

Heritage, Pride and Place

Exploring the contribution of World Heritage Site status to Liverpool's sense of place and future development

Appendix A: Literature review

By Neil Armitage



Project Research Team

Dr Beatriz Garcia, ICC Head of Research

Dr Neil Armitage, ICC Research Fellow

Stephen Crone, ICC Research Assistant

*The Institute of Cultural Capital is a strategic partnership between
University of Liverpool & Liverpool John Moores University*

Contents

Introduction..... 3

Background: UNESCO and World Heritage 4

 What is the World Heritage programme and who are UNESCO? 4

 UNESCO and the UK..... 6

 World Heritage cities in the UK 7

 Bidding motivations 8

The Liverpool bid and designation..... 11

 Heritage, pride and place 12

 World Heritage for improving image and ‘visitability’ 12

 World Heritage as funding leverage 14

 World Heritage management..... 15

Bibliography 17

Introduction

This review covers a varied body of work relevant to the UNESCO World Heritage programme and the Liverpool WHS. The first section provides an overview of UNESCO, the World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage List, in addition to detailing the processes involved in the designation, management and promotion of World Heritage Sites (WHS) both internationally and in the UK. The second part of the review, meanwhile, considers how the findings from this body of work relate to Liverpool's experience and the future of its WHS.

Background: UNESCO and World Heritage

What is the World Heritage programme and who are UNESCO?

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was founded in 1946 in response to the violence that engulfed the world in the first half of the twentieth century. With a belief that war and conflict is fuelled in some part through ignorance and suspicion of the ‘other’, both at a collective and individual level, UNESCO concluded that ‘it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’.¹ More importantly, UNESCO recognised and argued that ‘a peace based [only] upon the political and economic arrangements of governments’ would not be sufficient and that ‘peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.’²

Like many other international organisations, UNESCO is intergovernmental and is constituted of sovereign member states, known as ‘state parties’. UNESCO’s initial work following the Second World War involved rebuilding educational institutions and promoting cross-cultural research collaboration in the devastated countries of Europe and Asia. Thereafter, the organisation focused on improving education in impoverished areas of the world and supporting research to deconstruct racist theories and ideologies that had proved divisive and destructive.

‘They [UNESCO] emphasized that the biological differentiation of races does not exist and that the obvious differences between populations living in different geographical areas of the world should be attributed to the interaction of historical, economic, political, social and cultural factors rather than biological ones.’ (Sane 2001:1)

However, as the Cold War spread across the world in the 1950s and 1960s, UNESCO realised that new channels to develop a culture of peace were necessary. With violence increasingly involving groups and individuals fighting for self-determination within states, UNESCO recognised an increasing threat to the cultural and natural heritage of people and communities. As a means to protect heritage from the ‘formidable phenomena of damage and destruction’³ created by social and economic forces, in 1972, representatives of (some) state parties ratified the World Heritage Convention.

Whilst the World Heritage Convention acknowledges the importance of place and heritage in the formation of people’s identities, in order to safeguard unique and irreplaceable properties, it aims to ‘demonstrate [their] importance, for all peoples of the world’. Thus, once inscribed onto the World Heritage List, the significance of a site is reconfigured: not only is it recognised to be of value to the locality and the people thereof; it is also seen to be of ‘outstanding universal value’ (OUV), with the World Heritage Convention setting the criteria for what constitutes ‘outstanding universal value’.

At the time of writing, following the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in St. Petersburg in June 2012, there are 962 sites, with the first sites of these designated in 1978. UNESCO currently

¹ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/history/constitution/>

² <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/bureau-of-strategic-planning/themes/culture-of-peace-and-non-violence/>

³ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>

use ten criteria of OUV (six cultural and four natural) to evaluate proposals and designate a site as either a ‘cultural’, ‘natural’ or ‘mixed’ WHS. There are currently 745 ‘cultural’, 188 ‘natural’ and 29 ‘mixed’ sites in 157 of the 190 state parties. It is the state parties’ responsibility to identify and nominate suitable sites, first onto a Tentative List, for possible future inscription onto the World Heritage List. A member state must ratify the convention in order to become eligible to nominate sites.

‘When a State Party nominates a property, it gives details of how a property is protected and provides a management plan for its upkeep. States Parties are also expected to protect the World Heritage values of the properties inscribed and are encouraged to report periodically on their condition.’⁴

Additionally, the World Heritage Convention places responsibility on governments to ‘use educational and information programmes to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage and to keep the public informed of the dangers threatening this heritage.’⁵

‘The States Parties to the Convention should inform the Committee as soon as possible about threats to their sites. On the other hand, private individuals, non-governmental organizations, or other groups may also draw the Committee’s attention to existing threats. If the alert is justified and the problem serious enough, the Committee may consider including the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.’⁶

It was at the 36th session that ‘Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City’, inscribed in 2004, was placed by UNESCO on the list of ‘World Heritage in Danger’. This decision was made following monitoring missions by UNESCO and the International Council on Monuments and Sites to the city in 2006 and 2011, which were prompted by the alleged threat to the site’s OUV presented by proposed physical developments – in particular, the Liverpool Waters scheme.⁷ Such occurrences are not unique to Liverpool, however, and reflect what Pendelbury et al. (2009) refer to as a nascent problem surrounding urban WHSs: namely, the tension between preservation and development. Elsewhere, Di Giovine (2009: 77) suggests that UNESCO’s creation of WHSs:

‘is part of a distinctive *place-making* endeavour – one that strives to rework territorial conceptions in the minds of its global populous through the promotion of new and universally understood intellectual and cultural conceptualisation of the world.’

Di Giovine refers to this place as the ‘heritage-scape’, whereby the bidding and designation process irrevocably reconfigures places by making them fit into the World Heritage ideal, which may rub against local heritage definitions. Most recent academic attention has been directed at how the designation process and the title impact on local and national stakeholders (Rakic & Chambers 2008, Pendlebury et al. 2009). Numerous case studies from developed and developing countries illustrate issues over the ownership, management and commodification of sites (Lyon 2007, Gilmore et al. 2007, Tucker & Emge 2008, Jones & Shaw 2011) as local, national and ‘universal’

⁴ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/>

⁵ <http://www.liverpoolworldheritage.com/learning/index.asp>

⁶ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/danger>

⁷ <http://liverpoolwaters.co.uk/content/home.php>

agendas interact. Rakic and Chambers (2008) suggest ‘it is possible to perceive World Heritage as synonymous with contested heritage.’ Through a review of case studies exploring the economic dynamics and impact of inscription, Frey and Steiner (2011) outline the instances where inscription onto the World Heritage List is likely to prove beneficial to a site, as opposed to instances where alternative approaches are likely to be more appropriate.

Cases where designation onto the World Heritage List is likely to prove beneficial include those of ‘undetected’ heritage sites, commercially unexploited sites, endangered sites and sites where there the level of financing, political control or technical knowledge is insufficient for the protection of the site at a local or national level.

The instances where alternative approaches to the World Heritage List are likely to be more beneficial include popular sites, where no added economic value comes from designation; sites where inscription would divert local and national resources away from other heritage assets; and sites where inscription would increase the risk of its targeting in military campaigns or by terrorists.

UNESCO and the UK

The UK ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1984. Although an initial flurry of nominations resulted in a total of 14 sites enlisted by 1990, the rate of inscription has subsequently slowed down, with a total of 28 sites from the UK featuring on the World Heritage List as of 2012⁸. The ‘state party’ in the UK is the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

‘WHS status in the UK does not bring any financial awards from the Government or UNESCO, although it can attract indirect funding from other sources such as The Lottery and the private sector. The UK contributes around £130,000 to the Committee’s World Heritage Fund every year. However only developing countries can apply to the World Heritage Fund for assistance.’⁹

The national heritage bodies of the UK are tasked with monitoring and reporting on the state of the UK’s WHSs and identifying potential sites for inscription. There are currently 12 sites on the UK’s Tentative List, two of which were tasked by the DCMS in 2012 with preparing formal bids for inscription. For a more thorough discussion on this process, see Norman (2011).

Liverpool was placed on the Tentative List in 2002, and was immediately asked by the DCMS to prepare a formal bid in 2003, which was accepted and inscribed at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004. The site was declared to have OUV on three criteria, due to its role and significance as a world port. However, despite the prestige and opportunities associated with such an accolade, there are also immediate costs that bring important questions about value and local benefit to the fore.

‘The Cost of attaining World Heritage Site status is considerable – estimated in the UK to be up to €462,000 (£400,000), this has led to a national debate about the costs and benefits of getting the UNESCO designation and how its value can best be exploited for communities/sites.’ (Rebanks 2009)

⁸ This includes three sites in overseas territories.

⁹ http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/historic_environment/4168.aspx

The cost of attaining the title ‘Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City’¹⁰ was estimated at around £500,000 and was mainly funded by local authorities and the now-abolished regional developmental agency (Norman 2011). Beyond the cost of bidding, there are continual running costs associated with the maintenance and management of a WHS. These costs, according to a 2007 report produced by PricewaterhouseCoopers for DCMS, can range from £100k per annum for an average sized site, to roughly £600k per annum for large, complex urban sites like Liverpool (Norman 2011).

World Heritage cities in the UK

Whilst many WHSs, such as the Tower of London and the Acropolis in Athens, are located within cities, Liverpool, along with the ‘City of Bath’ and the ‘Old and New Towns of Edinburgh’, are the only sites in the UK that cover a significant part of a particular city’s historic urban landscape (Pendlebury et al. 2009). Yet, unlike the more all-encompassing and uniform sites of Bath and Edinburgh, the site in Liverpool is fragmented into six loosely-connected areas. These six areas are surrounded by a buffer zone that covers the city’s central areas, the intention of which is to protect the pathways in and out of the WHS.

In terms of managing urban historic landscapes, clear similarities exist between urban sites, in contrast to non-urban and self-contained sites (sometimes referred to as ‘monumental’ sites). However, in terms of promotion, Liverpool’s fragmented site poses different, and arguably more difficult, challenges than those in Bath and Edinburgh.

Comparing these three sites, Pendlebury et al. (2009) illustrate the tension across all three between the conservationist ideal of World Heritage and the requirement for local authorities to promote economic and social development. The authors use the concept of ‘authenticity’ to frame their argument, illustrating the tension between local and universal agendas (Rakic & Chambers 2008). Whilst they acknowledge that these tensions are likely to affect the management of all sites, the demands of living, dynamic cities provide an extra layer of complexity. In relation to the three UK city-sites, the authors suggest that the more pronounced economic and social problems of Liverpool make it more susceptible to this conflict. We would add that, coupled with the added complication of promoting and marketing a fragmented site, Liverpool’s leaders may have arrived at the viewpoint that Pendlebury et al. (2009:357) envisaged.

‘Locally the scale politics of World Heritage can become polarised around positions perceived as pro- and anti-development with each side mobilising around interpretations of the meaning of the WHS. This tension can develop to the point whereby the value of the status to the locality comes to be challenged; for some interests the restrictions on economic vitality and external interference outweigh the marketing and place promotion benefits of WHS status. Indeed, given the demands placed upon city managers to respond to UNESCO concerns, and their reluctance to use WHS as a means of restricting development, it may be that local decision-makers begin to reach a similar point of view.’

In Liverpool, whilst initial support was forthcoming from a wide group of agencies and government bodies, the business community have become increasingly concerned ‘that tightly drawn

¹⁰ Bid Available Online at <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1150.pdf>

boundaries are stifling investment. Indeed, stakeholders seem to be coalescing around having the WHS status revoked or at least revised to rid the city of the buffer zone' (Pendelbury et al. 2009:354). Conversely, conservation groups have been critical over Liverpool's poor track record in maintaining historic buildings. Furthermore, the authors suggest that the reluctance of UK planners and site managers to use World Heritage to restrict development – instead relying on existing UK legislation and national heritage designations – has possibly undermined the significance of World Heritage to the community and residents.

What can be drawn from this work is that while tensions between preservation and development play out distinctively from site to site, due to each site's unique management structure and environment (physically, economically and socially), the tensions themselves are not unique to Liverpool's World Heritage Site.

Pendelbury et al. (2009) document how the tensions between heritage and development have dissuaded some cities from pursuing the award and forced one city (Dresden) to forfeit it. In the case of Dresden, in two public referenda city residents voted in support of a new bridge to ease the region's traffic problems, in the knowledge that they would most likely lose their World Heritage status. Dresden was subsequently delisted in 2009. The comment below by Dresden city councillor Jan Mücke points to the political tensions between local concerns and the UNESCO ideal.

'In a democracy, we cannot have a dictatorship of a minority that, acting out of aesthetic grounds, thinks they know more than the overwhelming majority of citizens.' (Underhill 2009)

In the UK, Pendelbury et al. (2009) suggest that Manchester's laissez-faire approach to development has 'stymied' any plans for a potential designation. The once earmarked site in the city is no longer on the UK's Tentative List. Similarly, Jones and Shaw (2011) present the case of Freemantle in Western Australia, where there is little motivation among 'sections of the community dependent on traditional economic activities' to enlarge the existing WHS. This is because they 'can perceive heritage designations (at any level, but particularly at their highest) as a threat to their current ways of life, rather than as the conservation and tourism opportunity often envisioned by more distant observers.' (Jones & Shaw 2011:94)

Bidding motivations

While it is recognised across the World Heritage literature that the award is increasingly sought by local and national governments for its perceived economic benefits, these are not the only reasons it is sought. The report, *World Heritage Status – Is there opportunity for economic gain?*, by Rebanks Consulting in 2009 identified four essential motivations behind site designation among the 878 WHSs at the time. These are:

1. A 'Celebration' – acknowledgement and reward for previous heritage preservation
2. A Heritage 'SOS' – designated in order to preserve heritage at risk
3. A Marketing/Quality Logo/Brand – sought as brand value for marketing historic places
4. A 'Place Making' Catalyst – to encourage economic development and new place identities

Rebanks found that there has been a shift since the initial designations, from the first two categories to the second two categories. As the motivations behind a nomination influence significantly the type of impacts that are achieved post-designation, Rebanks notes that only cases within the same category lend themselves to comparison. It is therefore meaningless to explore the economic benefits and costs of sites that did not seek the award for these purposes. Not surprisingly, then, the greatest economic gains are achieved by sites in the ‘place making’ category. However, currently only 5-10% of WHSs fall into either the ‘marketing’ or ‘place making’ categories. A PricewaterhouseCoopers report from 2007 for the DCMS found that, in the UK, nominations are increasingly sought for the purpose of economic regeneration.

‘An increasing local and regional focus on culture and heritage as a tool for regeneration has created an atmosphere where WHS status is more likely to be supported for economic and social reasons that are not directly linked to its primary conservation objective. This hypothesis is also supported by the types of site currently coming forward and by the increasing involvement of RDAs [Regional Development Agencies] in the nomination process./.../This will affect the motivations and the achievement of benefits.’ (PwC 2007, para 45) – taken from Norman (2011)

Therefore, this same report, in its summary guidance, states:

‘Aspiring sites should consider what it is that they hope to gain from WHS status and in particular whether these aspirations link clearly with the World Heritage Convention. If these objectives relate to conservation, education, understanding or social objectives then they may represent a good fit. If these objectives relate to regeneration, economic or tourism objectives then these are not strongly related to World Heritage and indeed there may be more attractive ways of achieving these benefits.’ (PwC 2007:11)

Yet many state parties continue to pursue site designation on the basis of the economic benefits it is intended to bring to locales through tourism revenue (Frey & Steiner 2011). These conflicting objectives accentuate tensions between the local and the global, between the ‘instrumental’ (economic) value and the ‘intrinsic’ (cultural) value of heritage. However, a third heritage value discussed in the PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007: 10) report concerns the ‘institutional’ impact when the award is used to ‘involve the wider electorate in defining and providing access to the site and its value.’ Also referred to as the ‘democratisation of heritage’, this third value is seen as key to linking and maximising the ‘instrumental’ and ‘intrinsic’ values of heritage. In sum, and as will be discussed and argued later, public engagement in the management and use of sites is critical to establishing a working path between conservation and development in World Heritage cities.

Contrary to arguments positing the possible depreciation of the World Heritage brand due to the ongoing growth of designated sites (Underhill 2009), the Rebanks (2009) report found evidence to suggest the opposite: that as the World Heritage List grows, so too does consumer understanding and appreciation of the World Heritage brand. Furthermore, the ‘WHS Literacy’ of the public was argued to increase what Dicks (2003) refers to as the ‘visitability’ of sites. The Rebanks report also found that brand awareness ‘appears to result in dynamic World Heritage Sites attracting disproportionately large numbers of high-spending cultural visitors.’ (Rebanks 2009)

A further tension exists in terms of the resources required to obtain designation. Norman (2011) comments on the greater demands now placed on sites in developed countries to achieve the award, with UNESCO expecting comprehensive management and planning documents to be established prior to designation. Referring to her experience working on a site nomination in the UK, Norman outlines numerous positive consequences of these increased demands: one is increased democratisation of heritage, due to the need to involve more stakeholders in the management and promotion of the site, which ultimately brings wider and longer-lasting benefits to the site and the local community.

However, Norman suggests that the brand could become diluted if the majority of new WHSs continue to come from developed, as opposed to developing, countries. This, she argues, brings into question the policies and strategies of state parties in the UK and other developed countries. For example, Norman suggests that the UK could channel its resources and expertise into assisting under-resourced state parties, to preserve and protect sites at greater risk (as Norman concludes, it is *World Heritage*, after all). On this point, cross-state party nominations are increasingly encouraged by UNESCO and is a trend that could become more prominent in coming years.

In sum, Rebanks (2009) argues:

‘...that WHS status is what you make of it. Where the status has been used to full effect it has brought partners together, leveraged additional funding, led to new development and enhanced educational benefits, improved conservation and even led to regeneration in some locations. Where these opportunities have not been seized there have been more limited benefits. The benefits [and costs]¹¹ that the sites attribute to WHS status are therefore strongly related to the motives they had for bidding and correspondingly what they have used [or not] the status for.’

¹¹ Words in brackets added.

The Liverpool bid and designation

In applying the Rebanks typology to Liverpool's bid, as outlined on the site's website (see below), there are signs of each of the four motivational categories in the four pillars of the designation: 'pride', 'image', 'funding' and 'management'. Like many recent inscriptions, it was partly motivated by the anticipated economic benefits facilitated by marketing ('image') and place-making ('funding') opportunities. However, celebrating heritage ('pride') and saving heritage at risk ('funding/management') were also central to the bid.

How will Liverpool benefit from becoming a World Heritage Site?

World Heritage status will bring major benefits to the city and even since July 2004, these are beginning to be felt:

1. **Pride.** The international seal of approval will build confidence in the future of Liverpool and should be a source of great pride. Together with the success of being named European Capital of Culture 2008, World Heritage Site status is generating new pride in Liverpool as a vibrant cultural and historic city.
2. **Image.** Liverpool's new image and status is crucial to the on-going regeneration of the city. Liverpool is now better placed to attract informed cultural tourists who are keen to see the tangible evidence of what justifies the honour of World Heritage status. High quality historic environments make interesting places to live and work in and will attract more small business to invest in the city.
3. **Funding.** The enhanced heritage status is a powerful argument in any application for external funding for heritage and regeneration projects. A public pot of £4.5 million has already been secured for a Townscape Heritage Initiative for Buildings at Risk in the World Heritage Site and its Buffer Zone.
4. **Management.** But perhaps most importantly, the Liverpool World Heritage Site Management Plan is a valuable planning tool in the proper conservation and management of the Site.¹²

It is increasingly recognised by the DCMS and UK heritage agencies that World Heritage status can foster a sense of pride, promote social cohesion, and act as a focus for education and development. However, for UNESCO, a site's OUV remains its principal concern (Norman 2011).

With a bid motivated by numerous objectives, Liverpool does not fit neatly into the Rebanks typology. Yet, in light of the city's regeneration ambitions and efforts to counter longstanding negative imagery (Boland 2008), the image and place-making opportunities of the title to consolidate and increase cultural tourism revenues were decisive. To assess the full impact of World Heritage status on the city, a holistic approach is necessary that considers how the status has been used (or not used) since inscription. This must in turn highlight the benefits and costs (foreseen and unforeseen, tangible and intangible) of Liverpool becoming a WHS.

The sections below will briefly look at literature surrounding the four pillars of the designation in order to analyse the impact of 'Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City'. First, we explore how the World Heritage designation could foster (a sense of) pride in place.

¹² <http://www.liverpoolworldheritage.com/faqs/index.asp#c>

Heritage, pride and place

The broad social implications and significance of heritage, beyond preservation and conservation, are becoming increasingly recognised. This is reflected not only in English Heritage's annual report from 2009, but also in the organisation's current strategy, which aims to explore and establish the link between built heritage and sense of place. The results from a survey of 500 adults, published in the 2009 report, clearly demonstrated that people who live in areas rich in historic buildings tend to have a stronger sense of place, which may in turn foster social capital, with older and female respondents tending to value the historic built environment more in terms of their sense of place. However, the study acknowledged that taking the number of Grade Listed buildings in an area as a proxy measurement for the historic built environment is likely to ignore local colloquial definitions of heritage, which may diverge from official listings and titles. The study did not explore the relationship between sense of place and the state of the historic built environment. Hence, it was unable to determine how the re-use or, alternatively, the neglect and under-use of listed or unlisted buildings shape people's sense of place.

World Heritage for improving image and 'visitability'

The Liverpool WHS title was seen as a means for the city to attract more visitors, bolstering tourism and making the city a more attractive place to live and work. With regards to tourism, the title and the World Heritage brand is assumed to improve Liverpool's 'visitability' (Dicks 2003), particularly in terms of cultural tourism, and potentially among high-spending visitors (Rebanks 2009).

'Controlling for various other factors Yang *et al.* (2010) empirically shows that being in the List has a significant tourist-enhancing effect. An increase in a region by one world heritage site induces about six times the amount of international tourist arrivals as for the highest ranked sites in the national List.' (Frey & Steiner 2011: 558)

However, as Frey and Steiner (2011) found in their review of economic studies on the impact of inscription, there may not be a significant increase in visitors in established tourist sites unless local businesses can find means to appropriate and exploit the title for further economic gains. For instance, Hall & Piggin (2002) found in their study of tourism businesses within two of New Zealand's¹³ natural sites that while there was wide support for the titles and a belief (80%) that they had contributed to attracting more visitors, the titles were not comprehensively used in the promotion of tourism activities and attractions. The reason given for the poor appropriation of the sites was the lack of knowledge and awareness of them among businesses, which was perhaps not surprising given that only a quarter had received information regarding World Heritage.¹⁴

'...the results suggest that although operational guidelines exist for World Heritage at the international level there appears to be poor translation of these guidelines in the development of partnerships with private sector businesses. Such an implementation gap may have substantial implications in the longer term not only for heritage management but also for the manner in which World Heritage is perceived by visitors who will often receive information from the businesses themselves...' (Hall & Piggin 2002:410-411)

¹³ Survey conducted in the summer of 1998-1999 after inscription of sites in 1986 and 1994, respectively.

¹⁴ This corresponds with this study's findings for Liverpool, see Appendix C.

Van de Aa (2005: 122) similarly concludes that ‘most sites have no other visitor management plan than a plan to attract (more) visitors’ and, as such, that they often overlook the importance of the business/visitor relationship in enriching the appropriation and sustainability of the title. In terms of the political economy of World Heritage, Frey and Steiner (2011) illustrate the case of Dresden. Politicians in the city argued that the title had had no influence on tourism or the economy. Frey & Steiner (2011: 559) conclude that ‘in this case, it remains unclear if the argument was based on political reasoning or if the impact on tourism differs in whole cities [like Liverpool] and sites within a limited area’.

The complexity of calculating direct economic impacts increases when sites are not totally enclosed, as discussed below.

‘Not all World Heritage Sites charge for entry and even when a charge is made it may apply to only part of a complex site. The more complex the site, the more likely it is to consist of some paid elements (museums or specific attractions) and many unpaid elements, some of which will be utilized by local people.’ (Shackley 2006: 198)

Turley (2006: 118), discussing Hadrian’s Wall, identifies problems that open WHSs like Liverpool have with providing an economic rationale for inscription.

‘Free sites and access via public rights of way provide visitors with an experience of the Wall which arguably is not equalled through visits only to paid-entry sites, though it is at free sites where most pressure is exerted, visitors can be less effectively managed, and direct economic benefits are not derived.’

Therefore, in terms of the visitor economy, Boyd and Timothy (2006:67) advocate ‘the value [in] broadening marketing beyond the parameters of the site itself to incorporate the wider tourism space in which it is part.’ Such an approach recognises that the actual visitation of WHSs makes up only one part of the visitor experience, and may entail only a brief moment in time, and yet the UNESCO brand can be appropriated to add to a region’s distinctiveness. However, this also implies that the economic value of the WHS cannot be fully disentangled from other parts of the visitor experience.

In the UK, a report published by the Heritage Lottery Fund in 2010 found that the heritage tourism sector is worth in excess of £12.4bn a year in terms of expenditure. Once economic ‘multiplier’ effects are included, it is calculated that heritage tourism contributes £21bn annually to the UK’s gross domestic product, supporting a total of 466,000 jobs. This makes the heritage tourism sector larger than both the car manufacturing and the advertising and film industries, and significantly more influential to the economy than previously thought. Tourism is currently the fifth largest industry in the UK, with the total visitor economy estimated at £114bn.¹⁵ The Heritage Lottery Fund (2010) report found heritage to be the key driver within the tourism industry and a sector that is predicted to grow over the coming decade. However, very few studies have attempted to measure the economic impact of World Heritage inscription at individual sites. Those that have, have focused on increased tourism revenues since inscription, with specific examples in China (Yang et al. 2010) and elsewhere (van de Aa 2005). These studies show no significant increase in the number of

¹⁵<http://www.insights.org.uk/insightsnewsitem.aspx?title=Heritage+tourism+makes+a+valuable+contribution+to+UK+economy>

visitors to established heritage sites; although they do show – as figures from the LEP 2012 visitor survey indicate – that World Heritage status has a greater impact on the number of international visitors.

World Heritage as funding leverage

The significance of heritage tourism and world heritage to developing and developed economies has gained considerable recognition internationally. In a recent World Bank book, *The Economics of Uniqueness – Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development*, leading scholars and practitioners provide examples and present the case. The book discusses and presents numerous approaches for the economic evaluation of heritage investment.

‘There are different approaches that projects can follow. One end of the spectrum is to look at historic city cores as any other neighbourhoods of the city, as if all the housing and other assets in the area were indistinct or generic, and including only isolated investment on some heritage assets in the area as a component of the project. At the other end, there is the approach of investing in projects solely on landmarks of unquestionable significance, isolating them from their context and communities. In between these two extremes, there are innovative projects blending the two approaches, targeting simultaneously landmarks, historic city cores, housing, and land that would not qualify for protection individually but that taken collectively have enough character to be recognizable features that give to each city its uniqueness. Experts call this approach “integrated conservation”.’ (The World Bank 2012: xxi)

The book argues that if investment is sensitive to and can combine both the public and private values of heritage, then it can contribute to urban liveability, attract talent, and foster an environment for job creation. This approach therefore extends cultural heritage and World Heritage management beyond the realms of planning and visitor management, which the majority of sites, and studies thereof, have thus far concerned themselves with. Simultaneously, this work supports evidence presented in the Heritage Lottery Fund (2010) report on the labour intensiveness of heritage tourism, which provides proportionally more income opportunities for the low-skilled. The book builds on and develops the argument forwarded by Nobel Prize Laureate Robert Merton Solow:

‘Over the long term, places with strong, distinctive identities are more likely to prosper than places without them. Every place must identify its strongest, most distinctive features and develop them or run the risk of being all things to all persons and nothing special to any. [...] Liveability is not a middle-class luxury. It is an economic imperative.’ (The World Bank 2012:2)

Hence, the World Heritage title, as a means of differentiation, cannot only leverage tourism outcomes (Fyall & Rakic 2006, Boyd & Timothy 2006), but may also be used to promote a place’s liveability and attract and maintain talent. To date, there is no material evidence that Liverpool has strategically used the title to leverage these types of outcomes. Apart from the Townscape Heritage Initiative, created to conserve buildings at risk within the site and its buffer zone, our investigations have not uncovered any evidence of the title being used to leverage further local, national or international funding for regenerating the city’s heritage assets.

World Heritage management

‘Theoretically ‘all the peoples of the world’ are stakeholders in World Heritage. In practice, until recently, a limited number of stakeholders – governments, conservation experts and local authorities – were involved in the process. Local people, local amenity and community groups, local businesses, tour companies and visitors were largely left out of the consultation and management processes. /.../ In the UK in the 20th century, many people often did not know they lived or worked in or near a World Heritage Site and cared less.’ (Millar 2006:38)

‘But perhaps most importantly, the Liverpool World Heritage Site Management Plan is a valuable planning tool in the proper conservation and management of the Site.’ (Official WHS website)

While there is some evidence that public consultation by the city council helped Liverpool achieve designation, there is no clear legacy of this consultation in terms of either current or proposed management processes that promote, or could potentially promote, local community representation.¹⁶ The initial emphasis in Liverpool was to establish a planning framework to manage and conserve the site’s OUV¹⁷, with additional planning documents produced in response to numerous UNESCO monitoring missions. Within the proposed draft Management Plan from 2012, there is an increased emphasis on improving public awareness and understanding of the site. However, the focus so far has been on improving the visitor experience of the site, rather than the levering of wider benefits for the local population. Such issues are not unique for Liverpool; for instance, discussing the management of the Cappadocia site in Turley, Tucker and Emge (2010: 51) mention that:

‘What is unclear for the local community, however, is the part that their own culture plays in cultural tourism and heritage preservation in the area. The community has thus become increasingly disenfranchised from the tourism and heritage management processes in the area.’

In recognition of the growing concerns over community engagement in the management of World Heritage Sites in urban landscapes, UNESCO in 2011 adopted the recommendations of the Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) approach to site management, with the organisation recommending that state parties and local authorities take the following specific steps:

- To undertake comprehensive surveys and mapping of the city’s natural, cultural and human resources;
- To reach consensus using participatory planning and stakeholder consultations on what values to protect for transmission to future generations and to determine the attributes that carry these values;
- To assess vulnerability of these attributes to socio-economic stresses and impacts of climate change;
- To integrate urban heritage values and their vulnerability status into a wider framework of city development, which shall provide indications of areas of heritage sensitivity that

¹⁶ The proposed revised Management Plan acknowledges that greater public engagement in the management of the site is necessary; however, as yet there are no clear directives planned to achieve this.

¹⁷ As exemplified by the numerous Supplementary Planning Documents in 2009 for the site’s management.

require careful attention to planning, design and implementation of development projects;

- To prioritize actions for conservation and development;
- To establish the appropriate partnerships and local management frameworks for each of the identified projects for conservation and development, as well as to develop mechanisms for the coordination of the various activities between different actors, both public and private. (UNESCO 2011)

The HUL approach ‘suggests that in historic cities the process of change per se can be an integral component of the significance of the place’ (Araoz 2008: 36). The approach recognises the broader significance and role of heritage for regeneration within contemporary society, and acknowledges the necessity of the democratisation of heritage.

‘Communities have moved centre stage in the World Heritage debate. Their roles have yet to be defined in detail. But in the process of the democratization of heritage, a greater emphasis on intangible values and the pressing need to conserve and celebrate cultural diversity across the world, World Heritage Sites have the chance – both in the UK and elsewhere – to engage their stakeholders, community supporters and visitors alike in a new agenda.’ (Millar 2006:53)

...

The material analysed as part of this Literature Review has served to offer a background to the study and this Appendix provides an overview of some of the most relevant issues raised by published studies. The actual implications of these issues for the current study are discussed more specifically within the Main Report, available to download from the Institute of Cultural Capital website (www.iccliverpool.ac.uk)

Bibliography

- Araoz, G. (2008) 'World Heritage Historic Urban Landscapes: Defining and Protecting Authenticity', *APT Bulletin*, 39(2-3), 33-37
- Boland, P. (2008) 'The construction of images of people and place: Labelling Liverpool and stereotyping Scousers', *Cities*, 25, 355-369
- Boyd, S.W & Timothy, D.J (2006) 'Marketing issues and World Heritage Sites', in A. Leask and A. Fyall (eds) *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Dicks, B. (2003) *Culture on Display: The Production of Contemporary Visitability*, Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Di Giovine, M. (2009) *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*, Lanham: Lexington Books
- Frey, B. & Steiner, L. (2011) 'World Heritage List: does it make sense?', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5), 555-573
- Fyall, A. & Rakic, T. (2006) 'The future market for World Heritage Sites', in A. Leask and A. Fyall (eds) *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Gilmore, A., Carson, D., & Ascencao, M. (2007) 'Sustainable tourism marketing at a world heritage site', *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 15(2), 253-264
- Hall, M. & Pigginn, R. (2002) 'Tourism Business Knowledge of World Heritage Sites: a New Zealand Case Study', *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4: 401-411
- Heritage Lottery Fund (2010) *Investing in Success: Heritage and the UK Tourism Economy*, London: Heritage Lottery Fund
- Jones, R. & Shaw, B. (2011) 'Thinking locally, acting globally? Stakeholder conflicts over UNESCO World Heritage inscription in Western Australia', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(1), 83-96
- Lyon, S.W. (2007) 'Balancing values of outstanding universality with conservation and management at three United Kingdom cultural world heritage sites', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(1), 53-63
- Millar, S. (2006) 'Stakeholders and community participation', in A. Leask and A. Fyall (eds) *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Norman, K. (2011) 'Should the UK Be Nominating More World Heritage Sites?', *Present Pasts*, 3(2), 72-79
- PriceWaterhouseCooper (2007) 'The Costs and Benefits of World Heritage Site Status in the UK', Report for the DCMS:

- https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78452/PwC_fullreport.pdf
- Pendlebury, J. Short, M. & While, A. (2009) 'Urban World Heritage Sites and the problem of authenticity', *Cities*, 26, 349-358
- Rakic, & Chambers, D. (2007) 'World heritage: exploring the tension between the universal and the national. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(3), 145-155
- Rebanks, J. (2009) 'World Heritage Status: Is there opportunity for economic gain?', *Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trend Business Research Ltd on behalf of the Lake District World Heritage Project*
- Sane, (2001) 'Address given to World Conference Against Racism', Durban, South Africa:
<http://www.un.org/WCAR/statements/unescoE.htm>
- Shackley, M. (2006) 'Visitor Management at World Heritage Sites' in A. Leask and A. Fyall (eds) *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Tucker, H. & Emge, A. (2010) 'Managing a World Heritage Site: The Case of Cappadocia', *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 21(1), 41-54
- Turley, S. (2006) 'Hadrian's Wall (UK) Managing the visitor experience at the Roman frontier' in M. Shackley (ed) *Visitor Management: Case Studies from World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Underhill, (2009) 'To List or Not to List?' in *The Daily Beast*:
<http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/07/24/to-list-or-not-to-list.html>
- Van de Aa, B. (2005) 'Preserving the Heritage of Humanity? Obtaining World Heritage Status and the Impacts of Listing', Amsterdam: Organization for Scientific Research
- World Bank (2012) 'The Economics of Uniqueness: Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development', G. Licciardi and R. Amirtahmasebi (eds), Washington, D.C: The World Bank
- Yang, C.-H., Lin, H.-L., & Han, C.-C. (2010) 'Analysis of international tourist arrivals in China: The role of World Heritage Sites', *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 827-837