is only an ideal (Mason 2008, 121). Still, principles of sustainable development have become influential in the urban development field, as well as in the heritage conservation-planning field (Mason 2008, 122). While sustainable development provides a good basic principle for bringing many different stakeholders together, it is especially important to create a good working environment for the

cooperation of heritage managers and urban planners. This can be done by specifically employing sustainable tourism principles.

Sustainability principles have been divided between 'strong' and 'weak' sustainability (Mason 2008, 123). Strong sustainability demands immediate and full application of sustainability principles and is not negotiable, which is hardly possible, and therefore unsustainable (Mason 2008, 123). In heritage conservation, this is the stance of many conservationists, who do not want a site to deteriorate, and want to preserve it in situ. This has caused a preservation culture which is completely unsustainable. Some countries have immense lists of protected historic buildings, such as France (Throsby 2002, 101) and the United Kingdom (English Heritage 2011), and it is often the community who pays taxes in order to maintain these buildings on the advice of conservationists (Throsby 2002, 101). The sheer number of protected sites make them unsustainable.

On the other hand, weak sustainability allows change and is more flexible (Mason 2008, 123). It does not attempt to freeze things in place (Mason 2008, 123). This is the type of sustainability which policy makers and investors usually look for (Mason 2008, 123), but urban planners certainly want this too. However, economists are accused by conservationists of being too focused on the monetary value of heritage (Throsby 2002, 101). However, it is known that economically, cultural tourism generates very high revenues and employment possibilities (Russo 2002, 17). Specifically, it may create specialised services like personal services, information-intensive services, hi-tech services, creative industries services, etcetera (Russo 2002, 17).

Here, once again, the sociocultural value and economic value seem to be the problem when attempting to communicate and cooperate. One cannot simply force a viewpoint onto someone else. Therefore, the way to a solution is not to try to convince stakeholders of either the sociocultural value or the economic value, but to show all stakeholders the opportunities cooperation can give for both sociocultural and economic purposes. The way to do this, is promoting sustainable tourism.

Sustainable tourism is on the rise and has been for over two decades. Since the so-called Brundlandt Report, or the World Commission on Environment and Development Report from 1987, the application of sustainability practices has become more and more central, also in the tourism sector (Bramwell and Lane 2011, 413; Throsby 2002, 107). Based on the explanations in the Brundlandt Report about sustainability, which states that 'Humanity has the possibility to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'

(World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, 24). Although this report focused mostly on sustainable development through environmental and economic sustainability, the quotation above can be used to define sustainable tourism in a satisfactory way. In this way, sustainable tourism can be described as 'tourism that meets the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (Bramwell and Lane 2011, 413). Indeed, the United Nations World Commission on Culture and Development brought the ideas of sustainable development into the discussion surrounding cultural development in 1995 (Throsby 2002, 107).

The question of how sustainable tourism can be created cannot be answered very easily, since it is highly dependent on context. However, the policies of the United Nations' Environment Programme and the World Tourism Organisation both focus on a balance between economic, social-cultural, and environmental sustainability (Bramwell and Lane 2011, 413). Over time the ideas behind this balance have been questioned, and it has been suggested that in fact the balance is never there since focus is always on the economic sustainability (Bramwell and Lane 2011, 413). It cannot be doubted that sustainable tourism has served as a good concept to bring people with different ideas about the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of tourism together (Bramwell and Lande 2011, 414). However, it might well be very beneficial to speak about the possibility to use the concept of sustainable tourism to encourage cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners. After all, where heritage managers wish to focus on the sociocultural aspects of heritage, urban planners like to focus more on the economic and environmental sides of cultural heritage.

There are also those who refer to new types of tourism such as sustainable tourism as 'alternative tourism' which basically includes all forms of tourism that are consistent with natural, social, and community values and also allow for the wholesome combination of both visitor and community experiences (Stronza 2001, 274). Indeed, cultural tourism is essentially a clean industry and it is therefore quite recommendable to convert for example former industrial districts into touristic areas (Russo 2002, 17). However, it must almost be a focus of those who wish to create a lively tourism industry to make sure there is sustainability. Specifically, a place has to have the physical capacity to absorb the potential amount of visitors to a location without the actual archaeological remains being damaged (Russo 2002, 21). This is something that urban planners are experts in. They can design city centres in such a way that infrastructure and architecture are balanced.

It is important to understand that there is a difference between sustainable development and sustainable tourism. These two terms do not mean the same, as is explained excellently by Geoffrey Wall in his paper about sustainable tourism (Wall 1997). What is especially important to realise is that although sustainable tourism has proven to be a great starting point for a discussion about mutually beneficial approaches to development, it does not automatically lead to sustainable development (Wall 1997, 33). While sustainable development focuses on a multi-sectoral approach, sustainable tourism clearly seems to have only one interest at heart: that of the tourism industry (Wall 1997, 34 and 44). Where Wall focuses on the connection between the term sustainable tourism as applied in the case of nature tourism, this does not always have to be the case (Wall 1997, 46). In this paper, focus is on sustainable tourism for Roman remains in city centres. Although the term may have evolved from a report on environmental issues and sustainable development, the principles on which sustainable tourism has been built can also be useful in the application in city centres with regard to Roman remains as will be shown in the case studies and the analysis chapter.

2.7 Sustainable Heritage Tourism is the Key to Cooperation

Although it may seem easy to look for solutions for cooperation, it is not always so. One way to facilitate cooperation is to find common ground. On the basis of the above discussion of various theories crucial in today's heritage field as well as in the urban planning sector, several points are important to keep in mind when looking for solutions. Firstly, the values of different stakeholders should be fully understood. A difference should be recognized between sociocultural values and economic values. Secondly, sustainability is a key concept when considering the possibility for cooperation. Since strong sustainability is infeasible, weak sustainability is what should be taken as a guiding principle. Thirdly, the type of sustainability which is most suitable to the wants and needs of both heritage managers and urban planners is sustainable tourism. Attempting to create sustainable tourism in city centres with Roman remains is what will bring heritage managers and urban planners closer together. Specifically the use of the 'experience economy' and 'heritagescape' theories to create sustainable tourism will create a fruitful cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers.

3: CASE STUDY: ROME

3.1 Introduction

As described in the introduction of this thesis, the purpose of this investigation is to find out in what way the views of some of the stakeholders concerning archaeological heritage can be merged. Specifically, points of common interest between heritage managers and urban developers are searched for. The main point of common interest is sustainable heritage tourism, which has advantages for both heritage managers and urban planners because it brings together the different types of values they attribute to archaeological heritage. To investigate whether this is possible, several cities have been examined as case studies. The first city is Rome. The aim of this chapter is threefold. First, it explores how a city with such extensive Roman remains as Rome has dealt with some aspects of its heritage in past urban restructuring. Secondly, the influence of World Heritage Status on the city of Rome is discussed. Thirdly, it examines two examples of urban planning and archaeological heritage interplay in the city. In total, this provides the reader with an overview of the various advantages and disadvantages of having a large number of Roman archaeological sites within one city, of being inscribed on the WHL, and of attracting an immense number of tourists every year.

In many ways, Rome is just like other great cities in the world, and therewith struggles with the same problems that figure in those other cities: congestion, pollution, traffic problems, degradation of the urban landscape, and the disintegration of social and human relations, to name just a few (Archibugi 2010). However, Rome is very different as well: it has the largest surviving number of Roman remains right in the middle of its historic centre. Where over time many other large European cities have removed much of their historical centres, Rome has retained many of its monuments to some degree. It has therefore had to deal with very different problems while restructuring its centre in hopes of adjusting to the exponential urban growth over the past centuries but specifically during the past couple of decades. However, Rome has had a different process of urbanization from other European cities; where other European cities went through a process of urban reorganization in Baroque times, Roman planners did not need to because there had not been a very great population boom in the city until the end of the 19th century (Archibugi 2010, 2). However, at the start of the 20th century the European emphasis on conservation was also felt in Rome and the planners believed it best to employ peripheral urban sprawl instead (ArchiBugi 2010, 2-4). As

ArchiBugi states: 'Rome's peculiarity is that it was a century late in its growth and a century early in its commitment to preservation' (2010, 4).

3.2 Values, Stakeholders, and World Heritage

As discussed in the previous chapters, there are always many stakeholders with many different values involved with heritage. Taking Mason's idea about categories of value given to heritage by different stakeholders, we can consider some of the most important ones here shortly (Mason 2008, 102). Economic, historical, spiritual, political, educational, aesthetic, and artistic values all play an important role (Mason 2008, 102), and often stakeholders are concerned with several of these values. This is certainly also the case in Rome. On a local level, urban planners are especially interested in the economic and aesthetic values, trying to improve or maintain the infrastructure and social structure of a place by making it a beautiful but also an economically sustainable area. Heritage managers are usually more focused on the sociocultural values of sites, specifically the historical, educational, aesthetic, and perhaps occasionally also the economic values of a site. However, international stakeholders are also important because the city centre of Rome is an important tourist attraction.

The values that are important to the international stakeholder group of heritage tourists are difficult to distinguish. However, in Rome it seems that tourists are more interested in the historical and aesthetic values of sites. During research in Rome conducted during a course there, 11 people were interviewed at the Coliseum (De Vita, Fokke, and Fredholm 2011). The questions were standardized and the information was used as a basis for a presentation (De Vita, Fokke, and Fredholm 2011; for interview transcripts see Appendix I). What becomes clear from the interviews is that there are tourists from all over the world who come to visit the Coliseum. Furthermore, most of them consider it a symbol. However, what becomes blatantly clear from the great variety of answers is that the opinions about what the Coliseum symbolizes vary greatly. This is the problem with distinguishing between different values; if the Coliseum is considered of symbolic value, it still has different specific symbolic values for almost everyone. This means that the international community as a whole cannot be considered as one stakeholder group, and neither can heritage tourists. Every tourist is looking for a different experience and attaches a different value to a heritage site. The interviews at the Coliseum clearly show this.

If it is impossible to ascribe a specific value to be at the basis of international heritage tourism, it is impossible to use it as a basis for further cooperation between heritage managers

and urban planners. However, what is an important value to be introduced here is the experience value. The 'experience economy' concept (Pine and Gilmore 1999) discussed in the theoretical overview provides a way to understand the values different stakeholders attribute to a specific heritage site. More importantly, experience is something so individual that if every person is allowed to experience a site with a focus on the value they deem most important, it quickly becomes a highly individual and therefore pleasing experience. To create sustainable tourism, the concept of experience should be central to cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers. Every person who goes to a certain location has a different experience. What should be attempted is to create a significant experience for every visitor, and the goal is always to transform (Stronza 2001, 261; Pine 2002, 24). If possible, the heritage tourist should be transformed from a shallow tourist to a deep tourist who might turn into a knowledgeable patron.

Another important international stakeholder is UNESCO, which represents the values of the international community. The World Heritage Committee has designated Rome as an important World Heritage Site, therewith attributing outstanding universal values to the inner city. However, this does not necessarily mean that the site should be frozen in time. World Heritage Sites do not necessarily need to be static. Specifically, in the case of Rome the initial area suggested by the Italian state for inscription on the World Heritage List in 1980 was within the area of the Aurelian City Wall, but this bid was rejected because it did not take into account the medieval urban fortifications (Creighton 2007, 348). The eventual inscription was of the area up to and including the wall of Pope Urban VIII, and was expanded in 1990 to even include extra-mural properties (Creighton 2007, 348). Today, Rome is officially inscribed on the WHL as comprising the Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura.[5]

This means that basically the entire historical centre is under constant supervision by the international community. The influence of being a World Heritage Site comes forward clearly during the 16th session of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1992). During this session, the fact that the Coliseum was suffering from air pollution because of the road which runs directly around it, as well as suffering from the vibrations caused by the subway system was discussed (UNESCO 1992). Already during this session it was stressed in the case of Rome that periodic information was required so as to monitor which intentions States Parties had in terms of the conservation of monuments inscribed on the list (UNESCO 1992).

---

[5] See: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/91.

While at that time the Banco di Roma was offering financial aid to conserve the monument (UNESCO 1992), today the much needed restoration will be sponsored by Tod's shoes, a strangely commercial turn (BBC 2011). It would be very interesting to see what the World Heritage Committee thinks of this new turn, but no information about their opinion has been released.

While in the case of a city as large as Rome, there is an incredible amount of stakeholders involved with the heritage, one of the most important stakeholders is the Italian government. As mentioned previously all heritage is political, and political values permeate all other types of values (Mason 2008, 104). Rome is the capital of Italy, and the capital of a nation is both a national and an international symbol. Indeed, one of the interviewees at the Coliseum considered the Coliseum to be the symbol or Rome (De Vita, Fokke, and Fredholm 2011). National capitals often have a long history, and they represent the widest range of values and this is also true for Rome. What is extremely interesting in the case of Rome, is the legacy of the Fascist Era, which is in fact still very visible in both city planning and the preservation of the archaeological heritage, much more so than its World Heritage Status.

3.3 Fascism, Heritage, Urban Planning

It is especially in the historic centre where Fascist imperial ideology is perhaps most clearly visible in the urban landscape (Archibugi 2010, 19). The Fascist leader Mussolini at first compared himself to Julius Caesar, but because the story of a conqueror being murdered did not suit his Imperialist objectives, he soon began to compare himself to the emperor Augustus, and 1930s Rome to Augustan Rome (Wilkins 2005, 53-54). Augustan Rome was a highly successful Rome with immense colonial power, but also peace and great works of art and architecture. This was what attracted Mussolini to the idealistic image of Rome as the capital of the World, in a sense. To be able to re-create Augustan Roma as Mussolini idealistically imagined it to have been, resulted in the need to restructure the entire city.

The Fascist regime's treatment of the urban planning of Rome's historic centre is visible in many cases, some more clearly than others. The Master Plan (City Development Plan) was approved in 1931, and was a prime example of the Fascists' ideological connection to ancient Rome (Painter 2005, 16-17). There were several reasons for their focus on the historic centre's urban landscape: inspiring the awe of tourists, making contemporary Italians proud of their heritage, and accommodating modern traffic (Painter 2005, 3). Mussolini ordered archaeologists to recover as much from Augustan times as was possible, not paying

any attention to other (earlier or later) periods (Wilkins 2005, 55). Important was the so-called 'liberation' of ancient structures, which basically was the clearing of space around ancient Roman remains such as the imperial forums, Augustus's Tomb, the Theater of Marcellus, and many other structures (Painter 2005, 4-5; Wilkins 2005, 55). These ideas were not new in themselves, but were used for new objectives, in a sense. For example, already in 1881 the Minister of Public Education, Guido Baccalli, started to demolish the urban area that had naturally grown up around the Pantheon to isolate it (La Rocca 2007, 159). However, to return to Fascism, broad roads were created in the city centre that were used for gatherings and marches, such as the Via dell'Impero which runs from the Monument of Vittorio Emanuele II to the Coliseum in a straight line, cutting through the various imperial Fora (La Rocca 2007, 166).

It is interesting to see that some of the elements of the theory of the 'heritagescape' can be found in the way Mussolini dealt with the Roman heritage in the city. Several individual heritage sites were used to create a larger landscape of heritage sites placed into a new, Fascist context. In this manner, the intangible social space where gatherings are held became connected to historical, tangible places. Connecting the tangible and the intangible is an important part of the 'heritagescape' theory (Garden 2009, 270-271). The way in which the heritage sites were used showed that they were flexible and their meanings could change over time, while at the same time all the sites were related to each other through their connection to the great Roman Empire and the Fascist Empire that Mussolini was attempting to create. Boundaries and visibility were created by 'liberating' the structures, while cohesion was created through the cohesive story of Imperial Rome and the current Fascist government. Since boundaries, visibility, and cohesion were all present, and 'robust' (Garden 2009, 275), the past was connected to the present. Obviously this was done for the wrong reasons, but it must be stated that this is an early example of the way in which the heritagescape can be used to create an experience for those who visit these Roman remains.

3.4 The Case of the Coliseum

One of the most interesting, but also one of the most problematic areas in Rome is the site of the Coliseum. Known as one of the greatest constructions of the Roman age, it has become an icon for the city and perhaps even for Italy as a whole. However, it is important to understand the history of the site and its directly surrounding areas to be able to engage in a meaningful discussion about the urban planning and heritage problems of the area. Built by the Flavian

emperors and dedicated in 80 AD by Titus (Welch 2007, 131), the Flavian Amphitheatre (or Coliseum, as we now know it) was built on the former location of an artificial lake which had been part of the famous Emperor Nero's *Domus Aurea* (Welch 2007, 148; Hopkins and Beard 2005, 28-31), near which had stood the famous colossal gilded statue of Nero (Welch 2007, 150). Although the specifics are highly complicated, it is important to note that Nero was a very unpopular emperor, and that the building of the Flavian Amphitheatre on a site previously part of his palace was a clear political statement; 'the Flavian emperors were returning the centre of Rome to the Roman people' (Welch 2007, 148).

Within the urban planning of ancient Rome, the amphitheatre was built at the point where several major roads came together (the *Via Sacra*, the *Vicus Sandilarius*, the *Via Tusculana*, and the *Via Labicana*) and between some of Rome's most important hills (*the Oppina, Caelian, and Velian Hills*), right next to the Forum Romanum (Welch 2007, 131). This was partly because of the above-mentioned contrast with Nero's Golden House, and partly because of the suitability of the soil, the already present drainage system, and also because the land was already owned by the imperial family (Welch 2007, 132-133). Roman amphitheatres were usually built on the outskirts of cities (Welch 2007, 132), and perhaps its location in the city centre is part of its modern charm as well. However, placing a structure as large as the Coliseum in the centre of an already bustling city in ancient times would have great consequences for the development of the town throughout the years.

Many centuries later, the Coliseum had served many different purposes. For a long time it had been used as an amphitheatre, but after the decline of the Roman Empire it was mostly used as a quarry for marble and stone (La Rocca 2007, 150-152). Later suggestions were made for specific reappropriation, for example by Pope Sixtus V who wanted to transform it into a residential quarter with a wool mill and a fountain (La Rocca 2007, 152). This did not happen, and in 1675 the Coliseum was dedicated to the Christian Martyrs, and in 1756 it was declared a public church (La Rocca 2007, 152-153; Hopkins and Beard 2005, 5-7). In the 19th century preferences changed again, and in 1874 Catholic accretions were removed from the Coliseum (La Rocca 2007, 159).

The Coliseum and its surroundings as we see it now is largely still the product of the Fascist era. The Via dell'Impero (now the Via dei Fiori Imperiali) still leads towards it in a grand manner, and it is still used as the backdrop for many events, such as marathons and manifestations. It has been isolated from its surroundings, and its sole function appears to be inspiring awe in tourists who come pouring out of the metro station across the monument at every moment of the day. The large open spaces around the Coliseum are filled with masses

of tourists, tourist guides, and street vendors. Furthermore, the large numbers of tourists (4 million in 2005 according to Teichmann 2011, 47) have caused much decay, and the Italian state is not providing the funds needed for the conservation of the Roman landmark. Although the Coliseum is one of the greatest attractions of the city, the heavy traffic which passes by it causes much damage (as stated by UNESCO in 1992), and does not provide tourists with the most enjoyable experience. The experience realms of estheticism and escape (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31) are not at their maximum. It is difficult to see the beauty of the monument with so much soot on its walls, and so much traffic passing it at mere metres. Furthermore, the dangerous and busy road makes it difficult to truly immerse oneself in the experience and really enter the realm of the escape. The meaning of the monument is not conveyed because it is cut off from the landscape around it by artificial boundaries such as the road and many gates. A cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers should be able to create a solution for this problem that benefits many stakeholders. Through understanding attempts at the creation of sustainable tourism in other cities, Roman city planners and heritage managers could together find a solution for the combination of their aims through a shared interest in sustainable tourism.

3.5 The Testaccio Area

Although at first sight the situation may seem hopeless, there are also good examples in Rome of projects in which urban planners and archaeologists or heritage managers cooperate and discover solutions for problems that arise during the development of certain areas. One of these examples (which is still being developed), is the Testaccio Area in Rome. The Roman neighbourhood Testaccio already existed in ancient Roman times, and was Rome's fluvial port (Contino 2011; Sebastiani 2011). Currently, it is being redeveloped.

During a lecture at the Royal Dutch Institute in Rome on the 20th of May 2011, Alessia Contino from the Soprintendenza Speciale per I Beni Archeologici di Rome explained the current cooperation which is currently taking place in the area. The cooperation between the archaeologists and the municipality was described as exceptional, and that it was very rare that a full excavation could take place in which the post-excavation treatment of heritage was also considered (Contino 2011). A new building site was created in the neighbourhood, which would house a covered market area which is part of the economic livelihood of many of the Rione's inhabitants (Contino 2011). As is to be expected in a city like Rome, archaeological material was found. However, the material was of such exceptional quality, that the decision

was made with architects, archaeologists, and the municipality to develop an underground museum in the newly constructed market building (Contino 2011; Sebastiani 2011). Inspiration was drawn from sites in Ravenna and Barcelona where this has also been done, and the idea for an underground route with footbridges, rest areas, and passageways for disabled visitors came into existence (Contino 2011). Work on the site continues until today, but the excavations have largely been finished and much of the construction of the underground route is now underway. As potential users students (the area houses a large student community), locals, and tourists were named (Contino 2011).

However, one of the problems with the project is economic sustainability (Contino 2011). The economic sustainability of the project is an important consideration, because economic values are important for urban planners and developers but also for local residents. With a World Heritage Site as large as the City of Rome, will tourists truly come to a specific area in one of the lesser known neighbourhoods in Rome? To create economic sustainability, it is important to create an environment suitable for sustainable tourism. To be able to do this, the larger area of the Rione Testaccio should be taken into account. Indeed, one of the plans for the neighbourhood that was already created were information panels at key points in the neighbourhood (for example, the ancient ports) which provided information to visitors about the history of the area (Sebastiani 2011). The panels focus not just on the archaeological material, but more on the landscape of the area, the social identity aspects inherent to it, and the history of its population, taking a diachronic perspective and considering various time periods (ancient, medieval, and industrial for example). Unfortunately, although the interactive Smartphone application on the panels was supposed to work, they did not yet in May 2011. However, this is clearly an attempt to connect the different individual heritage sites in one are to create a more diachronic overview of the area's history both with tangible heritage and intangible heritage. This is what the 'heritagescape' theory aims to do (Garden 2009, 270-271, 274). By creating better accessibility and creating more visibility of the tangible heritage in the area the boundaries between the people and the heritage of the area are lessened. Furthermore, the cohesion is improved by showing the history of the area on the panels. Indeed, the fact that all that these things are present and 'robust' makes the area a clear example of a 'heritagescape' (Garden 2009, 275).

This project also reflects some of the main ideas presented in the theoretical overview concerning the 'experience economy' theory. Specifically, there are possibilities for those who are interested in it to experience the heritage in the four different experience dimensions (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30). Passive participation can take place in the Testaccio area by

simply walking around the neighbourhood and reading the panels. Active participation can take place when the people decide they wish to see the area's history from a different side, for example by going back in time instead of starting with the Romans and ending in the modern period. While the text panels cause absorption, visiting the market and the area underneath it with the excavation will cause a much more physical experience of the ancient heritage and its connection to the modern heritage of the area. They can experience the four different experience realms through being entertained and educated, while at the same time escaping modernity and experiencing the area's estheticism (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31). Here, the heritage managers and urban planners in the area have managed to create the opportunity for heritage tourists to hit the 'sweet spot'. The question remains whether this has caused transformation in the visitors (Pine 2002, 24). This cannot be ascertained in any other way then by performing visitor research. However, this was not within the scope of this thesis and therefore the only certainty there is, is that at least the possibility for this transformation has been created in the Testaccio area.

Still, there are improvement possibilities. Although a lot of money has been poured into the creation of the underground excavation area of the market (Contino 2011; Sebastiani 2011), more money and research should have been put into the panels and the route through the neighbourhood. A larger site with a variety of interesting time periods is much more sustainable than one specific archaeological site. It draws in a greater variety of people and offers different levels in terms of values and experiences. It may be what attracts tourists to an area in the first place, but the urban fabric should then be developed in such a way as to create an interesting larger 'heritagescape' which can be explored. This will take the stress of high numbers of tourists away from the main sites such as the Coliseum, meaning better conservation possibilities. It also provides economic opportunities for the locals throughout the neighbourhood as people spread more and make use of a variety of services attached to tourism. Therefore, although efforts are clearly being made, priorities should be reconsidered and there are still points for improvement. However, the 'Museo Diffuso' in the Rione Testaccio is clearly a step in the right direction.

3.6 Conclusion

As described above, the city of Rome is very important for a large variety of stakeholders, ranging from locals to the national government and to the international community via its inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The city's development shows an

interesting history of the relationship between urban planning and heritage management. As has been shown in the case study, there are often clashes between the values different stakeholders attach to the city. In the case of the Coliseum, many of the values clash and this becomes evident in its problematic role as the largest tourist attraction in the city, which makes its conservation expensive and time-consuming. By seeing the area around the Coliseum more as a 'heritagescape' and by considering the manner in which the visitor experiences the site as a whole, a more sustainable heritage tourism environment can be created. This is where the cooperation of both heritage managers and urban planners is key. However, what does become clear is that there are also examples of good attempts at cooperation in the city, such as in the Rione Testaccio. Here, the cooperation between the heritage managers and urban planners is better because both attempt to create a more sustainable touristic environment in the area which is being regenerated at the moment. This should be taken as an example of good practice in the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners.

4. CASE STUDY: BATH

4.1 Introduction

The City of Bath was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 on the basis of three of the four World Heritage Criteria (numbers I, ii, and iv).[6] It is especially well-known because of two specific periods in its history; the Roman period and the Georgian period. In this chapter, the focus lies on considering the issues involved with combining a World Heritage Status which so distinctly covers two periods in human history, of which one is the Roman age. Furthermore, Bath is in fact inscribed on the World Heritage List partly because of its urban planning history. This chapter has three aims. First, to explore in what way the balance between the Roman town and the Georgian town is addressed by museums and those involved with heritage tourism. Secondly, it considers modern planning and the effect of World Heritage Status on the city. Thirdly, this chapter investigates the possibility to create more sustainable heritage tourism in the city of Bath. By considering the history of the city and its change in heritage value over time, issues of stakeholders and values will come to the fore. Furthermore, through investigating current development within the city in relation to different stakeholders and their wants and needs, the practice of cooperation in a World Heritage Site will become clear. Eventually, this will lead to a good overview of issues of urban planning, heritage management, and sustainable tourism within a Western World Heritage City.

4.2 Values, Stakeholders, and World Heritage

The city of Bath has been designated as a World Heritage Site in 1987 because of both its Roman Baths and its Georgian architecture and urban planning.[7] Two specific and very different periods have been designated by its inscription on the World Heritage List. As in many city centres, earlier remains of the urban history have been covered under more recent building projects. In Bath, these newer buildings have specifically been designated as World Heritage because of their significance for Georgian history. This complicates the city's relation with its Roman past because in the World Heritage inscription emphasis is laid on a single Roman site within its boundaries: the Roman Baths. This discourages the view of a the centre as a diachronic 'heritagescape', the basis of the arguments presented in this thesis.

---

[6] See: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/
[7] See: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/

One of the main advantages of the city's designation as World Heritage is the obligation to produce World Heritage Management Plans. This offers heritage managers the possibility to clearly outline their ideas about the direction of future management, while at the same time it shows other stakeholders what the ideas are about the management of the city's heritage. The City of Bath has so far produced two Management Plans, the first in 2003 and another one in 2010. The Management Plans specifically lead to a consideration of the various stakeholders and their values. While for the 2003 Plan many different stakeholders had to be contacted separately on topics such as business, transport, environmental conservation, regeneration, tourism, and education, this was not necessary anymore for the 2010 Plan (City of Bath 2010, 12). The creation of the first management plan depends on cooperation with a Steering Group which consists of both local and national organisations and representatives from various sectors of the city (City of Bath 2003, 6). These and other stakeholders are contacted during the preparation of the plan, so that the various values these stakeholders may have with regards to the site are represented in the plans (City of Bath 2003, 6). Because the 2010 Plan was basically a revision and extension of the first Plan, a stakeholder workshop in December 2009 reviewed the topics presented in the 2003 plan and the draft of the Plan was then put up for full public consultation in the summer of 2010 (City of Bath 2010, 12; Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). Clearly, the fact that Bath is a World Heritage Site encourages cooperation between different stakeholders on a local level in a structured and transparent manner. A variety of values, from sociocultural to economic ones are taken into account as shown by the list of topics on which local and national stakeholders were consulted.

However, the international community also is a stakeholder because of the World Heritage Status of the city of Bath. The outstanding universal value of the site is a crucial point in the consideration of the international stakeholders such as international heritage tourists. While this value is emphasised in the Management Plan of 2010, it is also stated that the sustainability of the city as a working and living city is important (City of Bath 2010, 14). Furthermore, reference is made to both local development projects which may threaten the universal outstanding value of the site, and international attention for these local developments (City of Bath 2010, 14). This refers to the UNESCO Mission Report which was written when a UNESCO and ICOMOS mission visited the city due to redevelopment projects (City of Bath 2010, 14; Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). Although it may be suggested that international stakeholders could perhaps have been more involved from the beginning on, this is basically impossible because by the time that UNESCO has reviewed development proposals the development is already underway (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). Furthermore,

legally UNESCO has no influence on local planning decisions (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). This means that although the values of both local stakeholders and international stakeholders are considered important, it is difficult to take the international stakeholders into account because of practical and bureaucratic reasons.

4.3 Roman and Georgian Heritage: Excavations and Urban Development

One of the main features of the city of Bath are its hot springs. They are the only hot springs in the whole of Britain and already in Celtic times the springs were considered sacred, and home to the Goddess Sulis (Unichrome 1983, 3). While it is unclear when exactly the springs were discovered by the Romans, soon after the Roman conquest of Britain in 43 AD a bath was built in the area and the city was named Aquae Sulis (Unichrome 1983, 3; Cunliffe 1969, 1). However, Roman Bath seems to have a very interesting history, about which a lot still remains unclear. It seems that all the facilities belonging to the Baths were laid out in the second half of the 1st century AD, including the temple's first stage (Cunliffe 1971, 79). Over the years, the town expanded. At the start of the 2nd century AD visitors were attracted to the town from all over the Roman empire, attested to by the inscriptions found throughout the town (Cunliffe 1971, 79). During the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries the importance of the town became reflected more in the protective walls that were built around it, as well as in the development of houses (Cunliffe 1971, 80). Later on, the town developed into a real market town, and many villas were built in its vicinity (Cunliffe 1971, 80). After the Roman period, the next important period in the building of the city of Bath is the Georgian urban planning that took place in the city.

After the decline of the Roman Empire, the baths fell into disrepair and were covered by earth (Unichrome 1983, 3). However, the hot spring still poured forth the hot water from the earth, and during the Middle Ages the water was also used (Unichrome 1983, 4). During the 18th century the increase in visitors caused the need for redevelopment of the town, and in 1727 while working in Stall Street, workmen discovered the by now famous gilded bronze head of Minerva and remains of a hypocaust (Cunliffe 1971, 36; Unichrome 1983, 7). At that time, urban planning and redevelopment was considered of higher importance than excavations. This is shown in the example of the findings of Roman remains in 1755, while building new baths (Cunliffe 1971, 36; Unichrome 1983, 7). The Roman remains were recorded briefly and then reburied and built over by the new baths, because it was too costly a delay (Cunliffe 1971, 37; Unichrome 1983, 7). This is a practice that is still used today

because of the pressure put on modern developers by the 1992 Convention (Council of Europe 1992).

It is clear that over the long period during which Bath has existed, many changes have occurred in the city's planning. For example, while currently the Abbey is one of the biggest tourist attractions in the city, the building itself used to be much larger in the 11th century (McCoy 2011). The city's number of inhabitants has grown exponentially over the past centuries. While at the start of the 18th century around 3000 people lived in Bath, this number grew to 33.000 at the end of the century (McCoy 2011). Indeed, one of the main reasons for the city's fame are the huge amount of houses and urban planning projects that were undertaken under the auspices of the architects John Wood the Elder and John Wood the Younger (McCoy 2011). One of the most characteristic traits of Bath houses is the so-called 'Bath Stone' which is a type of stone mined in the hills just outside the city (McCoy 2011). Although most of the houses were built with this stone, there were different types of ways in which the stones were reworked (McCoy 2011). On a conservation level the type of stone is quite easy to clean, even though it absorbs soot, because the only thing that needs to be done to it is that by dripping water on it for a week, and then it needs to be cleaned with a soft brush (McCoy 2011).

Over the years, many Roman remains were discovered. It is very important to note that the Roman baths and the temple are certainly not the only Roman remains in the city. At a variety of places throughout the city remains have been found during (re)building works (Cunliffe 1969, 156-181; Cunliffe 1971, 66-80). Remains of what may have been a theatre, a great monument, and another temple have been found during Georgian building projects (Cunliffe 1969, 188-192; Cunliffe 1971, 66-71). However, some small-scale excavations have also been carried out in the city. An example is the excavation at Abbeygate Street (Cunliffe 1971, 71-73). Not only remains of walls have been found, but also a number of mosaics, some of which were lifted and are now on display in the Roman Baths (Cunliffe 1971, 75). In 1963 the Bath Excavation Committee was founded, of which one of the main aims was creating awareness among the public about the Roman Baths (Cunliffe 1971, 77; Unichrome 1983, 10). Indeed, focus in the past has mostly been on the Roman Baths and the Temple of Sulis Minerva. This is still the case today, both on local and international levels as shown by its designation on the World Heritage List.

4.4 The Past in the Present: The SouthGate Shopping Area

One of the most interesting recent projects in the city can be found near the Bath Spa train station. Here, a new shopping centre was planned, which was meant to replace an older shopping centre at the same location (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.; Bath and North East Somerset Council 2011). In fact, this was the first major regeneration project in the city centre of Bath for over 30 years (Bath and North East Somerset Council 2011). The project was completed in September 2010 (Bath and North East Somerset Council 2011). The Southgate Shopping Area was a controversial development because many stakeholders were involved with it. On a local level, stakeholders were local shop owners and residents, as well as the heritage managers and the project developers. On a more global level, the international community was alerted to the developments and in fact UNESCO and ICOMOS visited Bath because they had heard about the redevelopment projects taking place in the city (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.).

It is interesting to explore the difference of opinion which presented itself between international and local stakeholders. UNESCO and ICOMOS dispatched an international group which was hosted in Bath for three days in 2008 (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). UNESCO probably heard about the redevelopments via local residents with a more conservative point of view who were afraid of what was going to happen in their city centre (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). The Mission eventually concluded that the specific developments in the city were not necessarily threatening to the outstanding universal values of the site (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). They even stated that the new shopping centre was not modern enough in their opinion (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). The Mission thought that a more modern architectural approach should have been taken instead of what they referred to as a 'pastiche' or retrospective design (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). The WestGate shopping centre was specifically designed to resemble the Georgian city centre buildings and Bath Stone was used to build it (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.; WestGate 2011). On the shopping centre's website it specifically states that: '*SouthGate, Bath is not an enclosed shopping centre of the past. It's a modern shopping destination, with classic Georgian-style open streets and public space.*' (WestGate 2011).

So although eventually the local stakeholders turned out to love the shopping centre's appearance, UNESCO's view was that there should have been a bigger push for more contemporary architecture (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). Clearly there is a clash between the opinions of local stakeholders and that of international stakeholders such as UNESCO. This

shows that cooperation is not always easy. However, in terms of sustainable heritage tourism it is important that the 'heritagescape' theory is kept in mind. If both the tangible and the intangible aspects of a site should be taken into account (Garden 2009, 270-271), it is also important to understand that the intangible aspects of the current local stakeholders' beliefs are shown in their acceptance of the new SouthGate shopping centre. The intangible aspect forms part of the creation of a sustainable heritage environment which can adapt to changing perspectives.

While ongoing processes are crucial in the discussion at hand, the changing city centre should be considered in a diachronic perspective. Unfortunately today the heritage site as a landscape is usually considered as a synchronic concept (Garden 2009, 274). This point of view is reflected in the opinions expressed by UNESCO representatives about the lack of modern input in the design of the new shopping centre. The SouthGate shopping centre has now also become part of the city's 'heritagescape', and should simply be considered as the next step in its history. It is visible, provides cohesion, and does not have a lot of boundaries, which are the main ideas behind the concept of the 'heritagescape' (Garden 2009, 275). Even if its design can be considered as conservative, this does not necessarily diminish its sustainability from a heritage point of view.

4.5 The Past in the Present: Thermae Bath Spa

Cunliffe notes that the tourist value of the hot springs was already recognised in Roman times, and he even names it as one of the two reasons for the early growth of the settlement (Cunliffe 1971, 80). However, in the present the tourist value of the hot springs reaches out over approximately 2000 years of history. The past is in a way transported to the present through the recent completion of the modern spa facility in the city centre of Bath, called the Thermae Bath Spa. Like the redevelopment of the WestGate shopping area, the development of the brand new spa facility also caused a lot of local unrest.

The springs which have been a major tourist attraction for such a long time have been inaccessible for bathers since the 1970s due to an unfortunate incident with a woman who got Legionnaires Disease (Jones 2006). However, after many years a new building was designed which eventually cost over 45 million pounds and which may not fit very well in the city's Georgian urban landscape (Jones 2006). The way in which the heritage of the city is once again accessible to any and all who wish to make use of it has been pointed out in the media (Jones 2006), but also on the spa's website, the welcome message states: 'Welcome to

Thermae Bath Spa where past, present and future join for a special spa experience. Now in the World Heritage city of Bath you can enjoy Britain's only natural thermal waters as the Celts and Romans did over 2000 years ago' (Thermae Bath Spa 2011).

Although the amount of money poured into the new spa has been criticized (Jones 2006), it has indeed created a different heritage tourism environment. Specifically, it has created a more economically sustainable heritage tourism environment. Where before the opening of the spa in 2006 many tourists were day trip tourist who would visit the Roman Baths, would eat something, and then would get back on the coach which would take them to for example Stonehenge or Stratford-upon-Avon (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). It was important to change this model of tourism and now, several years after the opening of the new spa, the average visitor's stay is over two days (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.).

Indeed, the Thermae Bath Spa can be considered as a good example of the 'experience economy' theory. With the addition of the new spa to Bath's city centre, it becomes easier for tourists to hit the 'sweet spot'. The four different experience dimensions (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31) can easily be found within the city centre now. Passive participation and absorption can be found in the various museums in the city such as at the Roman Baths, while active participation and absorption are found at the spa. The Thermae Bath Spa offers tourists the possibility to truly use the site in a physical way. The experience realms of entertainment, education, escape, and estheticism (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31) are also all to be found in the city centre. Not only in relation to the experience of either the Roman or the modern thermal baths, but also in experiencing the urban planning development in the city during Georgian times. By experiencing the historical side as well as the modern beneficial side of heritage in Bath, a transformation might take place within the tourist. Perhaps the amount of two-day visits to the city is already proof of this happening.

4.6 Conclusion

From the above it has become clear that although Bath is not a metropolis, there is still an immense amount of stakeholders involved with its heritage. The struggle between Roman, Georgian, and modern heritage is clearly visible in the discussions concerning the different development projects. However, the city is clearly well accustomed to working with such a wide variety of stakeholders. This becomes clear in the Management Plans, but is also shown in the way the different values, needs, and wants of the local residents as well as (inter)national tourists are taken into account. While much has been done already, it is

important to connect the theories of the 'heritagescape' and the 'experience economy' more clearly. At the moment, these seem to be applied (unconsciously) in a rather separate way. This separation is also visible in the different levels of heritage which are important. There is the individual site of the Roman Baths, and the Georgian urban setting as a whole. What could truly improve cooperation between urban planning and heritage management in Bath is the consideration of the possibilities of combining these two theories by attempting to emphasize the connection between the different periods in the city's lifespan in order to create sustainable heritage tourism which takes into account as many stakeholders' values as possible. Inspiration may be drawn from other cities in Europe, and specifically spa cities. Because it is the hot springs which are both tangible and intangible heritage of Bath and have shaped the city's history as well as its form.

5. CASE STUDY: COLOGNE

5.1 Introduction

The city of Cologne, in the province of Nordrhein-Westfalen, is the fourth largest city in Germany (Trier and Tempel 2005, 32). On a daily basis it has to deal with many of the problems of large European cities, such as infrastructure issues. For the purpose of this thesis, the city is interesting for four specific reasons. Firstly, it is one of the most important cities in north-western Europe on the basis of the Roman archaeological record. Secondly, the Cathedral of Cologne has been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1996 and was shortly placed on the World Heritage List in Danger between 2004 and 2006 due to urban development plans in the city (UNESCO 2011). Thirdly, currently the city is redeveloping the urban metro-structures, and this has caused much controversy concerning the destruction of the archaeological record. Fourthly, currently a new museum is being developed in the city centre which has also caused a lot of controversy both because of its effect on the urban fabric, and because of the way it deals with the archaeological remains of the city. By exploring these issues in-depth, an overview is given of the various threats to the Roman remains in the city, as well as the opportunities for creating sustainable tourism which will improve the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners significantly.

5.2 History of Urban Development and Excavations

Although the history of Cologne draws back to the city of the Ubii, the *oppidum Ubiorum*, of main importance here is its designation as an official Roman colony in AD 50 (Von Elbe 1995, 9-10). Named the *Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (CCAA)*, the city became a melting pot of various cultures and ethnicities and around AD 90 became the capital of the Roman province of *Germania inferior* (Von Elbe 1995, 10-11). The important Roman city had many monumental buildings, such as a large stone wall with nine gates and nineteen round towers, as well as various temples, a provincial palace, and baths (Von Elbe 1995, 13-14). Not much of Cologne's Roman past is visible on for those who wish to see it. A gate has been reconstructed using original materials near the Cathedral, but is dwarfed next to the World Heritage Monument. Furthermore, some remains of the city walls are preserved throughout the modern city (Von Elbe 1995, 16-17).

A number of excavations have taken place in the city over the past decades, of which one of the most impressive was that of 1979 to the north of the Kurt-Hackenberg-Platz (Trier and Tempel 2005, 39). Here, remains of the Roman port were found, including wooden remains of the docks datable to about AD 90, as well as several Roman ships (Trier and Tempel 2005, 39). Over the centuries, Roman graves have been discovered on several occasions, for example in the 1960s, especially around the Chlodwigplatz (Trier and Tempel 2005, 41). Furthermore, many Roman remains such as graves, have been discovered during redevelopment in the area of the Friedhof on the Jakobstrasse between 1929 and 1930 (Friedhoff 1991, 15-18). Each of these locations are within the urban environment and therefore cause different stakeholders to be involved. Specifically, urban developers are confronted with the remains because their plans are often slowed down. However, heritage managers including scientific archaeologist also are stakeholders who wish to utilize the Roman remains in a way they seem fit, often for academic research. This creates a clash between the different values that these stakeholders attach to the archaeological heritage. While developers are usually more concerned about the economic values of the area as a whole, heritage managers can be very focused on the sociocultural values of the remains found at a certain location (see Table 1, above; Mason 2008, 103, table 7.2). What should happen is an exchange of information about values between stakeholders. While urban planners should understand the sociocultural values of Roman remains, and heritage managers and archaeologists should understand the economic values an area may have. The way to create this understanding is to explain how the values presented in Table 1 are very comparable and can be used both ways.

Cologne has a long history of urban redevelopment, reaching back to Roman times (Trier and Tempel 2005, 32). Even after the fall of the Roman Empire the city remained an important trade centre due to its excellent location on the Rhine, and the Roman remains were destructed in a quest for building materials, or simply to make room for new buildings (Von Elbe 1995, 15). Although Van Elbe has stated that this 'destructive trend' has now been reversed (1995, 15), this does not entirely seem to be the case. Although the discoveries of the Governor's Palace and the Dionysos Mosaic both took place during urban redevelopment projects and were both preserved *in situ* (Von Elbe 1995, 16), many of the remains discovered during current work on the metro system have not been saved (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). The Dionysos Mosaic has been displayed in the Roman-Germanic Museum next to the Cathedral, and the architectural design of the museum was adjusted during the building process to accommodate the mosaic in the best way possible. Today, the large, square

museum building seems unattractive and boring next to the immense Gothic Cathedral. However, the cooperation of heritage managers and architects and urban planners is still visible in the manner in which the glass front of the museum offers anyone who passes by an excellent view on the mosaic, still *in situ*. Here, both sociocultural values and economic values (Mason 2008, 103) have been combined in order to create sustainable heritage tourism in the sense of awareness-raising.

The architecture of the Roman-Germanic Museum seems to have taken into account the theory of the 'heritagescape' (Garden 2009) It seems to attempt to connect the heritage site to both a tangible place in the middle of the city at the central square at the Cathedral, while at the same time the way they display it connects it to the intangible side of life and speicifcally to the central square as a social space. While the 'personality' of the individual heritage site (Garden 2009, 274) remains intact, it is also clearly part of the city as a whole. It stands in relation to not only the Roman history of the city, but also to the Christian Cathedral, as well as to modern city life. While two of the ideas which are used as guiding principles for the creation of a 'heritagescape' are present (boundaries and visibility), cohesion could be improved more by offering more interpretation to those outside the museum. So although not all three ideas are present and 'robust' (Garden 2009, 275) this can be solved quite easily by offering better interpretation. It is important that this interpretation takes the 'heritagescape' as a whole in account, and does not only provide information about the mosaic or the Roman city.

While it has been stated that many Roman finds in Cologne had been discovered by accident (Von Elbe 1995, 21), it is certainly not surprising to find Roman remains buried beneath the city since it was arguably the most important centre in the Roman North for many years. Aside from the importance for local stakeholders of the finding of these Roman remains, the international stakeholder community should also be considered. First of all because of its ancient history as an important Roman city in the North of Europe, and second of all because of its current tourism attractions including the World Heritage Site: The Cathedral of Cologne.

5. 3 The World Heritage Status of the Cathedral of Cologne: Values and Stakeholders

The Cathedral of Cologne, built between 1248 and 1880, was built as a five-aisled basilica in the so-called High Gothic style (UNESCO 2011). Its two immense spires reach upward as if to directly connect to the heavens and they can be seen from very far away. Cologne

Cathedral was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1996 (UNESCO 2011). It has been inscribed on the basis of three of the four selection criteria, and it is stated by UNESCO that: "The Committee decided to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) considering that the monument is of outstanding universal value being an exceptional work of human creative genius, constructed over more than six centuries and a powerful testimony to the strength and persistence of Christian belief in medieval and modern Europe" (UNESCO 2011). In this inscription, it seems that the outstanding values placed on the site emphasize the long history of the site. However, it must be noted that while the long history of the site is emphasized in the description of the universal values, it focuses on one single, individual element of Cologne's heritage. This is not advantageous for the application of the 'heritagescape' theory (Garden 2009, 289). Focus should be more on the connection to the wider 'heritagescape' of Cologne, rather than to the single World Heritage Site in the middle of the city.

While the Site is clearly a single, individual entity designated as World Heritage, urban planning decisions elsewhere in the city had an adverse effect on the relationship of the local stakeholders with the international stakeholders represented by UNESCO. During the meeting of the World Heritage Committee in April 2004 in China, the world-famous cathedral was placed on the World Heritage List in Danger because the members of the World Heritage Committee did not agree with plans for high-rise buildings on the other side of the river (Deutsche Welle 2004a; 2005; UNESCO 2011).The buildings were meant to range from 103 to 120 meters in height, while the cathedral's spires measure 157 meters (Deutsche Welle 2004b). Allegedly, these buildings would impair the view of the cathedral (Deutsche Welle 2004a; 2005). The placement on the list does not have any real implications, but is considered quite shameful for Germany since it was the only European site on the list (Deutsche Welle 2004a). This was an immense disappointment for all involved; both heritage managers and urban planners and developers were devastated (Deutsche Welle 2004a; Deutsche Welle 2004b). However, one of the high-rise buildings was completed nonetheless (Deutsche Welle 2005).

After two years, the Cathedral was removed from the World Heritage List in Danger in 2006, during a meeting of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO 2006). UNESCO's demands in the case of the Cathedral were twofold. First, the high-rise building project had to be stopped (UNESCO 2006, 101). Secondly, the visual integrity of the site had to be protected in the future by the clear designation of a buffer zone on both sides of the Rhine (UNESCO 2006, 101). Indeed, in 2005 the decision was taken that further high-rise building projects had

to be stopped and that a buffer zone was designated (UNESCO 2006). What becomes clear from this example is that UNESCO is an international stakeholder who has a lot of power on even local levels. Local economic and sociocultural values seem to be less important than the purely sociocultural value given to the site by this international stakeholder. To be able to create a good cooperative environment between both heritage managers and urban planners, it seems that the power and importance of the international stakeholders such as UNESCO should also be taken into account.

5.4 The Past vs. the Present: The Cologne Subway

Since the 1st of November 2003 the Cologne metro redevelopment has become a fact, and the construction of a 4 km. long north-south underground railway line has been in full swing (Trier and Tempel 2005, 32). While problems in cooperation have been highlighted above, the dangers of urban planning development for city centres became blatantly clear in March 2009, when the Cologne Historical Archive suddenly collapsed (Der Spiegel 2009). Immediately, accusations were placed on the building company constructing the subway nearby (Der Spiegel 2009). It may be argued that in this case, not enough value was placed on the sociocultural values of the city centre, causing a lack in protection of the city centre's heritage. However, it is also a terrible accident which caused the loss of two lives (Der Spiegel 2009) and which has drawn much negative attention to the struggle between city planning and heritage management.

However, there are two sides to the story of the subway construction. On the one hand, it will cause an enormous inflow of archaeological information concerning the urban fabric of Cologne, while on the other hand it will also cause immense losses of archaeological information (Trier and Tempel 2005, 36). It is not the case that there were no expectations about the archaeology to possibly be encountered during the project. In fact, the Roman Germanic Museum – under the guidance of Professor Hellenkemper – was quickly included in the project's planning (Trier and Tempel 2005, 33). Prognoses were designed by the Roman-Germanic Museum's staff, and rescue excavations were planned well in advance (Trier and Tempel 2005, 33). Information about the possible finds was collected from available archaeological, historical, and topographical sources (Trier and Tempel 2005, 37). It was stated that during the planning the possibility of finding archaeological remains was taken into account, and measures were taken to prevent large-scale destruction of the archaeological record. These measures included digging the tunnels at a depth at which no major conflicts

with archaeological sites were expected, archaeological investigations would be conducted where necessary, and the extensive relocating of supply and disposal lines was documented within the scope of the archaeological measures accompanying construction (Trier and Tempel 2005, 33).

The excavations were at first believed to take place between 2004 and 2009, and were named 'one of the biggest operations of their kind ever to be carried out in a European metropolis' (Trier and Tempel 2005, 35). To ascertain enough time was reserved for excavations, the Roman Germanic Museum suggested binding time frames of between four and eighteen months for the excavations in the individual exploration areas, not to be exceeded even if there were exceptional finds (Trier and Tempel 2005, 38). The excavations are carried out by commercial archaeological companies supervised by the Roman Germanic Museum within the scope of 'contract archaeology' (Trier and Tempel 2005, 38). According to for example Dr. Sven Schütte, project leader of the Archaeological Zone Museum Project, the excavations are being carried out under too much time-pressure which has a negative effect on the levels of archaeological research (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). There are nine designated exploration areas, of which the research will eventually be published (Trier and Tempel 2005, 38). However, by now the excavations are still taking place (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.), and this may indeed put a strain on both time and money, which perhaps has an effect on the excavations as well.

While it is clear that there is a clash between urban planning and heritage management in the case of the subway in Cologne, it must be noted that there are also opportunities to create a better cooperation between those involved. These opportunities are to be found in the creation of sustainable tourism by using the subway construction in a constructive manner. Currently, only a small display in the Roman-Germanic Museum is used to notify people about the excavations taking place under the auspices of the Museum. The panels are small and flooded with text, and not many people notice it. The display is on the inside of the museum. Instead of focusing on the changes taking place in the city, which could be seen as an opportunity for creating awareness and generating economic income, the finds are brought into the museum and removed from their context. Instead of involving the various stakeholders, including Cologne's inhabitants, in the process by employing theories such as the 'heritagescape' or the 'experience economy', hardly anything is done to improve visibility, cohesion, and transparency.

5.5 The Archaeological Zone Museum: Experiencing the Heritagescape

The creation of a new museum in the city of Cologne, the so-called 'Archaeological Zone Museum' has started an interesting debate among some of Cologne's highest archaeological and heritage officials. The project leader of the Archaeological Zone, Dr. Sven Schütte, has ignited some discussions with his remarks about the director of the Roman Germanic Museum, Professor Hansgerd Hellenkemper (Volberg 2010). Schütte has said that the Roman-Germanic Museum has barely changed since its opening in 1974 (Volberg 2010; Schütte 2011 pers. comm.). Although his focus was mainly on the exhibition within the museum itself, he does make an excellent point. As mentioned before, the Roman-Germanic Museum is not as inventive as it could be, and if it would focus on creating a sustainable heritage tourism environment in cooperation with for example the urban planners working on the subway, cooperation and creativity would flourish.

However, the Archaeological Zone Museum is attempting to create this environment by combining urban planning surrounding the building of the museum itself, with archaeological excavations in the area. It is an international endeavour, involving architects from different countries and with different cultural backgrounds (Schütte 2011 pers. comm.). The project is being sponsored for a large sum of 14,3 million Euros, by the Landesbauministerium (Volberg 2010). The Governor's Palace, also called the Roman Praetorium, will also be incorporated and this will be connected by a walkway with the Archaeological Zone Museum (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). Currently, when one visits the Roman Germanic Museum, it is possible to buy a ticket with discount for both the Museum and the Governor's Palace. Clearly, the Archaeological Zone Museum will take away part of the income of the Roman Germanic Museum when it becomes a separate entity and will fully take over the ticket sales for the Governor's Palace. In a city with as many museums as Cologne, almost all located within a very close distance from each other, this will almost certainly cause immense competition within the museum field. Today, this can already be seen in the great rift between Dr. Schütte and the directors of the other museums, specifically the Roman Germanic Museum (Volberg 2010).

The immense building which has been designed to house the museum will not interfere with the World Heritage Status of the Cathedral, Schütte believes, because it has no direct influence on the view of the Cathedral and because it was designed by internationally acclaimed architects (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). An interesting fact about the building designed to house the Archaeological Zone Museum is that the same type of local stone,

quarried near Cologne for thousands of years already, will be used to create a sense of continuity in the life of the city (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). However, when standing at the site it was certainly obvious that the view of the Cathedral's magnificent towers would be influenced if the museum were built. It is interesting to note that UNESCO did not feel the need to interfere here, much closer to the actual World Heritage Site. In this case, international stakeholders seem to have less influence than local and national stakeholders.

The Archaeological Zone Museum has a great chance of becoming a highly sustainable and successful tourist attraction in the city of Cologne, while at the same time it is already showing great signs of sustainability on a local level. This is because it combines both the ideas presented in the 'heritagescape' theory (Garden 2009) and in the 'experience economy' (Pine and Gilmore 1999) theory. Specifically, it incorporates the diachronic perspective of the 'heritagescape' of the city in its exterior by using stone quarried near the city, as well as at the interior where several periods of Cologne's history will be shown to visitors (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). By involving the various local stakeholders in the discussion about the building, the archaeological excavations, and the future museum displays, a deep experiential connection is created between the residents and the future museum. Furthermore, the interior design of the museum is created so as to touch upon all experience realms mentioned by Pine and Gilmore (1999, 30-31). The museum will offer visitors entertainment, education, escape, and estheticism all at once. So the different experience dimensions of passive participation, active participation, immersion, and absorption (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30) are all a possibility for visitors, offering them the possibly to transform as well. It is clear that in the creation of this new museum, heritage managers and urban planners and architects are working together excellently because they share a common goal: creating a sustainable tourism environment.

5.6 Conclusion

From this case study several points become clear. First, that values of local and international stakeholders are not always the same and may even clash in quite a violent manner. This is represented by the discussion about the high-rise buildings which caused distress at the World Heritage Committee because they impaired the view of the Cathedral. Secondly, traditional views concerning heritage do not improve the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners. This is seen in the cooperation in the case of the Cologne subway. Although theoretically cooperation between the stakeholders takes place, in practice they are each

working on their own part of a project with their own goals. Thirdly, if the creation of sustainable tourism is taken as a starting point for cooperation, and if both theories of 'heritagescape' and 'experience economy' are used to create sustainable tourism, this causes excellent cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers.

6. ANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

In the chapters above, three European cities' issues with regard to their Roman archaeological heritage were investigated. On the basis of several theoretical concepts explored in the theoretical overview, several specific cases were discussed in which the cooperation or lack of cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners was the main focus. The influence of World Heritage Status on this cooperation was also explored in depth. The aim of this analytical chapter is to combine the information gathered in Rome, Bath, and Cologne, and offer insightful suggestions about the possibilities for cooperation. All this will be done on the basis of the belief that sustainable heritage tourism is what binds heritage managers and urban planners. Central topics will be the economic sustainability of communities, the conservation and preservation of Roman remains, and the social advantages of sustainable tourism on the basis of Roman heritage. Most importantly, examples of good practice explored in previous chapters will be used as a basis for suggestions for future improvements in the cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners.

6.2 Economic and Sociocultural Values

Different stakeholders have different values. This is one of the main points that need to be stressed in this chapter. To be able to create an environment in which cooperation is possible, stakeholders should not focus on trying to convince stakeholders of the importance of their own values. This is a useless approach because it does not respect the fact that different stakeholders have different values. For example, the interests and concerns of developers and tourist operators may not always be the same (Smith 2004, 8-9). While a tourist operator or a heritage manager may wish to leave Roman archaeological remains in place because it can become a tourist attraction on the basis of its historical value, a developer might wish to remove it because it consumes both his time and his money and interferes with his building plans. What is useful in cases like these is Table 1 (reproduced from Mason 2008, 103, table 7.2). While heritage managers may focus on sociocultural values, urban planners focus on economic values. However, these values do overlap. One aspect can have both sociocultural values and economic values. For example, a Roman site with a historical value can potentially have a use (market) value as well. If the similarities between these values are understood

better by both parties, this can lead to an easier discussion about potential of archaeological heritage sites. What is needed is a common typology of values in order to be able to evaluate different projects in a comparable way (Mason 2008, 102).

The way in which heritage is dealt with during discussions needed to cooperate depends heavily on the employment of a common typology. Economic and Sociocultural Values are not truly two different value categories, but rather 'two alternative ways of understanding and labelling the same, wide range of heritage values' (Mason 2008, 103). With understanding as a key component of cooperation possibilities, the use of this typology designed by Mason can be the first step toward cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners.

However, it is also important for international stakeholders to understand that there are local values that are important in any discussion of archaeological heritage. While archaeological heritage issues are usually dealt with on a local level, there are two important international organisation which heavily influence the cooperation process. First, UNESCO with its World Heritage List, and second, the Council of Europe with the 1992 Valetta convention. Although the theoretical background of these two strong forces in the cooperation process between heritage managers and urban planners has been discussed already, it is useful to point out the practical influence they have and how this is visible in the different case studies.

Especially the 1992 Convention's focus on the financial resources that need to be provided by the stakeholders in order to excavate a site before construction can continue (Trotzig 2001, 3-4; Council of Europe 1992) is problematic in practice. It has caused many developers to be hesitant and to look for the cheapest solution possible when Roman remains are discovered. This is often rescue excavation and preservation *in situ*. In Bath this practice is already seen during the 18th century (Cunliffe 1971, 36; Unichrome 1983, 7). This also becomes evident in the example of the discovery of Roman remains in 1755, while building new baths (Cunliffe 1971, 36; Unichrome 1983, 7). The remains were recorded quickly and then reburied and built over by the new baths, because it was too costly a delay (Cunliffe 1971, 37; Unichrome 1983, 7). This is a practice that is still used today because of the pressure put on modern developers by the 1992 Convention (Council of Europe 1992).

In Cologne, rescue excavations in accordance with the 1992 Convention have caused much devastation in the case of the construction of the subway. The collapse of the Cologne Historical Archive in March 2009 during work on the new subway line cause much grief and an immense loss of historical information (Der Spiegel 2009). Furthermore, the rescue

excavations taking place under the auspices of the Roman-Germanic Museum are under a lot of time- and money-pressure (Trier and Tempel 2005, 38; Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). Although plans were made, and cooperation was attempted, it does not work well. While there might be publications, and while there is a small display in the Roman-Germanic Museum about the cooperation, it does not seem very fruitful at all. This seems to be caused by the pressure of the 1992 Convention (Council of Europe 1992).

Where the 1992 Convention focuses on the preservation of archaeological remains by obliging developers to pay for excavations, UNESCO wishes to be involved on the basis of their designation of cities as being of outstanding universal value. This value is mostly sociocultural and the economic value is not usually considered by them. In the case of Cologne they stopped redevelopments by exerting immense amounts of pressure on the German government by placing the Cathedral on the World Heritage List in Danger (Deutsche Welle 2004a; Deutsche Welle 2004b). If this is compared to Bath, it is interesting to see that the redevelopments in the city centre were not stopped, but that they were deemed too conservative by the visiting UNESCO Mission (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.). It is clear that UNESCO does not work with a standardized system, but is simply a very powerful international stakeholder. They consider sites on an individual basis focusing on their own values which are usually only focused on sociocultural values. The bureaucratic system employed by the organization makes it difficult to involve them in the process of cooperation which is problematic and occasionally causes problems. It is interesting to note that they do not seem to worry about the redevelopment of the area of the Archaeological Zone Museum in Cologne, which is very close to the Cathedral.

6.3 Conservation and Preservation of Roman Remains in City Centres

Many modern European cities are built on top of earlier Roman remains. While this generally does not cause any problems, it does when redevelopment takes place. Because cities, and especially city centres, are places of change, redevelopment takes place regularly. Archaeologists and heritage managers are especially focused on the conservation and preservation of Roman remains in city centres because that is their job. However, it is important that by creating a better understanding of heritage (for example through interpretation), better support for preservation and conservation of heritage is created among the people (McIntosh 1999, 44). Material remains need to be activated and understood by

individuals to be used in a meaningful way, for example to create a sense of place (McIntosh 1999, 44).

The 'heritagescape' theory focuses on the creation of a sense of place (Garden 2009). This theory supports the view that it is crucial to take both the heritage site as a tangible place and a social space into account (Garden 2009, 270-271). By focusing on creating a flexible means of analysis of complexes of heritage sites, but still leaving enough flexibility to accommodate individual sites' 'personalities', the 'heritagescape' can be brought to the fore (Garden 2009, 274). It is a problem that the heritage site as a landscape has mostly been considered as a synchronic rather than a diachronic concept,(Garden 2009, 274). This should be changed, especially in order to create more sustainable heritage tourism. The application of ideas captured in this theory was visible in several case studies presented above.

One of the problems is that many heritage tourists go to the most visited attractions just because they assume that because so many people visit them, they must be the ones that are most worthy of a visit (Russo 2002, 21). This is the case in for example Rome, where the Coliseum and its surroundings as we see it now is largely still the product of the Fascist era. Still used as the backdrop for many events, such as marathons and manifestations, the site has been isolated from its surroundings, and its sole function appears to be inspiring awe in tourists. With 4 million tourists a year visiting the site (Teichmann 2011, 47), the large open spaces around the Coliseum are filled with masses of tourists, tourist guides, and street vendors. This has caused much decay, and the Italian state is incapable of providing the necessary funds. Therefore, the United Kingdom shoe manufacturer Tod's has now agreed to fund the conservation of this word famous monument. How this will influence the heritagescape is still unclear.

In Bath, a similar problem with visitors is seen. In this city, the Roman Baths are the main Roman tourist attraction in the city while there is more to see. Here, a solution has been provided by the development of the modern Thermae Bath Spa. It offers tourists the possibility to come into the city for more than just one day. It also underlines one of the main historical aspects of the town: the only town in the United Kingdom with natural hot springs. By connecting the site's various historical periods – Roman, Georgian, and modern – an unforgettable experience is created for visitors. Specifically, it is a good example of the application of ideas from the 'experience economy' theory. The four different experience dimensions crucial in this theory (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31) can easily be found within Bath's city centre now. Passive participation and absorption can be found in the various museums in the city such as at the Roman Baths, but with tourists staying longer because of

the attraction of the modern spa, other museums have a bigger chance of being visited as well. Furthermore, active participation and absorption are found at the spa, and tourists can use the site in a truly physical way. The experience realms of entertainment, education, escape, and estheticism (Pine and Gilmore 1999, 30-31) are also all to be found in the city centre.

Conservation and preservation are supported by the ideas presented by the theories of the 'heritagescape' and the 'experience economy'. By creating awareness of the broader 'heritagescape' of city centres, and by transforming visitors through offering them a complete experience, more funds and possibilities for site preservation become available. Economic values important to local stakeholders such as developers are in this way combined with sociocultural values important to heritage managers and interested local inhabitants. When tourists are transformed, they might become deep heritage tourists who can turn into knowledgeable patrons and can support a site by spreading awareness and by funding conservation and preservation projects.

6.4 Sustainable Heritage Tourism and Roman Remains

If the values of stakeholders are represented fairly, and if the theories of the 'heritagescape' and the 'experience economy' are applied in an insightful and creative manner, great things can be done. However, the theories should not be applied in a haphazard way. In order to connect these theories to the importance of the understanding of different stakeholders' values, a common goal is needed which is equally important to both urban planners and archaeological heritage managers. This common goal is sustainable heritage tourism.

In order to create a better cooperation between the different stakeholders with regards to Roman remains in city centres, sustainable tourism is the main common factor. Heritage managers benefit from sustainable tourism because a) it creates immediate income through entrance fees, which can be used for the conservation of the monument, and b) it creates long-term awareness, and increases both the economic and the sociocultural value attributed to the heritage. Urban planners benefit from sustainable tourism because a) it creates an immediate regeneration of the area, b) it creates a long-term sustainable economic and sociocultural environment, creating a better living environment for the local community.

In the above chapters, several case studies have been presented which can serve as examples of good practice in creating sustainable heritage tourism. First, there is the case of the Testaccio Area in Rome. Currently under redevelopment, the Testaccio area was Rome's former fluvial port (Contino 2011; Sebastiani 2011). Economic and sociocultural values are

combined in the construction of a covered market area in the neighbourhood. The market is an important part of the area's economy, but at the same time exceptional Roman remains were discovered at the construction site. These remains were integrated into the subterranean area of the market building, so combining both economic and sociocultural values. Furthermore, to improve the experience for tourists, the 'heritagescape' of the area was made more visible through the creation of a 'museo diffuso' with panels describing the neighbourhood's history (Contino 2011; Sebastiani 2011). There are possibilities for improvements, for example by dispersing the money more across the neighbourhood instead of focusing specifically on the underground excavation area of the market.

In Cologne, the new Archaeological Zone Museum is also a good example of the way in which urban planners and heritage managers cooperate by focusing on the common goal of sustainable heritage tourism. It combines both ideas from the 'heritagescape' theory (Garden 2009) and the 'experience economy' (Pine and Gilmore 1999) theory. Both on the exterior and in the interior, it incorporates the diachronic perspective of the 'heritagescape' of the city (Schütte 2011, pers. comm.). Furthermore, good attempts are made at discussing matters with various local stakeholders which creates a deep experiential connection. Also, the museum's interior is heavily dependent on the experience realms mentioned by Pine and Gilmore (1999, 30-31). This offers visitors the possibility to transform and change into knowledgeable heritage patrons. It is clear that in the creation of this new museum, heritage managers and urban planners and architects are working together excellently because they share a common goal: creating a sustainable tourism environment.

In Bath, emphasis is placed on the survival for future generations (City of Bath 2003, 5), and sustainability is at the core of both management plans. What is interesting to see is that not only economic and sociocultural, but also environmental values play a role here (City of Bath 2003, 5). In the creation of the WestGate shopping centre, the values important to local stakeholders were taking into account in a great way (Crouch 2011, pers. comm.), and this guarantees sustainability on both a sociocultural and an economic level. In the case of the Roman remains in Bath, other remains of the Roman town might be made more accessible or at least visible to the public in an engaging manner, the amount of tourists that flock to the Bath may have an option of visiting something else which is Roman in the city as well, instead of moving out to other sites in the vicinity of the town, such as Stonehenge. There is a distinct difference between people interested in the Romans, and people interested in Georgian town planning. If this would be taken into account, a more balanced tourist marketing programme could be developed. By having this as a goal when discussing new

developments in the town, and by focusing on both the sociocultural and economic values involved with this, cooperation would be much easier because of the common goal of sustainable tourism.

6.5 Conclusion: Sustainable Heritage Tourism as the Key to Cooperation

Several things become clear from the above analysis. First, by creating a common system of valuation of archaeological heritage, it becomes easier to discuss the wants and needs of different stakeholders. This can be seen in many examples from the three investigated cities. Secondly, the importance of adhering to international regulations and valuation systems is not to be underestimated. The legal basis of the 1992 Convention and the valuation basis of the World Heritage List cause struggles in modern city centres in relation to the archaeological heritage. Thirdly, a theoretical basis is needed to create a better cooperative environment. This theoretical basis is provided by the 'heritagescape' and the 'experience economy' theories. They provide the necessary tools and guidelines to create sustainable heritage tourism. Fourthly, by comparing three European cities as case studies, it has become clear that no situation is the same. However, much can be learned from looking at other places and the way heritage is treated there.

In conclusion, it is clear that attempts are being made at improving cooperation between different stakeholders. If cooperation remains divided between local, national, and international levels perhaps nothing will ever change. A good example needs to be set on theoretical, *and* practical levels. Focusing on the common goal of creating sustainable heritage tourism is the key to creating fruitful cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers.

7. CONCLUSION: SUSTAINABLE HERITAGE TOURISM IS THE KEY TO COOPERATIVE URBAN PLANNING AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

The relevance of the topic of this paper was explained initially in the introduction of this thesis. However, through investigating three very different European city centres with large amounts of Roman archaeological heritage the relevance has been shown in a very practical way as well. While cooperation is a key word in many archaeological heritage management discussions, it is important to investigate the practical sides of this cooperation as well. By using the ideas of the 'heritagescape' theory and the 'experience economy' theory to discuss practical examples which are currently found in different European cities, the difficulties and opportunities were clarified. What has become evident is that by using the proposed theories as a basis for the creation of sustainable heritage tourism, cooperation between heritage managers and urban planners improves significantly. While values are different for all stakeholders, this does not have to be a problem. By comparing value systems and showing in what way heritage can be both of sociocultural value and economic value at the same time, common ground is found.

It is important to note that the scope of this research did not allow for a deeper investigation of the way tourists experience heritage. It is therefore important that future research investigates the possibilities for mutual enjoyment of heritage tourism sources by both local stakeholders and international tourists. The values tourists look for are difficult to distinguish, and therefore further research is needed in this department. On a more practical side, future research should focus on establishing guidelines for the creation of sustainable tourism that are acceptable to both urban planners and heritage managers, as well as other stakeholders. More information should be gathered from practical attempts at cooperation, and best practice examples should be brought to the attention of the various stakeholders. This is perhaps what UNESCO can do as a next step. While they have stressed the importance of sustainable development in developing countries, it is important to stress sustainability in already developed countries as well. By praising practical examples of cooperation and sustainable heritage tourism, UNESCO can raise awareness. Furthermore, the bureaucratic problems at UNESCO concerning the information about future planning projects and their possible interference with outstanding universal values of World Heritage Sites should be improved as soon as possible so as to improve the cooperation with local stakeholders.

In conclusion, it is my firm belief that cooperative endeavours become instantly successful if all stakeholders have the same goal. To improve the cooperation between archaeological heritage managers and urban planners, this goal should be the creation of sustainable heritage tourism.

ABSTRACT

In recent decades many European city centers have been (re)developed to accommodate the exponential growth of inhabitants. Roman remains are regularly discovered during construction processes, and their careful excavation can delay construction projects significantly. The 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage attempted to ensure the protection of archaeological heritage during urban (re)development. This has led to a rather strained relationship between urban planners and heritage managers. Better cooperation between these two stakeholders is necessary.

In this thesis, key theories and concepts to improve cooperation are explored. On the basis of a mutual understanding of the similarities and differences between sociocultural and economic values, common ground can be found by the different stakeholders. Furthermore, sustainable tourism is an important concept. Recently an immense growth in cultural heritage tourism has occurred, also stimulated by the World Heritage List. Roman remains are among the most popular attractions, and are well represented on the List. Sustainable tourism is crucial to ensure long-term profit and minimal deterioration of cultural heritage. To create sustainable tourism in city centers, the theories of the 'heritagescape' and of the 'experience economy' are crucial. Attempting to create sustainable tourism in city centers with Roman remains is what will bring heritage managers and urban planners closer together. It is a common goal in which both these stakeholders' values are represented.

An investigation was conducted which consisted of a literature research and a field research. On the basis of a number of theories, the importance of sustainable heritage tourism was investigated from economic, social, and cultural perspectives. Important topics such as stakeholders, valuation, international legislation, and experience value are explored and explained. Field research was conducted in Rome (Italy), Bath (United Kingdom), and Cologne (Germany). It consisted of explorations of these city centers and interviews with the on-site heritage managers and project leaders. The information gathered was then analyzed.

International regulations and valuations always need to be considered. However, through a common understanding of valuation systems of archaeological heritage it is easier to discuss the wants and needs of different stakeholders. Sustainable heritage tourism is beneficial for many parties, and represents many values. It can be created through applying the 'heritagescape' and the 'experience economy' theories. Fruitful cooperation between urban planners and heritage managers can be created by focusing on the common goal of creating sustainable heritage tourism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bath and North East Somerset Council, 2011. *Southgate Redevelopment Project*. [online] Available at:
http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/majordevelopments/southgateproject/Pages/default.aspx. Accessed on 12 November 2011.

BBC. 2011. *Rome Coliseum repair to be funded by Tods shoe firm.* [online] Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-12256813. Accessed on 20 September 2011.

Bramwell, B. and B. Lane, 2011. Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19/4-5, 411-421.

Carman, J., 2005. *Against Cultural Property. Archaeology, Heritage and Ownership*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd.

Chen, J. S., 1998. Travel Motivation of heritage tourists. *Tourism Analysis* 2, 213-215.

City of Bath, 2003. *City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan*. Bath: City of Bath.

City of Bath, 2010. *City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016*. Draft. Bath: City of Bath.

Contino, A., 2011. *The 'Museo Diffiuso' and the valorisation of the Rione Testaccio*. [lecture] 20 May 2011. Rome: Royal Dutch Institute of Rome.

Copeland, T., 2010. Site Seeing: Street Walking Through a Low-visibility Landscape. In: E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds.), *Culture, Heritage, and Representation.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 229-248.

Council of Europe, 1992. *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*. [online] Available at: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/html/143.htm. Accessed on 1 August 2011.

Council of Europe, 2011. *Architectural and Archaeological Heritage*. [online] Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Archeologie/default_en.asp. Accessed on 1 August 2011.

Creighton, O., 2007. Contested Townscapes: the Walled City as World Heritage. *World Archaeology: The Archaeology of World Heritage* 29/3, 339-354.

Crouch, T., 2011. *Interview with the Bath World Heritage Manager Mr. T. Crouch*. 27 October 2011. Bath.

Cunliffe, B., 1969. *Roman Bath.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cunliffe, B., 1971. *Roman Bath Discovered*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Cuno, J., 2008. *Who owns antiquity? Museums and the battle over our ancient heritage.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dallen, J. T. (ed.), 2007a. *The Heritage Tourist Experience*. Critical essays volume 2. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Dallen, J. T., 2007b. Introduction. In: J. T. Dallen (ed.), *The Heritage Tourist Experience*. Critical essays volume 2. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., ix-xxi.

De la Torre., M. (ed.), 2002. *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.

De Vita, C., C. Fokke and S. Fredholm, 2011. *The Colosseum*. Paper and research. Rome: Royal Dutch Institute in Rome.

Di Macco, M., 1972. *Il Colosseo*: *Funzione simbolica, storica, urbana*. Rome: Bulzoni.

Der Spiegel, 2009. Cologne Archive Catastrophe – Were Subway Builders Cautious Enough? *Der Spiegel*, 03-09-2009. [online] Available at:

http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,612129,00.html. Accessed on 5 August 2011.

Deutsche Welle, 2004a. *Cologne Cathedral on UNESCO Danger List*. 06-07-2004. [online] Available at: http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,1256794,00.html. Accessed on 5 August 2011.

Deutsche Welle, 2004b. *Cologne Angered by UNESCO Criticism*. 10-7-2004. [online] Available at: http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,1262885,00.html. Accessed on 5 August 2011.

Deutsche Welle, 2005. *Crunch Time for Cathedral's Heritage Status*. 11-7-2005. [online] Available at: http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,1645947,00.html. Accessed on 5 August 2011.

English Heritage 2011. *Listed Buildings*. [online] Available at:http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/listing/listed-buildings/. Accessed on 29 November 2011.

Ennen, E., 1999. *Heritage in Fragments. The Meaning of Pasts for City Centre Residents*. Dissertation. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Fairclough, G., R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), 2008. *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Friedhoff, U., 1991. *Der römische Friedhof an der Jakobstrasse zu Köln.* Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Garden, M.-C. E., 2009. The heritagescape: looking at heritage sites. In: M. L. Stig Sørensen and J. Carman (eds.). *Heritage Studies. Methods and Approaches.* New York: Routledge, 270-291.

Harrison, R. (ed.), 2010a. *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Harrison, R., 2010b. What is Heritage? In: R. Harrison (ed.), *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*. Manchester: Machester University Press, 5-42.

Hoelscher, S., 2006. Heritage. In: S. Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 198-218.

Holtorf, C., 2008. Is the past a non-renewable resource? In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 125-133.

Hopkins, K. and M. Beard, 2005. *The Coliseum*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Jameson, J. H. Jr., 2008. Cultural Heritage Management in the United States – Past, Present, and Future. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 42-61.

Jones, B., 2006. The city that got its soul back. *BBC News, Bath*. [online] Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5225872.stm. Accessed on 12 November 2011.

Kreps, C., 2006. Non-Western Models of Museums and Curation in Cross-cultural Perspective. In: S. Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 456-472.

Kyriakopoulos, V., 2005. *Crete - Lonely Planet Regional Guides*. 3rd ed. Victoria: Lonely Planet Publications.

La Rocca, E. 2007. The Rhetoric of Rome and the Reappropriation of the Ancient Monuments. *Fragmenta. Journal of the Nethelands Institute in Rome*, 141-171.

Macdonald, S. (ed.), 2006. *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mason, R., 2008. Assessing Values in Conservation Planning. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 99-124.

McCarthy, J. P., 2008. More than just 'telling the story'. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 536-544.

McCoy, C. 2011. *Mayor of Bath Honorary Guide Walking Tour*. 26 October 2011. Bath.

McManamon, F. P., 2008. Archaeological Messages and Messengers. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 457-481.

Mason, R., 2008. Assessing Values in Conservation Planning. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 99-124.

McIntosh, A. J., 1999. Into the Tourist's Mind: Understanding the Value of the Heritage Experience. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 8, 41-64.

Precht, G., 1973. *Baugeschitchtliche Untersuchung zum Römischen Praetorium in Köln*. Köln: Rheinland-Verlag GmbH.

Rutherford, R., 2005. *Classical Literature. A Concise History*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Painter, Jr. B. W., 2005. *Mussolini's Rome. Rebuilding the Eternal City*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.

Pine, J. and J. Gilmore, 1999. *The Experience Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pine, J. B., 2002. Museums in the experience economy. In: A .Vels Heijn (ed.), *The future of museums, the museumof the future*. Amsterdam: Nederlandse Museum Vereniging, 19-26.

Pocock, D., 1997. Some reflections on World Heritage. *Area* 29/3, 260-268.

Russo, A., 2002. *The Sustainable Development of Heritage Cities and their Regions – Analysis, Policy, Governance.* PhD Thesis. Tinbergen Institute Research Series, 304.

Schofield, J., 2008. Heritage Management, Theory and Practice. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 15-30.

Schütte, S., 2011. *Interview with the author.* [personal communication] 29 November 2011. Cologne.

Sebastiani, R., 2011. *Rione Testaccio*. [excursion and lecture] 20 May 2011. Rome: Rione Testaccio.

Semple Kerr, J., 2008. The Conservation Plan. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 322-330.

Shipley, G., J. Vanderspoel, D. Mattingly and L. Foxhall, (2006). Knossos. In: *The Cambridge Dictionary of Classical Civilization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 490.

Skeates, R. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London: Duckworth.

Slive, S., 1995. *Dutch Painting 1600-1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Smith, L., 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge.

SouthGate, 2011. *SouthGate Bath*. [online] Available at:http://www.southgatebath.com/. Accessed on 12 November 2011.

Stig Sørensen, M. L. and J. Carman (eds.), 2009. *Heritage Studies. Methods and Approaches.* New York: Routledge.

Stronza, A., 2001. Anthropology of Tourism: Forging New Ground for Ecotourism and Other Alternatives. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30, 261-283.

Teichmann, M., 2011. Gladiatores: Exhibition in the Colosseum at Rome from the 26th March – 3rd October 2010 - A review. *Rosetta* 9, 41-52.

Thermae Bath Spa, 2011. *Thermae Bath Spa*. [online] Available at: http://www.thermaebathspa.com/. Accessed on 12 November 2011.

Throsby, D., 2002. Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage. In: M. De la Torre. (ed.). *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 101-117.

Trier, M. and L. Tempel, 2005. Cologne's North-South Urban Light Railway, Part II – The Archaeology. *Tunnel* 7, 32-43.

Trotzig, G., 2001. On the (Revised) European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, presented in Malta 1992. *The European Archaeologist* 15, 1-4.

Tunbridge, J. E., 2008. Whose Heritage to Conserve?: Cross-cultural reflections on political dominance and urban heritage conservation. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr. and J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*. New York: Routledge, 235-244.

UNESCO, 1992. *World Heritage Convention. 16th session. Santa Fe, United States of America*. [online] Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/1992/whc-92-conf002-12e.pdf. Accessed on 20 September 2011.

UNESCO, 2006. *Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, World Heritage Committee. Thirtieth Session, 8-16 July 2006. Vilnius, Lithuania. Appendix*. [online] Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006/whc06-30com-07Ae.pdf. Accessed on 3 October 2011.

UNESCO, 2011a. *Cologne Cathedral*. [online] Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/292/. Accessed on 3 September August 2011.

UNESCO, 2011b. *The Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura.* [online] Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/91. Accessed on 12 August 2011.

UNESCO, 2011c. *City of Bath.* [online] Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428. Accessed on 12 September 2011.

Unichrome, 1983. *The Roman Baths and Museum. Bath, England.* Bath: Unichrome (Bath) Ltd.

Volberg, S., 2010. *Museumschefs gegen Schütte*. Kölnische Runschau. 13-10-2010. [online] Available at: http://www.rundschau-online.de/html/artikel/1283520780404.shtml. Accessed on 3 October 2011.

Von Elbe, J., 1995. *The Romans in Cologne and lower Germany: a guide to Roman sites and museums*. Düsseldorf: Preis.

Wall, G., 1997. Sustainable tourism – Unsustainable development. In: S. Wahab and J. Pigram (eds.), *Tourism, development and growth*. London: Routledge, 33-49.

Waterton, E. and S. Watson, 2010. *Culture, Heritage, and Representation.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Welch, K. E., 2007. *The Roman Amphitheatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, A. T., 2005. Augustus, Mussolini, and the Parallel Imagery of Empire, in: Lazarro, C. and Crum, J.R. (eds.) *Donatella among the blackshirts. History and Modernity in the Visual Culture of Fascist Italy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 53-65.

World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987. *Our common future: the Brundtland report*. 4 august 1987. 42nd session. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zidda, G. 2005. Archaeological excavations and conservation. APPEAR Position Paper 3, 1-7.

FIGURES

Figure 1: Paul Bril (1554-1626) *Landscape with elements of the Forum Romanum in Rome.* 1600. Oil paint on Copper. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen.

APPENDIX I

Interviews took place around the Coliseum in Rome on the 22nd of May 2011.

Interview: 1

Where are you from?

Tuscany, Italy

Why are you here?

They have a house in Rome.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

Yes, before.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

The Colosseum is a symbol because it shows the technology of the past and the ability of a preindustrial culture to build such a huge monument.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

They think that Colosseum represents history and the greatness of the buildings of the Roman Empire.

Notes: *They think that panels outside do not allow tourists to understand the different structures of the area of the Coliseum. They think that the area needs more panels that should be visible to the public, not hidden in an angle of the square (they think the same for the Fora). There is no information about Constantine's Arch. So, they do not know the link between the monuments in the square.*

Interview: 2

Where are you from?

North Carolina, USA

Why are you here?

Tourism

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

Yes.

Did it live up to your expectations?

Yes, it was a worthwhile visit.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

It is a symbol of Rome, signifies its importance as the first powerful civilized nation.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Gladiator (the movie)

Notes: *Downloaded a podcast for free which was great.*

Interview: 3

Where are you from?

Egypt

Why are you here?

Cultural tourists

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

No yet.

Will you go inside the Coliseum?

Yes.

What do you expect from the inside of the Coliseum?

See culture, see what happened hundreds of years ago.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

Yes, a symbol of power.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Surviving.

Notes: *Also going to visit other monuments.*

Interview: 4

Where are you from?

England

Why are you here?

Holiday in Rome, Coliseum is one of the big places to visit.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

Not yet.

Will you go inside the Coliseum?

Probably, but there is a long queue.

What do you expect from the inside of the Coliseum?

I just want the experience of going inside.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

Not so much a symbol, just history.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

How grand and big it is, and the history of it.

Notes: *Went on a picture with one of the gladiators and liked it a lot.*

Interview: 5

Where are you from?

Turkey.

Why are you here?

For a wedding and a small touristic visit.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

No, but planning to. The queue is a little scary.

What do you expect from the inside of the Coliseum?

History and architecture.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

It is a symbol of Rome.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Spartacus.

Notes: *Did not know how old it was, they were discussing about that. They wanted to look for information or an audio tour. Not going to use any of the services around the Coliseum, he does not think it is interesting.*

Interview: 6

Where are you from?

The Netherlands.

Why are you here?

City trip.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

No.

Will you go inside the Coliseum?

No, the queue is too long.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

Yes, because of the architecture.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Fights.

Notes: *It is so commercial, I do not like it. I do not think I will miss something if I do not go inside.*

Interview: 7

Where are you from?

Greece.

Why are you here?

On vacation.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

No.

Will you go inside the Coliseum?

Yes.

What do you expect from the inside of the Coliseum?

Something amazing.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

Not really, but it is famous because of the movies and the history.

-- cut off

Interview: 8

Where are you from?

New York City.

Why are you here?

On vacations.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

He has, his wife has not.

Will you go inside the Coliseum?

Yes.

What do you expect?

A big open theatre (the wife).

Did it live up to your expectations?

Yes, because when you are inside you see everything, so you understand how big it really is. When you are on the outside you only see a part of it at al times. Also, you can see the skeleton of the structure. (the husband).

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

A symbol of the power, and of exploitation.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Gladiator (the movie) & the exhibitions and the function of the Coliseum as a way to placate the mob in ancient times.

Notes: *Came across the information panel, and it is important because he trusts the information more than a tourguide, and you can read it at your own convenience. If people like the touristic services like the gladiators that is fine, and it serves a purpose.*

Interview: 9

Where are you from?

The Netherlands.

Why are you here?

City trip.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

Yes.

What did you expect?

Beautiful and impressive, but the outside is more beautiful.

Did it live up to your expectations?

Partly. I had expected more steps, and I had expected to be able to go further into the middle of the arena.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

Yes, do not know why.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Gladiators, long queue, its history.

Notes: *Did not use any of the services around, they did think it was part of the whole atmosphere, and the gladiators are fun. The salesmen are annoying.*

Interview: 10

Where are you from?

Rome, Italy.

Why are you here?

They do not have an active interest in the story, they were doing a marathon and then they decided to enter.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

They went inside the Colosseum, but it was not the first time.

Did it live up to your expectations?

They think that inside is bigger than what they expect from outside, and they like the stands (tribunes).

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

They think that the Colosseum is a symbol of Rome, of Italy and of the Western world, so they chose it instead of another monument.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

When they think about the Coliseum, they think about the Romans, the tourists and the beautiful place.

Notes: *They did not read the panels, but they think that they are useful; they said that most of the tourist come to the Coliseum with a guide. They think that the queue is enervating, but they think it is impossible to solve this problem because there are too many tourists every day. They didn't use any services of the square because they say that they come from Rome, they are not tourists.*

Interview: 11

Where are you from?

Padua, Italy.

Why are you here?

They are in Rome for work, but they use Sunday for a touristic tour.

Have you been inside the Coliseum?

They are in the queue, it is their first time.

What do you expect?

They expect to see four stones.

Do you think the Coliseum is a symbol, and if so, why?

They think that the Coliseum is a symbol of the art, of the roman engineering.

What do you think of when you think of the Coliseum?

Rome, gladiators, lions, emperors, slaves, instrument of power.

Notes: *They did not use any services at the square, they think that is a problem of the consumerism, but it's normal in a touristic city. They think the queue is too long because it is Sunday. They know the links between the Coliseum and the others monuments. They did not read the panels but they think they are useful.*

Interview with Dr. Tony Crouch, World Heritage Manager of Bath.

26 October 2011. Bath: Lewis House.

TC = Tony Crouch, the interviewee

CF = Carolien Fokke, the interviewer

CF: I read through the management plan, and I think that the first management plan I read was from 2003.

TC: That's right.

CF: And it was not written by you, but by somebody who…

TC: I was my predecessor.

CF: A lady I think?

TC: Yeah that's right. Abby Harrap.

CF: I was wondering, did she have the same function as you have now, or was it different?

TC: It was largely the same, although she was supported a bit more by English Heritage.

CF: OK, so she had closer ties with them?

TC: Yes, because it was the first plan English Heritage helped a lot more, all of the English sites you know come up to a level where they had management plans. They have that support when it was needed and then they backed off a bit. So we're largely, we're a bit more on our own now. We know a little bit more what we're doing.

CF: Then the second plan I read was written by you I believe?

TC: Yes.

CF: How long did you spend on the job before you had to really write this plan.

TC: Not very long, really. 'Cause that was one of the first functions of the job. But I was line manager of Abby before, so I was involved, but sort of one step removed in line from it. I had an interested and an awareness of World Heritage and everything around it.

CF: So you knew that there were things in the first plan that needed to be explored more in the second plan? Because it is a lot larger, that second plan is a lot more with the appendices, etcetera.

TC: Well, we tried to keep it smaller. It is really difficult to do that. Even now ICOMOS UNESCO is asking for more. I think that is an unfortunate trend. They are very bureaucratic documents if you're not careful, and there won't be many people other than you who've read

them. People won't read that big bulk of information, and also then actions, when we came to review previous plan, a lot of the actions had long since become irrelevant and it needs to be just refreshed. That's much easier, much easier to refresh. So the actions in there, would be best if you could just take those out and look at those every two years.

CF: Yeah, that is very often of course.

TC: Yeah.

CF: 'Cause I also read in that later plan that there was the idea to show the plan to everyone and that they could give feedback, I think. I wrote it down, cause it was intriguing to me. 'A full public consultation of the draft document in the summer of 2010'. Did that happen?

TC: Yeah.

CF: How did that happen? I am very interested in this.

TC: What we did in the process of building a new plan is: first of all we announced that we were going to do a new plan, and then we had a big event for all of our stakeholders. So everybody who might be involved in the new plan, and that was about 120 people. Together. That was all the people that we would not normally talk to on a daily basis. So people like the emergency services, the fire and police, and things like that. The water authorities in flooding and supplying clean water, bus companies, train companies. Everybody who had something to do with it, with the site. And the idea was that we'd get them together at quite high levels. So invited the high level staff. And we had a workshop, that was nearly a full-day workshop, exploring all the issues that might effect them ,might come out of it. And what that did is that it led everybody know that the process was beginning. SO they'd feed that into their organisations, and we might not see the chief executives again, but they would tell their staff that something was happening, and you build awareness that something is happening, and you get the main ideas down that you thought you needed to work on and to refresh in the plan. And then we basically went away and started drafting up the plan in consultation with the core people on our steering group.

TC: So once we'd drafted the plan, we then went out to this wide public consultation and said: what do you think? And that was basically the process, and then we wrote up the final documents from there.

CF: Were there things that people pointed out to you, that you hadn't thought of before?

TC: There were. But usually, there are a lot of lobby groups who were interested in particular areas. A lot of it's to do with planning. So there's villages around the outside of Bath who don't want new houses near to their villages and things like that. So they've got an interest. They're coming on board and saying you should be protecting the setting, this is world

heritage and all. But there's people who are interested in particular aspects: archaeology, Georgian, roman, or other things who say: you should pay more attention to these items. But generally the audience is quite small. So we don't get a lot of comments.

CF: Do you think that's a pity?

TC: It's a shame. But it's always difficult to explain to people the relevance of these documents to them and their daily lives. And in reality some of it won't have great relevance to them in their daily lives.

CF: I was wondering also, because you brought up the term stakeholders, I was wondering how you decide who they are and whether you have special gatekeepers because you talk about the executives of the larger companies?

TC: Now, generally those stakeholders would be fairly obvious. So they would be a mixture of national and local people. So they would be the government and the relevant government departments, English Heritage, and then ICOMOS UK. There would be local landowners and heritage groups, that's also the national Trust. They are quite big landowners around bath. They own quite a lot of the skyline. So they've got an interest. Bath Preservation Trust are a local community society as well, again lots of members. Between those two groups, the National Trust and the Preservation trust there's over 20.000 members, who pay a fee every year. So considering there's only 80.000 citizens in bath, a quarter of those have signed up to heritage groups, so there's a big interest, they've got an interest, they're on board. And then you've got the universities who are one there as well.

CF: Two universities right?

TC: Yeah. Various council departments. And federation of resident's associations, and a few more bodies I have probably forgotten, tourism.

CF: Yeah there was this Bath Tourism Plus, with which you apparently cooperate quite closely? Does that involve thinking about the sustainability of the tourism in Bath?

TC: Yes it does. The relationship with the World Heritage hasn't always been so good. They haven't seen World Heritage as a major draw for tourism.

CF: Yes, I read about that, there were different values attributed to the World heritage Status in terms of marketing as well.

TC: That's right. They haven't seen it as a major thing for marketing. I think that's a mistake.

CF: Yes, it's very strange to me.

TC: Yeah. But it's a particular Bath thing. When I talked to the previous chief of tourism here he said, I've said why aren't you using the this logo and he said: people don't recognise it,

they think it's a recycling sign. He may know his job. But I think that the overseas market particularly will recognise it. We've got a lot of Chinese tourists coming in.

CF: They will recognise it.

TC: They recognise that. And they.. in the Roman baths the audio tours are all in Mandarin and languages now, because there are many Chinese coming in. And they will surely know. They know the world heritage symbol and its meaning and things like that.

CF: I must say, yesterday I went on the tour with the Mayor's Guides, it was very interesting. But it was only at the very end in front of the Baths that they said: oh and does anyone know what this sign means?

TC: Interesting.

CF: And then I thought hmmm and I was the only one who knew.

TC: How many people in the group?

CF: 14.

TC: We can't, because of the size of the site, we can't control all the means of delivery of the messages. So you know, the guest house owner, the taxi driver, the guides and everybody else. We can't get to all of those, so what we do, instead, is that we try to make sure that they've got a consistent and accurate message. That they give out. So as long as they are, you know, giving out the right message, then it doesn't really matter who delivers it.

CF: No, yeah. As long as everybody says the same correct thing.

TC: Yes, there's been a lot of inaccuracy in the past. You know, people just thinking that only the historic core was a world heritage site, or not really understanding what a world heritage site is, or just really ridiculous things, like saying Bath has formed out of an extinct volcanoes. Completely inaccurate. And it's on websites and stuff, and it becomes an urban myth. You just got to stamp it out really, and just make sure that the message is true.

CF: That is really, really strange yeah. A volcano! What I was wondering about is that I couldn't really find out whether there really was a buffer zone in Bath. I know that there's a conservation zone and when we had the tour yesterday the lady told us about the Holborn museum, which wanted an extension, and I know that for example in Cologne there was a big problem with building taking place in the buffer zone which UNESCO didn't agree with and then they put them on the World Heritage List in Danger, to give out a message of 'we don't like this'. In the case of Bath, do you ever think about repercussions like this? And how do you deal with that.

TC: Yes. In 2008 we had a mission, a UNESCO mission came across. And the reason they came was because at that time the development industry was very buoyant, and there was a lot

of new development coming forward. The Holborn Museum was one of them, the Southgate area with the new shopping centre which was another one, and there was Bath Western Riverside, which is the site where the gasholders are, out towards where you're staying it's a big area near the river.

CF: Yes, that's a very strange area, actually.

TC: It's up for redevelopment now. It's an old industrial area. But that was also coming on board. And there was a new school or academy going to be built as well, which was a large glass structure. So all of these things were very frightening for the residents of Bath, who are quite a conservative group anyway, you know, old, retired and rich, generally. And so not necessarily as good at dealing with changes as some cities. So there was a lot of anxiety, and it reached the ears of UNESCO and they said: we're going to come and have a look, and see what's happening.

CF: OK? So they actually came on purpose for this? Oh, that's very interesting.

TC: Terms of reference were to look at these specific developments. So they came to see that. So we hosted them for three days. And it was interesting what they said. They didn't feel that the developments where threatening to the outstanding universal values. So they were fine with that. And they actually criticised the new shopping centre here because they thought that we should have taken a modern architectural approach, instead of what they called a 'pastiche' or you know, retrospective design. Which is difficult. There's never an easy answer because the local people love that. The one that was there before was a terrible concrete thing, and that's been taken down. The new one's gone up and it's what people expect of Bath and it's an open street, it keeps the street patterns, it's in the Bath stone and everything else. But UNESCO's view was that in accordance with the Vienna Memorandum, was that we should have pushed for more contemporary architecture.

CF: Yeah, that you try and go out of your way to actually find something that still fits.

TC: But is new.

CF: Modern.

TC: It's a new chapter, instead of trying to replicate old chapters of the book, it's a new chapter.

CF: It looks like you're trying to save Bath in time and are afraid t change things, even if it is for the good.

TC: That's their view. But at the same time the Holborn Museum, which is a strikingly modern extension, a very modern one,

CF: Yeah, people were afraid of that.

TC: Yeah. And we had an enormous amount of correspondence in the planning department here, people had been very worried about that. But now it's actually good, I think that most people are okay with that.

CF: Yes, that's what they said during the tour.

TC: Yeah, that's alright. But I think that's an exception. That's one of the things. You couldn't do that everywhere. But a museum, you can get away with it because it's almost an external exhibit of the museum and people almost expect to see that sort of thing.

CF: Well, since you also brought it up, the industrial area, I passed it when I arrived here in the dark on Monday and I thought: 'Is this Bath?' That's what I thought. The redevelopment that will happen there, do you have a big say in it? You as the heritage manager?

TC: Yes. As part of the process we do. And I think World Heritage has been very influential in discussions about that. It's not entirely as I would wish it. These things never are. But nobody can say that heritage or World Heritage is not considered as part of the overall plan. I mean, the thoughts of UNESCO and ICOMOS were very useful as well. Because they said, you know, this is a new quarter for the city. It's not affecting or disrupting the historic quarters. It's a new quarter. It's appropriate in terms of its design and things like that and most importantly, it's not blocking view or anything.

CF: It's not very high-rise, the buildings?

TC: The height was always the issue. So, you know, we had lots of discussions about how high it should be. And still, in my view it's a little high, but development pressures are such that to get their returns they need to do that apparently.

CF: And to get these returns, do they ever think about incorporating the idea of tourism, and tourists not only visiting the historic centre then, but also these new areas. Do you ever think about it? Do they consider it?

TC: We do. We try to disperse visitors around the city. But that isn't easy. One of the reasons it's not easy is that we've tried hard to change the model of tourists. A lot of them were coach tourists, and they would come in, and they would do Stratford on Avon, then they would do Bath for two hours or three hours, and then they would go to Stonehenge. You know, and they would be their day. They would spend a minimal amount of money. They wouldn't stay in hotels or anything like that. Of course, of you're dropped of by a coach and you've only got a couple of hours, you'd only stay by the coach.

CF: Go to the baths.

TC: Yeah go to the baths, maybe have something to eat, back on the coach. So changing that model of tourism was important to us, and one of the things that has helped us do that is the

opening of the new spa. The average visitor's stay on that is over two days now. So people come on the weekend and with EasyJet and stuff like that, and they come for the baths and other stuff.

CF: Yeah, I saw that there was a lot of attention to a sustainable environment as well in the plans, with creating more bicycle movement and walking. Because I know that there's the trail which goes around the outskirts of the city. I didn't do it myself.

TC: There's a number of trails.

CF: And there's also an archaeological trail I think?

TC: There might well be. There's a geological one, and there might well also be an archaeological one. I am not aware of the archaeological one.

CF: I thought I read it somewhere, but I must say I read a lot so I am not sure. Maybe I read the things about the volcano as well. So there are considerations of 'how can we keep tourists to actually stay longer. That's really good. Aside from the environmental impact of you know, coaches, do you ever think about the impact of simply a lot of people visiting one thing, and therewith making it deteriorate.

TC: That hasn't been an enormous problem for us. Not as much as you might get in Rome or somewhere else. We're not at a point where we can't take any more tourists. The Roman Baths runs at a steady, it's been very successful at taking almost a million visitors a year.

CF: It was so busy yesterday.

TC: Yeah, and this year the summer has been one of the busiest that they've had. They did have to close it for groups. You know, they were completely booked out for groups over a few peak weeks in the summer. So that has become a key visiting area, but again, we're looking at dispersing that by providing other attractions and facilities around it. So now there's the development of an education centre.

CF: Yes, is that happening? Because I know that there were ideas.

TC: Yeah, it's still being.. the money's being put together and it's under discussion, under development. But yeah, the ambition is there.

TC: And that will give more capacity for the baths because it enables school groups and things like that to have a study area next to.. .

CF: Somewhere else, yeah.

TC: And the council is also taking the café, there's an old, tired café that's on the inside of abbey church square, which faces the abbey and the Roman Baths. And they're taking that over so that they can give another offer to visitors there as well. So at the moment you can have tea in the Pump Room, which is at the higher end of the market. It's quite expensive. But

there's a lot of call for just the coach tourists and others just to have something to eat. But the offer is not very good at the moment, so we're taking that over. And we will run that in conjunction with the Roman Baths. But it caters to another end of the market.

CF: OK. And when you think about doing this do you incorporate the idea of talking to residents of Bath who might be interested in you know, getting a share of this lucrative tourist market.

TC: We do. Not on that particular example, but I mean we do because there's close working with for instance the house association and the residents' association as well.

CF: Yeah, about also taking care of their houses.

TC: Yeah, taking care of their houses, the advice to do that. At the moment there's a big push for sustainability in terms of climate change. So last night I was at a big event for that. And that was to do with the green doors event where people who are planning to change their houses…

CF: Yeah, you can also find it online.

TC: And they open their houses up to show other people what changes they've made, how much it cost, and whether it's good and that sort of thing. And people who visit it often go on to make changes themselves.

CF: That's really good. Yeah.

TC: Those sort of things are not, obviously there's difficulties in Bath because capacity changes limits, you don't want to make too drastic changes but there's lots of things that you can do.

CF: Is there an emphasis, you know this is sort of a critical question which I sort of have to ask, is there a lot of attention to the fact that you sort of have a façade that sort of has to remain the same, but it doesn't really matter what you do behind that?

TC: No, no.

CF: OK that's good to hear.

TC: It's definitely not. 6000 almost, of the buildings are listed. So we have control over interiors and exteriors. And we do exercise that control. The interiors are as important to us as the exteriors.

CF: That's great to hear. Because I know that that's what they do in the Netherlands.

TC: Some of them are really good. I know that the one just over here, the Pratt's Hotel, I don't know what it was called., just around the corner. It's all john wood and it's grade I listed, and I was in there the other day talking to the owners in there. It's just got fantastic

features. The staircases have got circular backs on so that the Bath chairmen they can come around and they won't hit the handle against it.

CF: Oh yeah, yeah that's great!

TC: It's still there all that stuff, you know it's all been painted over many times, but it's all still there.

CF: Yeah, yeah that's alright. As long as it's all still there and it's the features that remain. OK that's good to hear because I know that that's one of the things we do in the Netherlands, for example in Leiden. Just keep the façade and it doesn't really matter. But when you look inside you see that it's not really there anymore.

TC: No I can't think of any examples of that in Bath. It certainly has not been Bath of us in quite a while.

CF: Personally, I believe that is part of sustainability. Because if you just have the facades people will get tired of this and they won't return for a visit because they have seen it before, and then if you have more than just the facade that's when the people return and you have a sustainable kind of tourism and also income for the people.

TC: Yeah there's a high degree of authenticity here because it is not only in the city centre it goes all the way out into the suburbs. It's not often visited but there's some old Georgian houses to go to. There's villas around the edges and all up the hills

CF: Yeah, up the hills there must be a lot to see as well. But I guess I must say that I am the same as the regular tourist in that sense, I think. I simply don't have the time to visit it all. That's also something I was wondering about because is there a way to get tourists to actually go outside of the city centre and how do you?

TC: There is. For instance, on that hill up there, it goes up to the university and every once in a while you see the red bus go up there. The tour bus.

TC: You can also take the wider tour which will go up and look over the top of the city and look down on it and things like that. So that's quite popular. There are the walking tours that you talked about.

CF: Yeah but of course that's dependent on weather etc.

TC: But there aren't that many destinations for people to head to in those areas. Pryor Park is one, the mansion on the hill. So people will go out to Pryor Park, take a bus out to there. But spreading them out can be problematic. You gotta have somewhere to go. You've got to have a destination to head for.

CF: Yeah, because one of the things I was looking for, of course, is Roman archaeology. And I know that there are the baths. But I know that there must be other stuff around here as well.

And that was, for me, in the touristy way that I did it, was very difficult to find. And I was wondering how you and your colleagues think about how to get more out of this archaeology. Because I read it in the management plan, but it is an important part of bath, and you want it to be emphasized but how do you do it. Because I think, yeah, the Roman baths of course is the prime example of Roman archaeology.

TC: Yeah the Roman baths is our main method of displaying the archaeology. There are other mechanisms. We just brought back into print a map, which his Georgian. In that series there's a map of the Roman as well. So it'got an overlay of the Roman city over the top of the modern city so you can see it. And there are outlined villas, there are funeral monuments and things and that, all the usual things you'd expect with a Roman settlement. The only trouble is that there's nothing to see when you get there. So you can see that there was a villa here, but being an archaeological site it's below ground and there's not much you can actually see.

CF: Yes, and of course exposing it would need a lot of money.

TC: Yeah, and it has often been developed as well so a lot of the, same as with any historic city, but a lot of the archaeology is still below the Georgian and there's not been an opportunity to expose it. Now we have got the Roman Baths, which are a good collection of the main display. There's a lot on display, but there are a lot of artefacts which aren't on display. And we don't have a city museum which is unusual. We're one of the only cities in the UK which doesn't have a city museum.

CF: Yes, I read that in the management plan as well.

TC: So if you think of our Outstanding Universal Value, we've got Roman, which is displayed in the Roman Baths, and then we've got the Georgian, which is at number 1 Royal Crescent, and then the museum that's about the Building of Bath. And landscape which is Pryor park, and national trust then, and things. But they're not brought together in one place. And the Victorian is largely the Bath at Work museum, and there are 18 or 19 independent museums all doing their different thing. I would like to have a hub that is an initial visitor centre to tell them very briefly the whole story and then point them in the direction of these other places for particular specialisms. If you're interested in this, go there, if you're interested in this go there.

CF: Like with the Fashion Museum.

TC: Yeah. But maybe that could be done through a website. It doesn't have to be a physical building.

CF: The website 'visit bath' does that for instance, that website. It was very good, I think. They had a lot of information. I got almost everything from there.

TC: Good.

CF: So that was for me, and also for my friend, we thought that that was a really nice way to prepare because it showed you know.

TC: Lots of people do, so that's interesting.

CF: Yeah, that was a really good thing. But what we did notice of course, also at the Roman Baths, is that there seems to be such a huge gap between the Roman part and the Georgian part. A city develops, a city isn't just planted somewhere. And that is sometimes the feeling that you get.

TC: You mean a gap historical, a gap in history?

CF: Yeah.

TC: Yeah, we don't tell that part of the story very well.

CF: Yeah and that's a pity because during the tour we heard the story about the Abbey being much larger at first, but of course there are ways to display this, also.

TC: Yeah, they Abbey is, I´m thinking of things, but again, we're back to this thing that nobody tells the whole story. You don't get the whole story, you get little bits here and there.

CF: So of course in the sense of urban development it's very interesting and then you could also connect that to new developments and that might cause people to actually go there and see new architecture and explore how a city grows and these are things I think that's part of my argument of course in my paper, in my thesis. Which is why I've come here. That it's the narrative that people place on cities that is sometimes so ripped up that it is sometimes difficult to see that there's a continuation which might be equally interesting to those parts that are so separate right now. And I think that in Bath it's quite visible and it's a pity. Cause I think that with all this new development going on it might be very, very interesting to do this. Because that might get people to come back. Otherwise they'll say: 'oh yeah, I saw the Roman Baths, I saw the Georgian city. OK.' So you know, if you want them to return or stay longer, you might make the history of the city longer. What do you think about this?

TC: We're doing some elements of that. I thoroughly agree with you. For instance, the western riverside, that new development, in order to sort of anchor that and give it some sort of local pride and distinctiveness, they put on display and brought back, it used to be, the industry there used to be crane manufacturers. So it was heavy metal, building cranes. Stella and Pitt were the company and they exported these cranes to dockyards all over the world. So they bought one of the cranes back and put it as a feature on the site. They've called the roads after the industry there. All that sort of stuff. To try and build back in some of the local connections that were there. So we're using it in that way. But, you know, we're not being

able to tell the whole story and that's really where that sort of City Museum would come in, that sort of thing. Because you can get to the whole story now, but you have to do your own homework. And you've probably done more than most because you're interested as a professional in the subject. But other people, the tourists coming off the busses, wouldn't necessarily get that.

CF: OK. Well it's interesting to hear that there are ideas about that.

TC: There is. But it's often quite difficult to put into practice because those museums, the eighteen museums, they're all independently run and they're all scratching around for a living. You know, none of them makes any significant money. They all rely on volunteer-time. So if you had a city museum, again, it's unlikely that that would survive without grants or subsidies.

CF: Well, yeah, that is of course a problem in these times, now. Anywhere in the world, I guess. It's something I'd like to think about.

TC: Yeah, it's a good point.

CF: Yeah, I think especially in the case of Bath, but it's also the case in Rome for example, where you have such a gap, because you have the whole Christian Papal thing and then you have the Roman thing, and there's nothing new. And yeah, it's very difficult. I know that there are, in Rome's there's a nice example where they're redeveloping a neighbourhood, where they've found some archaeological remains. Of course. But which they've tried to involve in an open air museum. Or in Italian it's museo diffuso, which is not really equivalent to what we consider an open air museum. But I think that that might be comparable with the trails that you have here around the city. But it's difficult because it's outside, and in Rome you might be able to walk outside longer and more comfortably than here. Even though it's very beautiful. What I hope to find, somehow, by reading a lot and investigating it, that I can figure out how you can create something that is not just outside or just in a museum, but that combines things and that's relevant for everybody and not just for a small group of people. Like you say, that you scramble to get the tourists that you can, because if you don't, you don't have the money. I'm sure there must be a way to do this.

TC: I'm sure there is.

CF: But yeah, it's so difficult to find.

TC: We are using a lot of new technology. The apps, phone apps, and things like that. Because about two years ago we published a world heritage trail, which shows people around town. Based on the Outstanding Universal values, and gives them a walking tour around. But we've published 33.000 of those. And they just go down into a black hole. They go on display

stand at stations, and people take them, and they keep taking them, but you've got no feedback as to whether they're using them, or do they take them and put them in their back pockets and then they get home and they throw them. You don't know. And also, the cost in producing them is so much. So the way that we're moving forward on that is having downloadable websites and things, and MP3. And the skyline walk is something like 40.000 a year that get downloaded of there, it's a huge amount. Again you don't know quite how many people are actually using them.

TC: But it's probably, that's the way to go rather than paper. And the other thing is, on the buildings we've got plaques that commemorate famous people. That's a real difficulty for us. They went on in the early 80-89?? And they're bronze and a lot of them are tarnished and have gone almost black. But they don't say anything else other than: 'Lord Shaftsbury dwelt here' or something. And so you can look at them and it's meaningless. But what we're going to do is back those up with a map so that you can have a little trail and you can go to it and you press a button and you even have these barcodes things on them. They will take you straight to the information and they will tell you a really interesting little story about Lord Shaftsbury and you know, you don't need to touch the building. Archaeologically you can leave it as found. And even the plaques themselves are historic artefacts being there since 1890, one of the first plaque schemes in the UK.

CF: That's so nice.

TC: But you can build on that. And the stories are great.

CF :But they need to be told. Because otherwise people don't know.

TC :For instance, General Walters outside of … street. He left that house and captured Quebec from the French and he was wounded and died over there doing it. It's likely that where you're standing and you're reading this is where he checked out, you know, that day, and he got on his horse and went off never to come back. And you're stood there, and it's the same stones. It's great.

CF: Yeah, that's beautiful! Those are things that you can explore more, I think. And as a tourist you would stay for this, I'm sure.

TC: Yeah I think, and also you would tell other people how exciting it was and you'd encourage others to visit.

CF: Yeah, because if you talk about, because I have some friends who have been here before, and I talked with them and they said: 'Oh yeah, the Baths, yeah they're very nice, yes it's a very nice city'. And that's it, you know. And then I think: 'but there must be so much more!' And I walk around here and it's beautiful and there's so much to see. Because with the tour

we came past, behind the abbey and then we went into one of the side streets and then there was a little bit where you can see the street level of Medieval times. And that was the only thing we saw of the medieval city. And then we thought: 'ah but there must be other things'. And then we were walking through the city and then suddenly there was the city wall.

TC: The city wall.

CF: Yeah, and that was really nice. Because it added to the factor of exploration and I really think that this is what tourists like, but sometimes it's just not so visible.

TC: No. There is an issue with interpretation and UNESCO commented on that when they visited us and we know. And it's something that we are looking at, and it's part of this package to work on it.

CF: Well and with the apps of course, now, you have the possibility.

TC: Apps is one aspect of it. But it's really difficult to control that because it's growing like wildfire. Everybody's doing an app. It's like websites. There's loads of them. You hit on Bath Tourism Plus website VisitBath, but if you just type in 'Bath World Heritage' you get about 10 if not more, websites and some of them are just completely private and completely rubbish.

CF: Yeah and you can't do anything about it.

TC: You can't do anything about it, no.

CF: And that information also gets spread, of course.

TC: And I guess that's the same in Rome, and anywhere.

CF: Yeah, there are so many untrue things said about Rome the way that everything has happened there. That's very strange yeah. Let me just check whether I've asked everything I wanted to ask. Oh, yes, there were topic-based working groups, I read. Do they – of course I hope you're going to say yes – do they also talk about the redevelopment and how to deal with that, and of whom are these groups then comprised? Do you go and pick from this list of 120 stakeholders, do you pick some?

TC: Yes, we would do. So we've had topics based on various things, on transport, on tourism. I'm thinking which other ones are still going. These topic-groups, they were largely put together for the management plan process. But at the moment we're looking at interpretation, so there's a group with which we work on that. But largely, in terms of development, that relies on the planning process. So we would influence the planning process or work through that.

CF: Just from the start on. From the beginning. Once you hear that there are ideas about change.

TC: Yeah, but also large developers would come and talk to us, because they would realise that World Heritage is important.

TC: For example, there's the rugby club.

CF: Yes, I read about that. They want a new stadium, or a bigger stadium?

TC: Yes, a bigger stadium. Because at the moment they only get five or six thousand people.

CF: On 80.000 inhabitants?

TC: Yeah. But also, they're competitors in getting supporters. 50.000, and with the seats, they can't stay at the premier level to do that. And you know, they're a very successful rugby club.

CF: City-pride, as well.

TC: Yes, and it's the same as with the football. A lot of them have moved out of the city. They moved to the outskirts of the city. There's a lot of discussion about it, but the rugby club would like to stay in the city. Because they've got a very historic site. Whenever there's television camera's you know, you see the Abbey in the background, and it's a great source of civic pride. So they're seeking to do that but at the same time there's tensions between them and the residents about getting the people in and out. And what was a public playing field years and years ago is becoming a, if you like, a private enterprise for one club. And yeah, and the architecture of course, because they're going to go bigger. So that's not easy.

CF: No, because of course you need all the modern equipment as well.

TC: Yeah, that's right, sky television.

CF: Yes, that must be very difficult because it's fine building a supermarket because you can contain it on the inside but I guess that with a stadium it's a much larger area that you need.

TC: Yeah. But it's good for tourism. Because in particular with rugby you get… with football you just tend to get men, because it's football. But with rugby you get women going to the rugby but also coming with their husbands and going shopping whilst their husbands are going there. And they tend to eat and drink in the city. And there's no culture of violence around it, and difficulties that you'd get with football. So it's a different thing.

CF: That's interesting. Because I never thought about it that way, that you would have a different group of people.

TC: And it works well with the timing because the season is in the winter. So every other weekend you'd get five to ten thousand people coming in on a Saturday when the tourists aren't necessarily here. Because the tourist season tails off. And it works well. Tourists go down, students come back. And the rugby. So that fills the void.

CF: Yeah, so you have a sort of balance. Well that's a really good point. So what happens if there's really something going on that you and your group of stakeholders think: 'this should

not happen.' This is sort of a sketch of a 'what if' but a really big developer comes in with loads of money. Half of the city says : 'do it', and half the city says: 'don't.' What happens? Do you have a sort of idea about how to deal with this? Will this cause a really big rift?

TC: It might do. It depends. We have a very strong lobby. We have no automatic right to stop anything. But the people who are on the steering group are largely at a high level. So it would be the chief executives and other people who are on the steering group. And they are extremely influential. So usually we work through influence. And it's amazing how much of that World Heritage does do that. I talked about that academy that was one of the developments. And that was the Dyson Academy. Have you heard of Dyson Hoovers, Vacuum Cleaners? I spoke to someone else from Holland, and they'd never heard of it, and it's huge here.

CF: No, never heard of it, I'm sorry.

TC: That's alright, that's alright. But anyway, this James Dyson invented the bagless vacuum cleaner. And he's made loads of money out of it and he's a British engineer and he wanted to put money into an academy for training young engineers. But it was very big and it was glass and that sort of stuff. And when the UNESCO mission came in 2008 they expressed concern over this building. And subsequently the UK government called in. So they usually make a planning decision at a local level. But the government said: 'this one is too big to make at a local level, the government is going to call in.' Now, that only happened through influence from UNESCO.

TC: They actually have the power to make that happen. It just happens through UNESCO influence. Same thing at Liverpool. There was an artist called Will Alsop who was going to do a statue called 'The Three Graces' and it was a selection of big cubes on top of each other. It was very modern. On the historic seafront at Liverpool. And again, the government put pressure on that and it was stopped. If you read it officially it will say 'lack of funding' but really it's conversations behind the scenes and you know it just can't happen because of UNESCO pressure.

CF: So it does have a lot of influence.

TC: We work with other Heritage Sites and it's amazing to see how that all works under the table not on the table. Obviously there's Dresden. But before that the only World Heritage Site that was delisted was the Arabian site with the Oryx goats on it. We've had guys over from Oman and you ask about this story and they say: 'Well, you know what happened is that the site was there for the goats, it was a natural site. And then all of a sudden, the goats were shot out, apparently by poachers. The Omani government applied for delisting of the site and

got it delisted. And immediately afterwards there was oil exploration and oil was found and you know you have to put two and two together. So you see why things happen.

CF: Yes, these are things that you don't read.

TC: Yeah, no. So on the table, you know in your notebook, you look for processes and you look for official steps and processes. But it's what goes on in the back, that is where UNESCO can have the greatest influence. Because when they came to Bath. And they're coming again now to Westminster and to Liverpool. And the message that that will send out, the message that will be in the UK press is that the government isn't looking after its heritage. So that's an embarrassment to the UK government.

CF: Yeah, the same happened in Cologne.

TC: The UK government will move mountains to stop that embarrassment.

CF: Yes, I can imagine. Because in Cologne, they were the only Western country. And they were so embarrassed.

TC: Yes, and their political enemies will make big capital of that and they will say: 'look, at what they're doing. They can't sort their own house out'. So it is in their interest to sort that out.

CF: Yes, and it is very interesting to see how that all goes on behind the screen, and you can't really see. I also found it very interesting to see that UNESCO actually came partly because there were so many developments going on in Bath. It's interesting to see that they do keep track of that. Because, do you have a certain person at UNESCO that you talk to regularly?

TC: No. That's really one of the difficulties. The bureaucracy is not as bad as other countries but we wouldn't talk to UNESCO directly. We, as one of 28 United Kingdom sites, we would talk to the government. And the government then, as a states party, would then talk to UNESCO. And when we do have contact with UNESCO or ICOMOS, we just got comments back on the management plan. And we don't know who they're from. It just said 'ICOMOS International', it didn't say who, there's not traceability, you can't talk to that person, you can't find them.

CF: But that's so strange. Because you want to be able to spar and say and think.

TC: We sent out a box of documents supporting this because they asked for things like public realm plan and transport plan. And we've got one of those but it's not in this document otherwise it would be this big. So we sent those over with it. And it's clear that whoever read it didn't have those documents. So they were lost somewhere from here to London. We sent it to London, London sent it to Paris, and whoever got it in the end, just got the management plan. So they wrote back saying: 'We asked you for these, but you didn't send us these'. And

we had to write back: 'Yes, we did.' And when you have a face-to-face conversation with somebody you could say: 'Have you seen those, and if you haven't we'll get them to you by tomorrow'. And it's hugely bureaucratic in that, so if UNESCO don't like a development – say the rugby club. We would only tell them that the rugby club is happening, but we could only tell them when we get an application come to us with the details. And by the time they look at it, it's a year later.

CF: Then they've already started to build it.

TC: They would already have started to build it. They've got legal permission to do so, and UNESCO can't revoke that.

CF: And then it comes down again to that political pressure.

TC: Yeah, and then you get the political pressure but that's happening trying to unpick something that is already in place. So that's hugely imperfect.

CF: So actually the communication should just improve in a sense. Yeah, of course that's something that is basically impossible to do in an organization as big as that. So with whom do you work most closely then if it's not really someone at UNESCO, or is it really the council itself and your colleagues here.

TC: It's the council and the local stakeholders. Like the preservation Trust and the local groups, and also English Heritage.

CF: But they're also a big sponsor, I think. Or they were at the start.

TC: Yeah, they are not financial sponsor, but they're the government's advisor. So if we got any issues on the management plan or issues with UNESCO we would call them and they would come in and advise us on things.

CF: OK. So it's the Council and English Heritage then.

TC: Yes.

CF: I believe that right now it's Heritage Week. Is it?

TC: Yeah. Is it Heritage Open Week? I think it is?

CF: Yeah I believe it is, 22 till 20something of October, but I think it's still going on then. Is that really organised by you or is that a joint venture of the whole city?

TC: It is a joint venture of the city. And that is organised by my colleagues who are based in the Roman Baths. But yeah, we have a part in that. So that's basically open doors then.

CF: Yeah, that's probably why it was so busy.

TC: Yeah it would have been. Because that would have been free for Bath residents then on those days, so they would pour in. And it's half-term week as well, so the schools are off this week.

CF: Oh, I didn't know. Yeah that makes a lot of sense.

TC: Mid-term holidays. So they would be piling in there.

CF: Yeah it was really, really busy. In the morning it was OK but then in the afternoon I went into the baths and it was just like: 'what's this?' but it was still a very nice experience of course, but it was interesting to see that you know, apparently residents do want to visit. They do have a certain feeling to where they live, which is good to see.

TC: They do, they do. Yeah, I think so.

CF: And I think that that could also be exploited not just by letting them in for free into the museum, but doing more that inspires them to care about their city.

TC: It would be interesting if you could come up with any suggestions about that.

CF: Yeah, I would have to think about it. But it's one of the things that I will consider, so. I also look at other places of course, I look at Rome.

TC: Yes, that's very valuable.

CF: But it's difficult to make a comparison when some cities have the entire city centre. Bath, in a sense, is the biggest city I look at because it's so large. Well, Rome is more confined within the walls, and the rest they don't really care about even though there is a lot there. And in Rome that is one of the problems. And I think here not really a problem, but an issue might be that it is so big.

TC: Yeah, and it's spread. That is an issue. I mean, I've been to other cities like that. York is like that, Baden-Baden, Regensburg. When you get the medieval city walls, you tend to get preservation within the city walls. And outside you have tire dealers and car shows and everything.

CF: And that's what keeps people in as well. Because that's when tourists don't really want to go outside. While here, of course, it's better if they go outside. They get a better overview. That's one of the things that I hope to draw some inspiration from other cities to see what could be done. Of course it's always an case of context, and whether it's possible and whether there are funds and whether there are people who are willing to invest. But it's something that would be great to think about. Well, I actually think this was all I wanted to ask. So thank you very much for this interview. I really got a lot of information from you.

TC: You're welcome.

CF: Thank you again.