



United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization  
Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture



## Centre du patrimoine mondial World Heritage Centre

### SUMMARY REPORT

#### of the Regional Conference of Countries of Eastern and Central Europe on "Management and Preservation of Historic Centers of Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List"

St. Petersburg, Russian Federation, 29 January to 2 February 2007.<sup>1</sup>

#### **Introduction**

The St. Petersburg Conference was a direct follow-up to the international Vienna Conference on "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture" in May 2005 and the second meeting (after the Jerusalem networking event of June 2006) in a series on the safeguarding of historic urban landscapes. These meetings fall within the framework of the request to work towards a UNESCO Recommendation on this subject, which is scheduled for submission to UNESCO's General Conference in 2009. The organization of international conferences and seminars is part of the development of a theoretical framework under the *World Heritage Cities Programme* to facilitate debate on specific themes in order to establish or update international standards concerning approaches to and methodologies in conservation and management of historic urban ensembles.

The conference was organized by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in conjunction with the UNESCO Moscow Office, the National Commission for UNESCO and its Russian World Heritage Committee, and the government of St Petersburg. It was led by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Tumu te Heuheu (New Zealand). The meeting, in which 80 professionals participated (see Annex 1 for List of Participants), was financed by the World Heritage Fund, the Russian Authorities, the UNESCO Moscow Office and the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust at the World Heritage Centre. It originated from an International Assistance request submitted by the Russian authorities for a regional seminar on conservation management of World Heritage cities and to utilize this to inform decision-making on St. Petersburg. It was co-financed under the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust to introduce and discuss the concept of 'historic urban landscape', and to raise awareness on UNESCO's initiative to draft a new standard-setting document on the subject.

As such, the programme of the conference (see Annex 2 for Programme) was divided in two parts: two days of general debate on historic urban landscapes, followed by two days of presentations and discussion of World Heritage cities management in Central and Eastern Europe, including St. Petersburg, which were separated by a one-day site visit to the monuments of St. Petersburg.

---

<sup>1</sup> Report prepared by Dennis Rodwell and Ron van Oers, 6 March 2007.

## **Historic Urban Landscapes Debate**

The over-arching objective of the regional meetings is to refine the concept of *historic urban landscapes* and to elaborate it as the basis for a tool-kit to facilitate a holistic approach to the management of historic cities in a diversity of geo-cultural contexts.

The background was summarised as follows:

1. Existing international charters such as the 1975 Council of Europe *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage* and the 1987 ICOMOS *Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas* (the Washington Charter), together with the 1976 UNESCO *Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas*, date back over a 20 to 30-year period and focus on smaller settlements or parts of cities, not on historic cities in their wider setting.
2. Two key international agendas have come to the fore in recent years neither of which feature prominently in the above-mentioned documents: firstly, sustainable development (*Our Common Future* or the *Brundtland Report*, 1987); secondly, intangible cultural heritage (the UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, 2003).
3. Analysis by Dr Vladimir Krogus, ICOMOS-Russia, has identified that of the worldwide total of 830 sites inscribed on the World Heritage List (at July 2006), 411, or just under half, relate to monuments and sites within urban settings. Of these, 233 comprise whole cities or substantive urban areas, 133 comprise individual monuments or ensembles, and a further 45 comprise urbanised settlements within a natural landscape setting.
4. Recent years have witnessed intensification of three issues that pose escalating threats to historic cities:
  - high-rise construction within or neighbouring historic city centres;
  - iconic contemporary architecture; and
  - dramatic socio-economic changes in many non-Western countries.
5. Both numerically and in terms of the pressures that impinge on them, historic cities constitute one of the most important challenges confronting the World Heritage Convention today.
6. Initial markers have been laid down by the 2005 *Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape* and the 2006 *Jerusalem Statement of the Workshop on New Approaches to Urban Conservation*.

The concept of *historic urban landscapes* is not new. The perception of its potential pivotal relevance today, however, is. It is a concept that draws from experience in urban conservation and cultural landscapes and seeks to encompass values relating to natural elements, intangible heritage, authenticity and integrity, and *genius loci*. *Genius loci* embraces key components of the sustainability agenda such as sense of place and community belonging, cultural identity and cultural diversity, and – alongside intangible cultural heritage – it subsumes associative values.

Keynote speeches, formal presentations and other interventions raised many important theoretical and practical issues. These may be summarised as follows:

Francesco Bandarin, director of the World Heritage Centre, spoke of the need to distance ourselves from the notion that ‘the city is a monument; unfortunately it is inhabited’ and of the gradient of issues and values that need to be taken into account if we are to achieve an improved level of conservation for historic cities around the world: from monuments, through urban sites, to the *historic urban landscape* in its entirety. Stressing that cities are first and foremost places where people live, he emphasised that to date we have not considered intangible values enough. Accordingly, we need a clearer definition of the city in terms of what it is we are seeking to protect; hence, of the tools that are needed in order to establish the desired level of protection and to improve our management of cities. He emphasized that whereas the current reflection is focused on historic cities on the World Heritage List, the intention is that the resulting tool-kit will be relevant to all historic cities.

Dendev Badarch, director of the UNESCO Moscow office, underlined the challenges of globalisation and sustainable development and the dynamics of transmitting values to future generations whilst serving today’s and tomorrow’s needs.

Professor Jeremy Whitehand, University of Birmingham, illustrated the importance of understanding urban morphology and *historic urban landscapes* in historico-geographical terms that embrace town planning, building fabric, land and building utilisation; this, as the basis for comprehending past development processes and managing future ones in the urban conservation interest. He spoke of morphological rather than historical periods or architectural styles, and the importance of an integrated approach rather than a focus on individual monuments or areas. Importantly, his theoretical premiss is not geo-culturally limited either in space or time. In discussion, others expanded on the opportunity that his methodology offers for incorporating socio-economic and human factors as the basis for managing change, not simply in a physical sense, but as a continuous past-present-future cultural process that incorporates intangible values.

Dr Peter Fowler, UK World Heritage adviser, set out the relationship between *historic urban landscapes* and the encompassing category of *cultural landscapes* – as defined in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, paragraph 47 (2005 version), as cultural properties that represent the ‘combined works of nature and of man’ – and the value of the concept in highlighting the essential connection between a historic city and its natural setting. He went on to illustrate that by far the most numerous category of historic cities are organic and associative and that they are not so much the work of named architects and planners, as the result of huge human effort over a long period of time – the majority of which is both anonymous and unselfconscious. Successful management, therefore, is not about the individual beads on the necklace, but the necklace as a whole. He also reinforced the importance of terminological precision: to provide clarity and establish academic credibility as the foundation for taking the debate on *historic urban landscapes* forward.

Dr Christina Cameron, World Heritage Committee Member for Canada and Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage, Université de Montréal, reported on recent decisions of the WH Committee concerning new developments in and around urban sites on the World Heritage List, specifically in relation to the requirements set out in paragraph 104 of the *Operational Guidelines* for the provision of adequate buffer zones. Recent decisions suggest that the

obligation to protect views and vistas extends beyond the formal boundaries of buffer zones. For complex sites such as historic urban centres the implications of this are only now becoming apparent. Recent cases include: the Wien-Mitte development project just outside the buffer zone of the Historic Centre of Vienna, Austria (inscribed in 2001); a major commercial development overlooking the Meidan Eman, Esfahan, Iran (inscribed in 1979), outside the cartographic buffer zone but within the ‘aerial buffer zone’; proposed high-rise development across the river from Cologne Cathedral, Germany (inscribed in 1996), a closely defined site that has no buffer zone; and a number of development proposals, several of which have been implemented, in the close vicinity and within the panorama of the Tower of London, United Kingdom (inscribed in 1988). Of these four cases, the WH Committee has to date been successful in influencing three projects, while the case of London will be discussed at its 31<sup>st</sup> session in June 2007.

Professor Bruno Gabrielli, University of Genoa, considered three main ideas that appear to encapsulate the concept of *historic urban landscapes*: an object of aesthetic experience and subject of aesthetic judgement; a mirror of civilisation; and a place of relations in which the whole and the parts are inextricably linked and should not be treated separately. Similar to Dr Fowler, he related these to the different urban typologies that are used by geographers to classify cities according to their natural setting: sea, river, lake, plain, hill and mountain. In this sense, St Petersburg is a river city closely associated with the sea at least as much as a collection of monuments and architectural ensembles. Professor Gabrielli articulated a ‘crisis of legitimacy’ in the theory and practice of urban planning today and the need for a new approach that re-positions urban planning as part of a continuous cultural process that focuses on quality, embraces tangible and intangible aspects, reinforces *genius loci* and associative values, engages with ecological and environmental issues, and restores cultural and social dignity to the degraded and lost parts of cities. He described the city as ‘a landscape within a landscape’ and illustrated the integrated approach to the conservation and evolution of the manmade and natural, humanised landscapes of Urbino (inscribed in 1998) and Assisi (inscribed in 2000), where contemporary interventions have followed the morphological disciplines and vocabularies of the historic cities.

### **World Heritage Cities Management in Central and Eastern Europe**

The conference enjoyed a series of presentations that focused on urban conservation and management issues affecting historic cities across Central and Eastern Europe. The presentations addressed the following States Parties and historic cities (relevant dates of inscription on the World Heritage List are shown in brackets):

- Armenia: Yerevan, Dr Artyom Grigoryan.
- Azerbaijan: Baku (2000), Ms Leyla Houseynova.
- Belarus: Nesvizh (2005), Ms Galina Kondratieva.
- Bulgaria: Nessebar (1983), Dr Uliana Maleeva-Damianova.
- Czech Republic: Prague (1992), Český Krumlov (1992), Telč (1992), and Kutna Hora (1995), Dr Vera Kucová.
- Lithuania: Vilnius (1994), Dr Jonas Glemža.
- Poland: Cracow (1978), Professor Jacek Purchla; and Warsaw (1980), Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska-Nosek.
- Russian Federation: Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (1990), Professor Natalia Almazova; and Yaroslavl (2005), Professor Yuriy Avrutov and Mr Igor Makovetskiy.

Following the change from the planned to a free-market economy, and in varying degree, all of these cities are facing rapid economic and social change. The presentations raised a number of issues:

1. Problems associated with changes in the functionality of historic urban areas, the loss of resident populations and the traditional mix of functions, and the concentration of commercial and tourist developments, including: pressures for redevelopment; the scale and design of new buildings and the definition and extent of buffer zones; loss of identity, authenticity and integrity; traffic and parking; advertising; ‘disneyfication’; and street traders and their paraphernalia.
2. Recognition that there are options for a city’s master plan, specifically between monocentric development that focuses pressures on historic urban areas and polycentric development that siphons redevelopment pressures away from the most sensitive historic parts.
3. The importance of understanding and awareness as the starting point for establishing the management frameworks that safeguard outstanding universal value; a shortage of skills; a lack of adequate management tools; and the importance of exchange of information and experiences.
4. The need to refine the definition of *historic urban landscapes* in the 2005 *Vienna Memorandum* to incorporate more fully issues of ecology and sustainable development and to review whether its approach to contemporary architecture in the context of historic cities is too permissive.

In the discussion that followed, Dr Christopher Young of English Heritage, spoke of the lack of consensus over how historic cities should change and grow; the need for a clear understanding of why *historic urban landscapes* are important and focus on the outstanding universal values of a site; and greater clarity in relation to inscribed monuments that happen to be in a city. And Rémy Prud’homme, Emeritus Professor at the University of Paris XII, spoke to the four complementary reasons why there is a general absence of conflict between conservation and development in historic city centres in France: development pressures are not strong; reasonably efficient protective measures are in place; in most larger cities major commercial developments have been focused away from historic city centres – for example, La Défense, 10 kilometres to the west of the centre of Paris; and public opinion, supported by the media and political parties, is very strongly in favour of conservation.

### **Conservation Management of St Petersburg**

Dr Mikhail Piotrovsky, Director of the State Hermitage, and Ms Valentina Matvienko, the city’s Governor, spoke of St Petersburg as a prime example of a historic city whose socio-historical parameters have changed dramatically in just 300 years, yet whose *historic urban landscape* has not. Built by Peter the Great as the capital of an empire, the scene in the twentieth century of revolution, civil war and siege and their associated degradation, dilapidation and suffering, it remains one of the best preserved cities in the world.

One of the key characteristics of its *historic urban landscape* is its horizontality, broken only occasionally by modestly scaled highlights, and the relationship that this reinforces between people and the city’s streets, public spaces and parks, canals and riverbanks. This

horizontality was recognised as a key characteristic of the city, experienced most poignantly along the panorama of the river Neva.

Despite the complexity of the serial site of St Petersburg, comprising several clusters of monuments and sites, thorough and extensive work has been undertaken recently by the Russian authorities in the restoration of monuments and a number of experts from St Petersburg presented the updating of inventories; reviewing the core and buffer zone boundaries and the height parameters for new development; considering intangible and associative values; and the advances that have been made in information access and associated opportunities for public involvement through the Encyclopaedia of St Petersburg website located at: <http://www.encspb.ru/en>.

The conference coincided with local, national and international controversy over the almost 400-metre high office tower (design by RMJM, architects, United Kingdom) that Gazprom proposes to construct a few hundred metres across the Neva from the eighteenth century Smolny cathedral and convent (1748-64; Francesco Bartolomeo Rastrelli, architect). This project focused delegates attention on the need for an embracing working concept to enable historic cities to be managed effectively in the age of globalisation and at a time of increasing development pressures, and there was general agreement that *historic urban landscapes* is an essential concept for St Petersburg.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The participants to the regional conference on “Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in Management and Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List”, taking place in St Petersburg 29 January to 2 February 2007, very much appreciated the efforts of the local counterpart in St Petersburg and the Russian Federation for organizing this important platform for discussion and exchange of information and experiences in the management of historic city centres.

They were impressed by the overall state of conservation of the city of St Petersburg and recognized that despite 300 years of turbulent history, the city has retained an intact townscape and silhouette up to today – a truly remarkable achievement. The participants, among others specifically recommended keeping the current differential height regulations for new constructions within and around the city’s World Heritage limits in order to maintain St Petersburg’s unique characteristic of “horizontality”, which is unprecedented in the world.

They expressed the hope that notwithstanding increasing development pressures and on-going socio-economic change, the local and national authorities would continue their efforts in and commitment to the preservation of this city of outstanding universal value.

### Historic Urban Landscapes Debate

Three keynote presentations, by Prof. Whitehand (University of Birmingham, UK), Dr. Fowler (World Heritage Advisor, UK) and Prof. Gabrielli (University of Genoa, Italy) respectively, discussed the general theme of the St. Petersburg meeting, “Are historic urban landscapes a type of Cultural Landscape (as defined under the Operational Guidelines)?” While no in depth discussion took place concerning different types of cities and their development (for instance between ‘organically grown’ cities and planned new settlements), the general conclusion was that indeed historic urban landscapes can be regarded as a type of Cultural Landscape. In particular the presentation of Prof. Gabrielli showed that for several

historic cities in Italy already a landscape approach to identification, protection and conservation is being employed with satisfactory results.

To further the discussion and operationalize certain aspects for the development of tools, four main areas of research were identified:

- 1) Refinement of the definition of ‘historic urban landscape’;
- 2) Exact definition and description of ‘impacts on values’;
- 3) Existing tools for assessment of impacts on historic urban landscapes;
- 4) Relationship between the local and the international in terms of protection and conservation.

Further to this, to inform decision-making in the conservation management of St. Petersburg three workshops addressed key historic city management issues related to the common theme of *historic urban landscapes*. Their summary conclusions were as follows:

#### I. Outstanding Universal Value, Authenticity and Integrity

The workshop session focused on the World Heritage concepts of outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity. Participants referred to these concepts in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

##### 1. Outstanding Universal Value (OUV):

OUV is so exceptional as to transcend national values and be of common importance to present and future generations of humanity as a whole. The key issue focuses on protecting the values in their entirety based on a system of geological and natural values. Values are not only physical and architectural, but also intangible.

For St. Petersburg the outstanding universal value rests primarily with the imperial city, though other values connected to major events and important citizens were also mentioned. Given the city’s image as a port city and “Venice of the North”, participants emphasized the need to include all of the river, the canals and the embankments within the nominated area.

##### 2. Authenticity:

Authenticity refers to the ability of the site to convey truthfully its historical significance. This is a necessary condition for supporting outstanding universal value.

For St. Petersburg, authenticity is strongly met. While some participants felt that new interventions from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards obscured to some degree the authenticity of the site, most agreed that the tremendous efforts at reconstruction and attention to accuracy in carrying out that work meant that the authenticity of the property of St Petersburg was intact.

##### 3. Integrity:

Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the heritage site. To ensure outstanding universal value, the site must be of adequate size to make a complete representation of the features and characteristics of the property. There was a sense that authenticity and integrity may not always be sufficient to protect a city’s outstanding universal value and that the landscape approach might provide a better protective framework.

For St. Petersburg the participants felt that in general the components and elements contribute to the integrity of the site. A list of components and elements has been drawn up to clarify the initial inscription in the nomination document. In addition it was felt that the application of authenticity and integrity to each component may be too narrow, and it was suggested that a landscape approach would better support the outstanding universal value.

#### 4. Policy issues:

In general, conservation zones including the World Heritage site and supporting conservation areas should be integrated into an overall broad, general plan.

The participants felt that a large bufferzone should be created in St. Petersburg around its historic centre that should include an area sufficient to protect the horizontal character of the viewscape, one of the dominant characteristics of the city, in accordance with the layout of the protective zones.

### II. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

World Heritage sites should have a series of boundaries that reflect their outstanding universal value as defined by the criteria, by concept and theme. This should include ‘areas of concern’ responding to the spheres of influence of the local stakeholders and community.

The historic urban landscape, as part of an urban ecosystem, is a means to consider the ensemble of the component individual sites. The evaluation of the historic urban landscape should include a character study through urban morphology and hierarchal visual analyses.

Buffer zones are an ‘added level of protection’, they are not homogeneous and relate to possible threats to the authenticity and integrity of the site; these might include:

- Development
- Transportation and accessibility
- Social pressures
- Economic change
- Visual and aesthetic impact
- Topography

The zones of visual and aesthetic impact need special attention as they represent viewpoints for the image of the city, the *genus loci* and spirit of the site, its intangibility and its conservation.

The views would include looking in and out of the terrain; arriving and leaving - the river, canals, the sea, the road and rail; the skyline – the open and built view, the “stadtbild”.

Buffer zones will identify threats and mechanisms for their mitigation according to the local legal instruments. Alternative urban policies and strategies should be presented for evaluation.

**St. Petersburg:** Based on the documentation and analysis prepared by the authorities, a set of boundaries for the outstanding universal value of the site should be presented with special reference to its role as a river city.

An urban morphological survey and hierarchal visual analysis should be extended to the site. Consistent height restrictions should be enforced pending further analysis.

A series of buffer zones should be prepared including, where relevant, the initiation of planning and design alternatives for current projects.

### III. General Approach to Preservation of Historic Centres and Key Indicators of Conservation

The definition of outstanding universal value as evolving in World Heritage cities, from site to heritage, from monument to context, the cultural landscape could embrace urban ensembles in the spirit of the city. The group discussed the need to describe the city's components, its characteristics, and attempting to quantify them for monitoring and assessment purposes. Key indicators will enable cities to find out how successful they are with their conservation efforts and determine whether or not a re-direction would be needed.

In terms of a general approach the factors that work in the city need to be distinguished and mapped, which are social, cultural, economic and ecological. Each factor can be subdivided into a tangible and an intangible aspect.

For St. Petersburg an extensive mapping of the tangible cultural elements exists. This could be complemented with a mapping of the other factors as well. This would help to show the interconnections between these four factors. A number of key indicators were identified:

Cultural-tangible: buildings, open spaces, green spaces, public space, designed ensembles, parks and gardens, composition, silhouette (horizontality with vertical accents), metropolitan/regional planning, transportation and movement

Cultural-intangible: views, events and activities

Social-tangible: accessibility of the city (for living, working, leisure, services) for the population

Social-intangible: quality of the housing units, range of housing categories (social housing, middle incomes, high income), civic pride

Economic-tangible: performance in terms of revenues (taxes, tourism, GDP), expenditures (on conservation), relation to the metropolitan/regional economy

Economic-intangible: marketing potential, image of the city

Ecological-tangible: biodiversity, water, air

Ecological-intangible: water quality, air quality

Different methodologies exist for mapping these indicators (based on facts and figures, questionnaires and cartographic studies). Furthermore, strategies would include the mapping of the key indicators, based on the essential characteristics, awareness raising (general public, participation, education), as well as setting priorities focused on livability, continuity of use, maintenance of buildings and spaces, and the relation with the broader context of the city.

**Annex 1. List of Participants**  
**to the Regional Conference of Countries of Eastern and Central Europe**  
**"Management and Preservation of Historic Centers of Cities inscribed on the World**  
**Heritage List"**

(January 29 – February 2, 2007, Saint Petersburg, the Russian Federation)

**Honorable participants**

1. Ms. V. Matvienko Governor of Saint Petersburg
2. Mr. M. Piotrovskiy Director, State Museum Hermitage

**UNESCO Partner Organizations**

1. Mr. Y. Nishimura ICOMOS; Professor of urban planning, University of Tokyo, Japan
2. Mr. J. King Sites Unit Director, ICCROM, Rome, Italy
3. Ms. I. Wiese-von Ofen International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP), Bonn, Germany
4. Mr. H. Moggridge International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), London, UK
5. Ms. L. Cox First Vice President, International Union of Architects (UIA), Sydney, Australia
6. Mr. D. Ricard Organization of World Heritage Cities (OVPM), Montreal, Canada
7. Ms. F. Minaidis Organization of World Heritage Cities (OVPM), Greece

**External Experts (Working Group on Historic Urban Landscape)**

1. Ms. Ch. Cameron Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage, University of Montréal
2. Mr. R. Prud'homme Professor, University of Paris XII, Paris, France
3. Mr. M. Turner Professor, UNESCO Chair for Urban Design and Conservation Studies, Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem
4. Mr. P. Meurs Professor, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
5. Mr. Ch. J. Young World Heritage expert, English Heritage, UK

**Keynote Speakers**

1. Mr. J. W. R. Whitehand Professor, University of Birmingham, UK
2. Mr. P. Fowler World Heritage Advisor, London, UK
3. Mr. B. Gabrielli Professor, University of Genoa, Italy

**Invited Academicians**

1. Mr. D. Rodwell Rapporteur & Conservation Architect, Edinburgh, UK
2. Mr. A. Chen Professor, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA
3. Mr. M. Bonnette President ICOMOS/Canada, Québec, Canada
4. Mr. R. Schäfer Editor-in-Chief, TOPOS Landscape Magazine, Germany

### **Regional Experts**

1. Mr. A. Grigoryan Head of Agency for Conservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments, Yerevan, Armenia
2. Ms. L. Houseynova Chief Architect, Baku, Azerbaijan
3. Ms. G. Kondratieva Vice-Director of the National Museum-Reserve "Nesvizh", Belarus
4. Ms. U. Maleeva-Damianova National Institute for Culture Monuments, Sofia, Bulgaria
5. Ms. V. Kucova Engineer-architect, National Institute for Protection and Conservation of Culture Heritage, Prague, Czech Republic
6. Ms. L. Kralova Department of the Prague Administration, Prague, Czech Republic
7. Mr. S. Ciocanu President of ICOMOS/Moldova, Kishinev, Moldova
8. Ms. K. Piotrowska-Nosek National Center for Historical Monument Studies and Documentation (KOBiDZ), Warsaw, Poland
9. Mr. J. Purchla Professor, Director of the International Culture Center, Strategy and Communication Department, Krakow, Poland
10. Mr. J. Rimantas Glemza President of ICOMOS/Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania
11. Mr. J. Asaris State Inspection on Culture Heritage Protection, Riga, Latvia
12. Mr. A. Kassiteridis ICOMOS/Greece, Greece

### **World Heritage Committee Members**

1. Mr. T. G. Te Heuheu Chair World Heritage Committee, Wellington, New Zealand
2. Mr. H.E. Taungahura World Heritage Committee, Wellington, New Zealand  
Paki
3. Mr. A. Gillespie Professor at School of Law, University of Waikato, New Zealand

### **UNESCO Staff (World Heritage Centre and Moscow Office)**

1. Mr. F. Bandarin Director of the World Heritage Centre (WHC)
2. Mr. R. van Oers Programme Specialist for Cities/WHC
3. Ms. M. Rössler Chief of Europe Section/WHC
4. Ms. K. Manz Assistant Programme Specialist, Europe Section/WHC
5. Ms. A. Borchhi Consultant, WHC
6. Mr. D. Badarch Director of the UNESCO Office in Moscow
7. Ms. V. Kostornichenko Assistant Programme Specialist, UNESCO Moscow Office

### **Russian Participants**

1. Mr. I. Makovetskiy President of the Russian National Committee for World Heritage, UNESCO Chair in Urban and Architectural Conservation, Moscow

- |     |                      |  |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| 2.  | Ms. N. Potapova      | Executive Secretary of the Russian National Committee for WH   |
| 3.  | Ms. L. Lim           | Program specialist, UNESCO Chair in Urban and Architectural Conservation, Moscow                                     |
| 4.  | Mr. N. Kassumov      | Director of the Museum, Derbent  |
| 5.  | Mr. V. Oudovitchenko | Executive Secretary, UNESCO Chair in Urban and Architectural Conservation, Moscow                                    |
| 6.  | Mr. Y. Avrutov       | Deputy Director, Department of Culture and Tourism, Administration of the Yaroslavl region, Yaroslavl                |
| 7.  | Mr. O. Bykov         | Deputy Director, Department of Urban and Architectural Protection, Administration of the Yaroslavl region, Yaroslavl |
| 8.  | Mr. V. Manturov      | Director, National Centre of the Heritage Trusteeship, Moscow  |
| 9.  | Mr. Y. Magueriya     | Assistant of programme specialist, UNESCO Chair in Urban and Architectural Conservation, Moscow                      |
| 10. | Ms. N. Almazova      | Professor, Moscow Architectural Institute, Moscow  |
| 11. | Mr. V. Krogius       | Deputy Director, Institute of Historic Towns Reconstruction, Moscow  |

### **Official Representatives of the Russian Federation**

- |    |                      |   |
|----|----------------------|---|
| 1. | Mr. G. Ordzhonikidze | Secretary-General of the National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO, Moscow                                 |
| 2. | Mr. V. Shevelev      | Chief of the UNESCO project in Saint Petersburg, National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO, St. Petersburg |
| 3. | Mr. B. Boyarskov     | Director, Federal Agency for Protection of Culture, Moscow  |
| 4. | Mr. A. Rabotkevich   | Head of Department, Federal Agency for Protection of Culture, Moscow  |
| 5. | Ms. O. Tinina        | Deputy Chief of Division of Monument Conservation, Federal Agency for Culture, Moscow                                     |
| 6. | Ms. I. Smirnova      | Deputy Chief of Division of Museum-reserve Protection, Federal Agency for Culture, Moscow                                 |
| 7. | Mr. K. Zaitsev       | Chief of Division, State Control of the Cultural Heritage, Federal Agency for Protection of Culture, Moscow               |
| 8. | Mr. A. Nikiforov     | Chief of Division, Agency for Protection of Culture, Moscow   |
| 9. | Mr. V. Kalinin       | Director, Department of the North-West Region of Russia, Agency for Protection of Culture, St. Petersburg                 |

### **Participants from Saint Petersburg**

- |    |                   |  |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 1. | Ms. V. Dementyeva | Chairman, Committee for the State Inspection and Protection of Historic Monuments (CSIPHM), Administration of Saint Petersburg |
| 2. | Ms. O. Taratynova | Head of Department of Landmark Protection and Use of CSIPHM  |

3. Mr. A. Komlev Head, Department of Protection Zones of Cultural Heritage Object, CSIPHM
4. Mr. B. Kirikov Head, Department of Public Records of Historical and Cultural Landmarks, CSIPHM
5. Mr. A. Razumov Head, Legal Department, CSIPHM

**Experts, Members of Council for Culture Conservation of Saint Petersburg Government**

1. Mr. V. Ulitskiy Professor, Head of the City Commission on Submissions and Foundations, Administration of Saint Petersburg
2. Mr. A. Kobak Executive Director, Dmitry S. Likhachev International Charitable Foundation
3. Mr. A. Margolis Chairman, Foundation of Safeguarding of Saint Petersburg
4. Mr. Y. Kurbatov Academician of the Academy of Architecture, Institute of Cultural Protection, Member of Council
5. Mr. V. Lissovskiy Chairman, Branch of Russian Union for Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments, Saint Petersburg
6. Mr. M. Milchik Deputy Director, Institute of Restoration “Spezproektrestavrazia”, Saint Petersburg
7. Ms. G. Gromova Head, Department of Tourism, Committee for Investments and Strategic Project, Saint Petersburg Government
8. Mr. V. Popov Chairman, Union of Architects, Saint Petersburg
9. Ms. O. Levoshko Senior specialist, Institute of Cultural Protection
10. Ms. M. Alekseeva University of Saint Petersburg
11. Mr. S. Gorbatenko Senior specialist, CSIPHM
12. Mr. O. Ioanissian Senior specialist, Hermitage, member of Council

**Observers**

1. Mr. C. Karpinski Consul of the Republic of Poland, Head of the Culture Department, Consulate General of the Republic of Poland at Saint Petersburg.

**Annex 2. Programme of the**  
**Regional Conference of Eastern and Central European Countries**  
**"Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in Management and**  
**Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List"**

<b><u>Sunday</u></b> <b>28 January 2007</b>	Arrival of participants, accommodation in Hotel Ambassador Registration
<b><u>Monday</u></b> <b>29 January 2007</b> Hermitage Theatre	<i>Chair: Mr. Tumu Te HeuHeu, Chairperson World Heritage Committee</i>
09.30	Official Opening of the Conference with Welcome Addresses by: <b>V. Matvienko</b> – Governor of Saint Petersburg, <b>G. Ordjonikidze</b> – Secretary-General of the National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO, <b>I. Makovetskiy</b> – President of the Russian National Committee for the World Heritage, <b>D. Badarch</b> – Director of the UNESCO Moscow Office
10.00 – 18.00	Conference Part I: <b>Are Historic Urban Landscapes a Type of Cultural Landscape ?</b>
10.00 – 11.00	Introductory presentation: <b>"UNESCO's Historic Urban Landscape Initiative"</b> <b>Francesco Bandarin</b> – Director of UNESCO's World Heritage Centre
11.00 – 11.30 Lobby of the Hermitage Theatre	Coffee break
11.30 – 12.30	Keynote presentation 1: <b>"Urban Morphology and Historical Urban Landscapes"</b> <b>J.W. Whitehand</b> – Professor at the University of Birmingham (UK)
12.30 – 13.30	Keynote presentation 2: <b>"Historic Urban Landscapes as Cultural Landscapes"</b> <b>P.J. Fowler</b> – World Heritage Advisor, London (UK)
13.30 – 14.30	Visit of the State Hermitage
14.30 – 15.30	Lunch
15.30 – 16.30 Conference Hall of the Academic Council of the State Hermitage	Special Presentation: <b>"Protecting Important Views? Recent Case Studies from the World Heritage Committee"</b> <b>Ch. Cameron</b> – Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage, University of Montréal
16.30 – 18.00	Presentations and Debate by the Expert Group on the Theme "Concept of Historic Urban Landscapes: its Definition, its Scope, Boundaries of Historic Landscapes and Usefulness as a Tool for the Safeguarding of Cities in 21 <sup>st</sup> Century"
18.00 – 18.30	<b>D. Rodwell</b> Rapporteur: Key Issues of Presentations and Debate

<b>Tuesday</b> <b>30 January 2007</b> Yousupov Palace	<i>Chair: Mr. Tumu Te HeuHeu, Chairperson World Heritage Committee</i>
09.30 - 10.30	Keynote presentation 3: <b>"Urban Planning facing the Historic Urban Landscape"</b> <b>B. Gabrielli</b> – Professor of the University of Genoa (Italy)
10.30 – 11.30	Presentations by Country Participants from: 1. Armenia 2. Azerbaijan 3. Czech Republic  Debate on the current situation in the preservation of historic centers and its relations to the Historic Urban Landscape initiative (to provide guidelines and detailed recommendations)
11.30 – 12.00	Coffee break
12.00 – 13.30	Presentations by Country Participants from: 4. Belarus 5. Bulgaria 6. Hungary  Debate on the current situation in the preservation of historic centers and its relations to the Historic Urban Landscape initiative (to provide guidelines and detailed recommendations)
13.30 – 14.30	Lunch
14.30 – 16.30	Presentations by Country Participants from: 7. Moldova 8. Poland 9. Russia  Debate on the current situation in the preservation of historic centers and its relations to the Historic Urban Landscape initiative (to provide guidelines and detailed recommendations)
16.30 – 17.00	Rapporteur: Key Issues of Presentations and Debate
17.00 – 17.15	Closing of Part I of the Conference by the Chairperson
17.15	Dinner
19.00	Mariinskiy theatre

<b>Wednesday</b> <b>31 January 2007</b> 10.00 Hotel "Ambassador"	Excursion to World Heritage properties and objects of restoration in Saint Petersburg
13.00 – 14.30	Lunch
15.30	SMR "Peterhof", SMR "Oranienbaum"

<b>Thursday</b> <b>1 February 2007</b>  Lomonosov sq., 1 (KGIOP)	<i>Chair: Mr. Michael Turner, Bezalel Academy of Arts, Jerusalem</i>
09.30 – 18.00	Conference Part II: Management and Preservation of World Heritage Cities in Central and Eastern European Countries
9.30 – 11.00	Special presentation: The plan and strategy of preservation and restoration of the historic center of Saint Petersburg including boundaries and buffer zone of historic center, preservation of authenticity/integrity and criteria of "outstanding universal value", under which inscription on the World Heritage List was approved, and also key indicators of conservation of the historic center. (By St. Petersburg Representatives) Discussion
11.00 – 11.30	Coffee break
11.30 – 13.30	General Debate on boundaries and buffer zone of historic center, preservation of authenticity/integrity, Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, key indicators of conservation of historic centres
13.30 – 14.30	Lunch
14.30 – 18.00 Shpalernaya st., 56 Water-tower	Formation of 3 Working Groups to elaborate guidelines and recommendations on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- boundaries and buffer zone</li> <li>- maintenance of authenticity/integrity and criteria of "outstanding universal value",</li> <li>- general approach to preservation of historic centers and key indicators of conservation</li> </ul>
18.00 – 19.30	Dinner

<b>Friday</b> <b>2 February 2007</b>  Hotel "Ambassador"	<i>Chair: Mr. Igor Makovetskiy, President of the Russian National Committee for World Heritage</i>
9.30 – 12.00	Presentation of the 3 Working Groups on their proposals Debate and elaboration of the Action Plan
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 15.00	Formulation of the final version of the Action Plan by participants. Approval of the Conference report and recommendations. Closing session
18.00 – 19.00 Smolniy	Dinner

<b>Saturday</b> <b>3 February 2007</b>	Departure of participants
---	---------------------------