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HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH AS A TOOL FOR SUSTAINABLE URBAN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

LOES VELDPAUS & ANA PEREIRA RODERS

INTRODUCTION: HERITAGE IN AN URBAN AGE

Urban development and the protection of heritage are often positioned as opposing powers in the management of cities, while one can just as well argue that they are two sides of the same coin (Araoz, 2013). Heritage gets accused of being one of the ‘usual suspects’ of local grass-roots opposition to urban development, while development pressures are perceived as threatening, for endangering the continuation of cultural heritage resources (Fairclough et al., 2008). In heritage theory and supranational policy, the trend is to recommend a holistic, integrated and multidisciplinary management of resources, by means of a new approach in heritage management: and urban landscape approach. For the urban context, the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape promotes this landscape approach.

Cities have gained a central place in cultural, economic, environmental and social policymaking and there is wide and transdisciplinary interest in regional and urban cultures (Soja, 2011). This age has therefore already been coined the urban age. Since the second half of the 19th century, large parts of the world have seen rapid urbanization, urban growth and urban renewal. This urban and urbanizing environment is expected to become more important for humankind in the decades ahead. In the 1980s, cities became a lens into the larger economic and political shifts of the emergent new global era, which increased the urge to rebuild entire urban centres and prepare them to become platforms for the current urban century (Sassen, 2011). During this process, cities became strategic and their management increasingly complex in nature. There is growing interest in the increasingly urban condition of the planet, if only for the increasing interest in labelling cities as smart, sustainable or resilient (De Jong et al., 2015).

However, the urban can no longer be understood (if it ever was) as a bounded, enclosed site of social relations (Brenner and Schmid, 2014). Urbanization processes are not bounded by municipal or even national boundaries: they take place simultaneously on various levels and at multiple locations, and are thus to be managed accordingly. The urban ‘condition’ is now understood as a historic dynamic process, in which larger urban areas magnify the opportunity for social and cultural interaction (Bettencourt, 2013). At the same time, the presence of culture and heritage increases the attractiveness and sustainability of an urban area (Auclair and Fairclough, 2015; Van Duijn and Rouwendal, 2012) and thus likely stimulates growth. This implies a cycle that can be both virtuous and vicious, but will always entail the creation or reuse of urban resources while others disappear or are destroyed. This process will likely be accompanied by accumulating development pressures and needs for transformation, particularly in areas that constitute a high level of cultural value.

Heritage management in the urban context for long focused on conserving the fabric of the past for future generations (Pendlebury et al., 2009). While this might often still be the case, a change in thinking can be observed. During the second half of the 20th century, the approach slowly shifted from conserving historic fabric to managing resourceful urban areas. Change is no longer used as a binary concept with (0) no for protected resources and (1) yes for all other resources. The level of change is gradual and related to the, also gradual level of value. Third, the focus was on a ‘site’, while it is now on the processes that create a site. Therefore, the focus is now on the processes of integral management of urban resources and their values, generally called the ‘landscape approach’ (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015). The landscape approach as a new approach in environmental management has been the framework for more recent supranational urban policies. The approach is
holistic, and aims for the integration of urban heritage management with larger socioeconomic development frameworks.

In this context heritage is thus defined as a process that contributes to sustainable development. Not only by being an urban resource that can be recycled, but even more so, by the social and cultural contribution it makes everyday to the human environment, and to quality of life. “As the future of humanity hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, conservation has become a strategy to achieve a balance between urban growth and quality of life on a sustainable basis.” At least, that is what was globally agreed in the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. The main aim is to enhance the quality of the cultural landscape while acknowledging its inherently dynamic nature, in order to allow communities to (continue to) prosper. This view of heritage, as a process that contributes through cultural sustainability to human well-being is becoming more mainstream.

THE HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE

The landscape approach was developed by and within several adjoining disciplines, such as rural, cultural, urban and natural landscape management and territorial governance. ‘Landscape’ can be a slippery notion, and as such landscape, and a subsequent ‘landscape approach’, needs to be further defined (Phillips, 2015). Landscape is a crucial concept for many academic and professional disciplines (Turner, 2006). The development of a landscape approach is strongly entangled with theory on landscape as a concept, as it develops in cultural geography and urban studies. Landscape in this case refers to how humans affect geographic space as well as to real places (Nassauer, 2012). This notion of landscape is universal, dynamic, hierarchical and holistic; it cannot be understood or managed except through an integrated, multidisciplinary approach that embraces all its components (Taylor et al., 2015; Brown et al. 2005). The landscape approach is therefore not about transformation in itself, but about guiding the nature of the transformation. It addresses the quality of the resources and relationships that form a landscape over time (Cortina, 2011; Dalglish, 2012). This goes hand in hand with a shift in thinking in culture- and heritage-led studies. The focus of those fields has traditionally been on materiality, and on aiming to decipher embodied meaning and social expectations (Latham and McCormack, 2004). More recently, however, the focus has been on understanding the material and immaterial as resources of a more performative, constitutive nature. Following actor-network theory, heritage theory is moving towards defining objects as actors or agents, creators of value, rather than as symbols that represent value (Pendlebury, 2013; Yaneva, 2013). Heritage is seen as the ever-present interplay of resources, standards and values, cross-linking past, present and future societies (Winter, 2012). To manage such interplay in a more integral and ethical way, heritage is conditionally framed by a conceptual landscape that incorporates social, economic and environmental factors, through space and time (Stobbelaar and Pedrol, 2011). Such a landscape easily crosses policies, nations, disciplines and scales, and thus also the boundaries that would traditionally be defined to manage heritage in an urban context.

When it comes to the historic environment, guidance on landscape approach can be found reflected in the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL). HUL defines a historic urban landscape as a landscape that goes beyond the city core, to include hinterland, metropolitan regions, urban peripheries and peri-urban zones, from World Heritage to wastelands. A Historic Urban Landscape, the recommendation defines, is “the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, [...] to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting” As such, this landscape can exist of (a selection of) socio-spatial arrangements, tangible and intangible, movable and immovable, natural and cultural resources such as products, patterns, practices, perceptions, and processes, and their relations, and the values they constitute.
The 2011 UNESCO recommendation also states that “[u]rban heritage, including its tangible and intangible components, constitutes a key resource in enhancing the liveability of urban areas, and fosters economic development and social cohesion in a changing global environment. As the future of humanity hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, conservation has become a strategy to achieve a balance between urban growth and quality of life on a sustainable basis”. It promotes the protection and enhancement of the quality of the human environment, while acknowledging this environment is dynamic and needs changes to allow communities to continue to prosper. The HUL approach does not focus on a particular idea or type of heritage: it aims at quality of life and a socially just urban world. It builds on the assumption that “development without the conservation of key resources cannot be sustainable, while conservation cannot succeed without development to sustain its efforts” (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015).

Heritage management becomes the thoughtful and sustainable management of change, instead of the prevention of change. Rather than hindering development, heritage can foster development: it can be used as a driver and source to build sustainable and resilient cities, while fully acknowledging that change is in the very nature of the urban landscape.

This paper provides a review of this landscape approach, and its application in the context of sustainable urban heritage management. It presents a SWOT analysis of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, to provide a discussion of its Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. This SWOT analysis is based on a review of the concepts put forward in HUL in relation to the general landscape discourse as well as workshops to test the application of HUL (Veldpaus, 2015). The aim is to further the thinking on the landscape approach as a suitable and sustainable approach to the management of urban resources, and question the future of the landscape approach as a strategy to balance sustainable urban growth and quality of life.

ANALYSING THE HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH

To further the thinking on the landscape approach as a suitable and sustainable approach to the management of urban resources, and question the future of the landscape approach as a strategy to balance sustainable urban growth and quality of life, critical reading of the approach is important. The presented analysis is based on the concept of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) method. The SWOT matrix was used to analyse the HUL recommendation in relation to current theory on heritage and landscape. While SWOT is a standard tool to be used for assessment and management to combine analyses of the positive and negative, internal and external factors (Helms and Nixon, 2010) it is also a criticised tool. In this case was mainly used to structure the arguments and to find out how the values and vulnerabilities of the HUL approach relate to each other.

This SWOT was conducted by the researchers, based on the outcomes of a series of workshops discussing HUL in the context of local government (Ana Pereira Roders, 2013; Veldpaus, 2015) and a systematic analysis of supranational urban heritage policies of the past 50 years (Veldpaus and Roders, 2014). The results are intended as a critical reading of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape undertaken to further the thinking on the approach and the heritage concept in general.

Using SWOT for analysing environmental policies in multilevel governance settings has its pros and cons. Research shows that SWOT allows for structured qualitative analyses of a wide range of issues, and can also be useful for identifying the needs for change in policy or processes (Fertel et al., 2013; Scolozzi et al., 2014). The limits mentioned are that SWOT is done from the perspective of the one undertaking the analysis, which can easily bias the outcomes. Moreover, it provides only a snapshot in time. It does, however, create awareness of the matter at hand, which can provide a
push forward in an ongoing transformation of processes or policies (Dyson, 2004; Helms and Nixon, 2010).

The starting point for this SWOT analysis the approach itself, and in particular the questions: what is being recommended and why?

The preceding systematic analysis of supranational policies (Veldpaus, 2015) revealed four thematic issues throughout the past decades. Those were the A) integration of heritage policies in sustainable development frameworks and urban policies; B) definition of heritage in terms of attributes and values; C) focus on the management process rather than heritage categories; and D) widening of the definition of actors to be involved. By means of the SWOT analysis (Table 1), those issues were addressed and further discussed in relation to each other.

Table 1. SWOT analysis on the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths, the possible value of HUL</th>
<th>Weaknesses, the possible vulnerability of HUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A] HUL is defined as an open concept of heritage, to facilitate its integration in wider sustainable urban management frameworks;</td>
<td>[A] Integration is a reactive and problem-solving measure, it lacks a proactive vision or strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B] HUL uses the umbrella terms: attributes and values instead of specific heritage categories. By doing this there is no a priori in-or exclusion of what could be defined as heritage.</td>
<td>[B] Nor the terms attributes and values, their relations, or implications of their use are further explained or clearly defined in the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C] HUL is defined as management approach, and introduces general process steps;</td>
<td>[C] The implication of focus on process are not made explicit, while they can be radical for both heritage and management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D] Possible involved stakeholder groups are made explicit in the recommendation.</td>
<td>[D] It remains unclear how role and responsibility (power) are to be (re) distributed, and thus how co-creation and consensus building can work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities to develop and implement HUL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities to develop and implement HUL</th>
<th>Threats to be aware of when developing and implementing HUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A] A platform for integrating approaches, knowledge and skills from all types of disciplines and affiliations is needed to grapple with the complexities of heritage;</td>
<td>[A] Multilevel and multidisciplinary governance is getting more and more complex;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B] Provide an alternative to the Authorised Heritage Discourse. Using a definition that does not a priori define categories of attributes and values, or stakeholder groups in theory means everyone and everything can be involved.</td>
<td>[B] Authorised Heritage Discourse is strongly developed in many places, leaving the notions of attributes and values undefined will probably not change the discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C] Making the process steps explicit, makes them comparable to current practices, and it opens up the process for ‘outsiders’, can help streamlining and inclusiveness; The process focus does seem to fits better with current urban governance systems, as the line of reasoning becomes very important. This way a platform for a more open and just process is provided.</td>
<td>[C] Implicit preferences (implicit bias) can play a huge role in the heritage management process; a process focus can facilitate such implicit bias without naming it. A category focused system is at least clear on the categories is favours; Moreover, the process focus might open up ways of change that are not considered acceptable by current standards, and with the focus on the line of reasoning, miscommunication and misuse are looming;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D] Ways to open discussions between stakeholder groups, to stimulate inclusion, and enable democratization and the redistribution of power are asked for. HUL is ultimately meant as a stakeholder-led process to facilitate exactly this</td>
<td>[D] Current critiques on power relations in heritage are not addressed by making the process and the line of argumentation leading; As long as the discussion on power (re) distribution is hardly taking place in practice, it is very well possible nothing much changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) A historic urban landscape of integration

In HUL, landscape is used as a notion of integration of tangible and intangible attributes and human values, which is not at all uncommon in territorial research disciplines (e.g. urban studies/cultural geography). The HUL approach is applicable to the entire landscape, including all tangible, intangible, movable, immovable, cultural and natural resources and all the values they constitute. There is no a priori exclusion of anyone or anything because there are no predefined categories for the attributes and values that could define the heritage. As such, the landscape approach stresses holistic heritage management. It supports the integration of many branches of heritage, as defined by all possible stakeholders stimulates them to find common ground, literally. This is definitely an enthusing exercise that provides an opportunity for horizontal and vertical co-creation, and as such stimulates...
new crossovers and innovation. HUL recommends integrating by means of ‘the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes within an overall sustainable development framework’ (article 10).

A weakness however, is that the landscape as a conceptual framework for integration is still to gain prominence when it comes to heritage management (Bandarin and Van Oers, 2015). In terms of concrete suggestions of integration, HUL is very much focused on integrating heritage management and urban development. This integration in urban policies has been recommended in most supranational policies since the 1970s. As it is emphasized in HUL even more strongly, it is safe to say it is still not at a satisfactory level. The integration of heritage management and urban development might be considered a first and necessary step towards wider integration. This ‘in between step’ however, can also undermine the intention of integration in a more general sustainable development framework. It does not stimulate the consideration of integration for example in socioeconomic and cultural policies, or even wider environmental and natural policies. Moreover, the actual level of integration of heritage policies in urban development frameworks is largely understudied. The studies that have investigated this are all based on one or a few case studies. While some studies indicate it is the way forward (Dupagne and EC, 2004; Getty Conservation Institute, 2010; Landorf, 2009; Pickard, 2010), they also show that the level of integration, and the understanding of this integration, are still generally low. Finally, it can be considered problematic that integration is in a way a reactive measure. It implies bringing together existing systems that also evolve in themselves. Thus, integration can never fully catch up with existing systems, unless the original systems cease to exist. In addition, the definition of heritage continues to expand and shift, which makes the integration with other policies more and more necessary but also more complex. The context of heritage policy, and its integration in the multilevel and multidisciplinary setting it has to operate in, is becoming increasingly convoluted.

B) A historic urban landscape of attributes and values

For a long time, supranational policy tried to set common categories of heritage such as “monument” or “traditions”. The ever-growing critique is that this precludes anticipating diversity. As discussed above, HUL focuses on suggesting a landscape approach that defines heritage in terms of tangible and intangible attributes and human values instead. The historic urban landscape is then defined as a complex and layered set of attributes and values. Those are preferably determined and built up in consensus by all involved stakeholders. The umbrella term ‘values’ or ‘significance’ had already replaced more specific definitions of such values, such as ‘beauty’ or ‘historic’. The notion ‘attributes’ can be seen as the umbrella for all specific categories of heritage assets that were introduced in supranational policies, as for example monument or ‘traditions.

One of the main potentials of the notions of attributes and values is that they help to redefine the concept of heritage in a more open way, to be nuanced, open and socially just. One landscape can then consist of many different overlapping, conflicting or parallel sets of attributes and values, which are probably also changing over time. Working with attributes and values as umbrella terms provides the opportunity of alternative to the often used Authorised Heritage Discourse (Smith, 2006). Using a definition that does not a priori define categories of attributes and values, or stakeholder groups in theory means everyone and everything can be involved. However, this Authorised Heritage Discourse is often strongly developed. The pitfall being that leaving the notions of attributes and values undefined and this shift under discussed will allow for this bias to persist. The assumption that attributes are only those traditional heritage categories is easily made. This is one of the problems in HUL. Although there is a lot of potential in using attributes and values, these terms are not further explained or clearly defined. Using these notions implies a different way of approaching the heritage management process; the novelty of this perspective is neither explained nor emphasized. There is a need to further understand and thus theorize and analyse the conceptual and concrete application of the notions of attributes and values, and their relations. Otherwise categories are no longer
acknowledged as guiding the thinking on heritage, but remain steering implicitly. Another vulnerability of this attributes and values approach is potentially too nuanced and open, which might lead to time-consuming and thus expensive processes (Sobhani Sanjbod et al., 2016).

C) A historic urban landscape management process

The landscape approach is explained throughout the Recommendation and the attached ‘action plan’ as a set of process steps. This as opposed to most preceding policy guidelines (except for the Burra Charter, (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) that do not specify such process explicitly. The proposed steps provide a management structure for national and subnational urban and heritage policy, to be tailored accordingly. Specific cases or projects are also expected to benefit from the proposed process. By defining the steps, the process becomes potentially more accessible, especially to non-expert stakeholders. It can synchronize moments of input, increase understanding for decision-making and support the integration with other processes.

Making them explicit also emphasises the shift from category-driven to process-driven guidelines. HUL aims to make the process the main place for integration: streamlining urban and heritage management processes. For the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 1972), it was explicitly chosen not to suggest a single regulatory framework (Vadi, 2014), but to define categories of cultural heritage (monuments, groups of buildings and sites) to be protected by any kind of regulatory framework established nationally. The HUL approach more or less turns this around. It suggests a process and as such a regulatory framework, and does not lay down the categories to which it should apply. This is a radical change in supranational guidelines that potentially supports the opportunity for heritage management to become more open to a much wider variety of attributes, values and stakeholders. Instead of steering on common categories, the aim is now to develop a common process (how). Within this common process the stakeholders (who) with a vested interest should agree on the landscape of attributes and values, and its management. The implications of such focus on process however, are not made explicit, while they could be fundamental for both the heritage and heritage management.

The landscape approach is intended to expose overlapping, matching as well as conflicting, values, needs and ethics (among groups, individuals, levels of power, etc.). Revealing and managing those is not an easy process, and it remains a matter of give and take, of selection, concession, mitigation and conflict resolution. However, HUL stimulates governments to transparently draw and map the landscape of attributes, values and needs, and co-create a strategy accordingly. The landscape of attributes and values is a starting point for the process as suggested by HUL. From here, one can sketch scenarios to understand the potential impacts on the communities and their resources of favouring certain attributes, values or needs over others. As such, they form a baseline to understand the impact of certain development scenarios (both in future projects and in retrospect) on those attributes and values. It is in this perspective that HUL does not prescribe specific categories or treatments, as those are based in the local reality of the defined attributes and values. In other words, there are no pre-set limits, either for what is heritage or for what is acceptable in terms of change.

Making the process steps explicit, makes them comparable to current practices, and it opens up the process for ‘outsiders’, can help streamlining and inclusiveness; However, implicit preferences (implicit bias) can play a strong role in the heritage management process; a process focus can facilitate such implicit bias without naming it. A category focussed system is at least clear on the categories is favours. The processes of increasing the amount of heritage categories presumable eventually led to the shift towards a process-minded heritage management. They are, however, often presented as the same argument. This impedes the discussion on the implications of both. Shifting the emphasis from tangible to intangible attributes for example, is replacing one attribute category with another. Shifting from an aesthetic to an ecologic bias is a change in value. This is different from replacing the suggested categories for a suggested process, as HUL does. A bias
towards one category (what and/or why) over another could, but does not necessarily change the overall way of thinking, as HUL aims for by its focus on process. The implications for or impacts on heritage management caused by this shift from category to process remain unclear. Open mindedness towards what is valued and why, and possibly even actively stimulating the exploration of ‘other’ attributes and values, seems necessary to go beyond an Authorised Heritage Discourse.

The process focus seems to fits better with current urban governance systems, at least in the Western European context that move towards indicative approaches, that act more as a facilitator, guiding and shaping the policies (Dühr et al., 2010). The line of reasoning becomes very important, and the guiding framework. This way a platform for a potentially more open and just process is provided, that can also accommodate for a more tailored solution. This process focus however, might open up ways of change that are not considered acceptable by current standards which could be considered a threat as well as an opportunity. Though with a focus on the line of reasoning, miscommunication and misuse are looming. For example, due to the focus on process, stakeholder groups that are less involved or informed, such as the wider public, might understand less about certain decisions. The approach to two different buildings that seem like similar cases might be totally different based on the actual attributes and values agreed upon.

D) A historic urban landscape of and by its actors

Not excluding any resources or treatments beforehand is primarily an opportunity to not exclude people, disciplines, ideas, and perspectives – and thus potentially making the entire process more holistic and inclusive. HUL is open: everyone and everything could be part of the process; the stakeholders decide. To make clear that this could involve stakeholders beyond the most direct and obvious ones, the possible stakeholder groups are made explicit in the HUL Recommendation. ‘This approach addresses the policy, governance and management concerns involving a variety of stakeholders, including local, national, regional, international, public and private actors in the urban development process’ (article 6). Ways to open discussions between stakeholder groups, to stimulate inclusion, and enable democratisation and the redistribution of power are asked for (A Pereira Roders and Van Oers, 2015). HUL is ultimately meant as a stakeholder-led process to facilitate exactly this. Heritage is always a stakeholder-led process; attributes and values do not select themselves. This is not inherently different from previous supranational policies. The approach HUL suggest is, however, potentially more inclusive. As it takes an approach similar to what was stated by Howard a decade before, “people and their motivations define heritage. Not everything is heritage, but anything could become heritage” (Howard, 2003).

However, the differences in stakeholder roles and responsibilities, or any possible shift in this regard, are not very explicitly addressed or pushed for in HUL. Roles and responsibilities per process step are also not made explicit. The only explicit reference to it, is the aim for consensus on attributes and values among all stakeholders. As such, it still remains unclear how power and responsibility are to be (re) distributed, and thus how co-creation can work. Apart from the fact that there is no ready-made solution here, and the current guidelines are not all that clear, there is also not much research to be found that goes beyond the individual case study in relation to this. As long as the discussion on power (re) distribution is hardly taking place in practice, it is very well possible nothing much changes. Moreover, none of the current criticisms of power relations in the definition and management of heritage are solved by making the process and the line of argumentation leading. Understanding the impact of democratisation of heritage needs to remain or even rise on the agenda.
HUL is a heroic attempt to address the current issues in the field of sustainable urban heritage management on a global scale. Such attempts can easily be criticized, as they can probably never fully succeed. Though, why not try to see it as an opportunity? It allows for a much needed shift in thinking and opens up new perspectives on sustainable urban resource management. Its application will provide new challenges, some of them are discussed above though reality will surely reveal many more, and snags are to be expected. It is however, also a post-crisis recommendation to reposition and renegotiate culture and heritage in the context of reduced government involvement and investment. If the future of humanity indeed hinges on the effective planning and management of resources, we should take seriously the ideas that HUL promotes. Not because it is a perfect and clean solution to a problem, but because it pushes for different ways of thinking, for new perspectives and for openness in processes of heritage management, for thinking about heritage beyond the traditional definitions. A landscape approach is inclusive, as it encompasses cultural, social, economic and environmental factors, in space and time. As such, it contributes to the discussions about inclusive and sustainable development for the urban age we live in. It is holistic and development-minded, and promotes a focus on sound reasoning and process over a specific pre-selection of attributes and values that should or should not be protected. It positions heritage in the wider landscape discourse and alters the conceptual framework for heritage management. And it does so in a context beyond the theoretical academic one. This opening up of new discussions and interpretations is essential.

Defining what is of value and why (the attributes and values) by the stakeholders involved, sets a baseline for determining the impacts of future actions, including the redefinition of those values over time. Heritage is a stakeholder-led process and there are no pre-set limits, either for what is heritage or for what is acceptable in terms of change. As such, what is really new about HUL is the shift from category-driven to process-driven guidelines.

The concept of heritage as represented by supranational policies has been criticized for being a European invention, being Eurocentric (Willems, 2014; Winter, 2012) and supporting an 'authorized heritage discourse' (Smith, 2006). Authorized heritage discourse is a conceptual framework that has gained considerable importance in heritage studies over the past decade. The question for this paper was to find ways to continue beyond theorizing such discourse, by questioning the future of the landscape approach. The critical interpretation of the definition of heritage such as authorized heritage discourse is providing, is clearly taken seriously by those developing supranational policies. The inclusiveness of the heritage concept increased a lot over the past decade, and the predefined nature of heritage decreased. This does not mean we can dismiss the critiques on heritage management and supranational policies. It simply shows the value of an active debate between practice, policy and theory, and of the presence of a wide variety of disciplines in the heritage discourse. Moreover, the global urban condition immediately confronts us with the next questions. What is sustainable urban heritage management when urbanization processes are not bounded by municipal or even national boundaries? What is the impact of the fundamental reforms in urban governance driven by global economic forces, migration, and climate change? Shouldn’t we push much more for sustainable urban resource management? And isn’t this actually the same as heritage management?
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