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Abstract

Urban heritage sites today encompass much more than the physical buildings, or their material remains which have endured in a place. They are also ‘productive’ contributing to the site’s identity and vitality. Urban heritage sites carry aesthetic, cultural, social, emotional and psychological qualities that in part shape the identities of the groups of people who live and work in and around them. These groups and communities are, in turn, first and foremost responsible for preserving the sense of identity and continuity of urban heritage sites. The urban cultures into which these groups of people are thus composed become essential to fully understanding the implications of identity for these places.

Considering, however, the group of middle-income countries explored in this study – Brazil, India and Sri Lanka – the existence of a heritage site located in a rapidly changing urban environment is common, and this can prove challenging to the preservation of its integrity and its community’s identity. Ferocious urban growth, allied with a housing deficit, makes a living within the heritage-listed boundaries a possibility for relatively few people, primarily those who can afford the high real estate values and high building maintenance costs associated with historic sites and architecture. These trends can create gentrification and the social exclusion of local low-income communities, among many other threats. However, the majority of people that live on the outskirts of such sites also contribute to the site’s identity and vitality. While for some government agencies these districts, by nature of their unplanned, random and potentially uncontrollable character, appeared threatening, this thesis seeks to highlight their current and potential contributions as a register of transience and to our understanding and preservation of heritage centres today.

Therefore, one of the intentions of this research is to examine the concept of integrity and authenticity, focusing on the heritage manifest in the built environment of
heritage sites and their surroundings. This study is framed by an architectural and urban planning approach, underpinning research and adopting a holistic perspective on the heritage of urban environments. It considers the relationships between built form, public spaces and the many layers of historical artefacts and meanings that contribute to local cultural identity. This approach assumes that aesthetic, socioeconomic, and environmental concerns impacting on urban heritage require balanced management based on policies-based assessment, including considerations of ethics, social justice, and urban vulnerability.

Case studies are defined as the principal material of research, linking them by the study of comparable sites demonstrating similar colonial circumstances; sites associated with an informal unauthorised built form of today located in the fringe of the heritage sites; and mutual impact of heavy tourism and urban growth in and around these sites. This thesis aims to understand the challenges for the architectural and cultural preservation of heritage sites in emerging countries where accelerated, informal and unauthorised urban growth occurs and increases its vulnerability.

Cultural heritage plays an active role in contemporary society through respectful and mutually beneficial interchanges between local communities and heritage sites. Local development is a tool for resilience, for heritage preservation and also for community empowerment. My thesis argues further for the careful, holistic and sustainable urban development in the sites’ buffer zones, and the need for consideration by government bodies, institutional systems and heritage organisations of the positive aspects and contribution made by the dynamic relationships between urban heritage and their neighbouring communities today.
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Preface

On my field trip, three hours after I left Mumbai, rattling inside a derelict tourist van and heading North on India National Highway 8, I finally arrived at the Municipality of Vasai, within the Maharashtra State, and reached the site of the fort ruins. I had been anticipating this moment for quite a while, and I thought I knew every inch of the place.

At the first glimpse of the fort far off in the distance, just beyond the traffic lights, a white carriage, fully tiled with intricate mirror mosaics and colourful gems, stopped beside us. A tall man, dressed in a white suit was driving the carriage led by a pair of tired, white horses. This was an event I had not imagined would complete the picture of my arrival at a heritage site in India. It was immediately forged in my mind. The mixture of new, old and diverse traditions may seem an incongruous picture, but I would argue nonetheless culminates in a “true” one of the culturally rich land I was fortunate enough to research. Heritage is understood by the thesis as prescribed in such terms, whereby layers of culture against the backdrop of exceptional architecture in a remarkable setting compose an ensemble that invites the viewer to explore its contours.

En route to the Vasai fort ruins, I passed a number of memorable places: Dharavi slum—the largest in Asia yoga centres, Hindu temples atop granite hills, tuc-tucs, rickshaws, and uniquely decorated trucks, different groups of peoples in traditional attire and many, many vegetarian restaurants. An entire thesis on intangible culture in Western India would be insufficient to convey its diversity. The same could be said of Sri Lanka. Minutes before our departure from the country, for example, a Tamil procession wended its way through the streets. We witnessed devotees hung platforms aloft by hooks that pierced their naked skin and fully dressed elephants, decorated with religious motifs and paintings.
Recollections of these scenes fired my imagination as surely as the many histories I had read about slavery, wars and conquest during the European age of exploration. Not surprisingly, the innumerous Portuguese slave ships that sailed the Atlantic transporting more than two million forcibly removed people from Africa to Brazil occupied my thoughts. The task with which I then struggled while on my own thesis journey was to reconcile the Portuguese engineer, architect and artist and the intangible traditions they carried, across oceans with the fierce Portuguese explorer and conqueror.

The thesis traces these trans-Atlantic shifts apparent in the shared material culture evidenced in my case studies – the beautiful colonial architecture and urban ensemble, which formed the backdrop to my childhood. I focused on the festivities, traditions and intangible heritage, which were handed down from generation to generation. On the basis of their persistence over time, I hope to show, the continuous presence of an identity that belongs to humanity as well as the Portuguese, Indian, Sri Lankan and Brazilian cultural heritage.

With this research, I have realised a core objective. Drawing attention to the marginalised people living near heritage sites yielded worthwhile knowledge of their unique contribution to the historical character of cultural sites today. The fragility of these communities in the face of catastrophic disaster brings key insights to developing resilience in the hostile environment of urban growth in low and middle-income countries. I hope that perhaps this research assists in ensuring these people are acknowledged as the ones responsible for a meaningful and important layer of cultural heritage offered by our current generation to future ones.
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1. Introduction

... no city can be saved unless it is loved. It can be cherished from afar and helped from afar, but it can be preserved only by people who love it from inside. (Tung 2001, 342)

Visitors arriving by boat in Paraty, from the calm, warm waters of the Green Coast along Rio de Janeiro’s south coastline in Brazil, may feel as if the clock has stopped some time during the eighteenth century. Colonial houses, well-preserved churches and the exquisite pé-de-moleque (cobblestone) paving create the ambience of an earlier period, associated with ‘the golden age’ of the village (Figure 1). After a stroll of exactly five hundred meters across the Brazilian nationally heritage-listed historic district of Paraty, one reaches the site’s listed boundaries. Beyond these limits, the real Paraty presents itself (Figure 2), a crowded and dense village with electrical wires crossing the sky, cars jamming narrow streets; apparently incomplete buildings are interspersed with present-day copies of traditional colonial buildings and old structures with contemporary additions.

Paraty serves as one of the case studies addressed by this thesis, along with some other urban heritage sites situated within the middle-income group of countries. These places today encompass much more than the physical buildings that have survived generations, contained by boundaries demarcated at some time in the past. Urban heritage sites also possess aesthetic, cultural, social, emotional and psychological characteristics that in part shape the identities of the groups of people who live and work in and around them. Each characteristic is essential to understanding these places fully, and those responsible for preserving the sense of identity and continuity of such urban cultures are first and foremost the communities and groups living in them today.
Figure 1 - The heritage centre, Paraty, Brazil. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 2 - Outside the heritage boundaries, Paraty, Brazil. Photo by author, 2012.
This study began with my interest in the architectural heritage of former Portuguese colonial settlements such as Paraty. These settlements are typically located in coastal, riverine or hillside areas, which enabled optimal strategic positioning for defence, particularly of colonial territorial interests (Cavalcanti 2004). Many of these urban heritage sites are under pressure from explosive urban growth and environmental and anthropogenic threats (Smith 2002; Rodwell 2007; Imon 2008; Yuen and Kong 2009; Jha et al. 2010). At the same time, the local communities that have persisted in urban heritage sites continue to practice traditions instigated during colonisation, providing interesting examples of multi-layered cultures (India 2002; Solomon 2009; Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012). Such communities living in those districts contribute significantly to the identity of the urban heritage centres as well as to their social, economic and cultural vitality (India 2002; Solomon 2009; Karmarkar 2010; Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012; Holgersson 2013), for example, by preserving traditions, performing and transmitting cultural activities through generations, supporting local tourism. They are significant stakeholders in the heritage structure. However their contributions to heritage tourism and preservation are often not acknowledged (India 2002; Solomon 2009; Karmarkar 2010; Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012; Perlman 2010).

Heritage sites around the globe are subject to forces of unequal development, which have disparate effects upon historical, urban morphological, cultural and material integrity and authenticity. Of course, there are positive aspects to the dynamics that accompany growth, however, the consequences of globalisation and differential development have had strongly deleterious effects on the culture and context of heritage sites in developing countries, threatening the sense of place commonly associated with them (Imon 2008; Rodwell 2011; Mutual 2011). Infrastructure development, led by government agencies and required to satisfy international interests, is often detrimental to the authenticity and integrity of heritage sites in developing countries. Heritage-listed
Chapter 1

Colonial architecture is surrounded and, arguably, overpowered by haphazardly completed modern construction and its characteristic reflective glass panels, aluminium window frames, and shiny tiled building facades. However, these environments also prompt potentially new cultural opportunities and understandings of preservation.

Research Questions

In light of the foregoing overview and outline of issues, this study raises the following questions:

1. How does the informal unauthorised built form of today contribute to or detract from the heritage value of sites?

2. What is the impact upon local cultural and material wholeness, integrity and authenticity from heavy tourism and neighbouring overdevelopment in heritage sites?

3. How are heritage sites made vulnerable by the neglect of low socio-economic level communities, combined with the impact of environmental stresses?
Chapter 1

Significance

This thesis focuses on the dynamic relationships between urban heritage sites and their neighbouring communities in Brazil, India and Sri Lanka. These countries share a history of Portuguese colonisation and forms of urban heritage associated with colonial periods, as well as explosive urban sprawl near their heritage centres. Much of this sprawl is created by the urban poor seeking to survive in an economically challenging system. Population growth caused by inward migration from rural areas is exacerbated by tourism that intensifies in and around historic centres (India 2002; Solomon 2009; Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012). Rapid urban growth, allied with housing deficits, makes a living within the heritage-listed boundaries of a site possible for relatively few people, primarily those who can afford the high real estate values and high building maintenance costs associated with historic sites and architecture. The communities living within and around such sites have significant social, economic and cultural ties to urban heritage in city centres. The majority of the urban population resides on the outskirts of such sites, often within ‘buffer zones’ established to physically protect the heritage-listed sites from the twin threats of nature (including landslides, floods, erosion, drought and heat waves) and over-development (including deforestation, pollution, water scarcity, and inadequate infrastructure). However, the vulnerability of heritage sites is increased by accelerated, informal and unauthorised urban growth in the buffer zones, which are often poorly maintained or ineffective as protection measures (Imon 2008; Yuen and Kong 2009; Jha et al. 2010). Consequently, these zones present challenges for architectural and cultural preservation in these countries.

This research, therefore, examines current understandings of and threats to the heritage values of integrity and authenticity in the context of heritage sites in developing
countries. It considers the prevailing social, economic and cultural dynamics between heritage precincts and their surroundings, including the unplanned urban growth and informal districts. Some government agencies are pressured by the unplanned, random, and potentially uncontrollable character of these districts (Wijeratne et al. 2005; Soares Goncalves 2006) and these largely unauthorised developments are scarcely accommodated by heritage policies. Seeing a need, UNESCO (2005) adopted the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) in 2005, which acknowledges the holistic contribution of a constantly changing environment to a heritage core. Despite the implementation by UNESCO’s recommendation on HUL in 2011 and its wide acceptance by heritage practitioners (UNESCO 2016), the contributions of the non-indigenous and low socio-economic communities that surround heritage sites are rarely acknowledged by local governments (Karmarkar 2010; Perlman 2010). However, the informal architecture that surrounds heritage sites suggests that inhabitants make efforts to maintain traditions while securing the vitality of the heritage sites. This thesis, therefore, considers the heritage sites and their surrounding informal districts and inhabitants as registers of transience and highlights their current and potential contributions to our understanding and preservation of heritage sites.

The authenticity and integrity of heritage sites are also challenged by heavy tourism, which has multiple effects. The vicious cycle of rising tourism opportunism contributes to migration to areas close to economic opportunities (Bourdeau, Gravari-Barbas and Robinson 2016), increasing the demand for housing, generating neighbouring overdevelopment where governments do not enforce planning policies, and stressing the environment. Tourism branding in particular (Giraudo 2016; Bauer, Trimarchi and Zappino 2016), challenges the authenticity and integrity of a heritage site by requiring the built fabric to cater to and accommodate the tourism audience, thereby escalating demand for and value of the real estate. Gentrification and rising social inequality follow.
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The recent exponential growth in the tourism industry (Bourdeau, Gravari-Barbas and Robinson 2016) experienced at the heritage sites investigated during this research has contributed to the expansion of informal urban development around the sites, as people move in to cater for armies of short-term tourists.

Urban growth processes also directly modify the hazard profiles of cities – for example, through the urbanisation of hills and sloping terrain or floodplains – and indirectly generate hazards such as landslides and more frequent or intensive flooding. International heritage organizations recommend that agencies responsible for all heritage sites in disaster-prone areas have disaster risk management plans in place (UNESCO 2007a). When such catastrophes occur, it is the urban poor and their contribution to the urban vitality and longevity of heritage centres, which face the greatest danger. For example, the favelas, or low-income districts, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil are vulnerable to landslides, while Western Indian sites and Galle in south-west Sri Lanka are endangered by earthquakes and tsunamis (India 2002; Fernandes et al. 2004; Wijeratne 2005; Solomon 2009; Desai and Choudhury 2014). Moreover, climate change increases the vulnerability of heritage sites to natural disasters. While ‘natural’ disasters are difficult to predict and their effects hard to mitigate, hazards resulting from human activities are predictable and their effects, to some degree, can be mitigated. Consequently, risk reduction plans to protect communities, visitors, and both tangible and intangible heritage assets from catastrophic threats are particularly important for heritage site managers in cities with explosive growth. This research has therefore cultivated a further understanding of the specific vulnerabilities of heritage centres and their surrounding low-income informal districts in developing countries to disaster risks.
Scope of Study

During the period of exploration and colonial expansion by European nations in the sixteenth century, cities were integral to the political and economic control of territories (King 1985, 8). Situated along routes of global human migration, former Portuguese colonial cities in South America, Africa and Asia are of particular interest for heritage scholars. Such cities are cultural crossroads whose architecture has been directly influenced by centuries of mixed identities and capital flows. Particular cities are repositories of political and social culture, insofar as their townscapes and collective memories are concerned (Shaw 2009, 6), providing material evidence of changing cultures. After more than four centuries, the complex hybrid cultural heritage in former Portuguese colonies is evident in the extant colonial architecture.

Cities such as Rio de Janeiro and Paraty in Brazil, Goa, Vasai and Daman in India, and the Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka are particularly ripe for consideration. Sequential refurbishment or development of these cities enriches our knowledge of the consequences of phenomena attending urban growth, including high-intensity land use, traffic congestion, deterioration of civic infrastructure, pressures of commercial development, and the physical and aesthetic dominance of modern buildings over heritage structures (Chung 2009; Shaw 2009; Alhabshi 2010; Arantes 2011). Further, these cities share a similar pattern of settlement and are, for the most part, situated in coastal, riverine, or hillside areas of middle-income countries. Reclaimed coastal land is highly susceptible to natural disaster damage. Because many formerly unoccupied natural areas near traditional settlements are now formal or informal settlements, their heritage is doubly threatened by urban growth and its attendant problems and the spectre of natural disaster. The Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka, for example, was listed as a World Heritage Site in 1988 and is
vulnerable because of the commodification of local culture caused by tourism and intrusive construction.

This research assesses the vulnerability of cultural heritage attributes to socio-economic stresses and environmental impacts, investigating the opportunities and constraints for heritage development in rapidly changing urban environments. This is done through the themes of (1) heritage as a register of transience, (2) heritage integrity and authenticity, and (3) heritage vulnerability. This assessment is supported by material evidence and the contributions made by informal unauthorised communities to the integrity and authenticity of three World Heritage Sites in Brazil, India and Sri Lanka: the Rio de Janeiro Cultural Landscape, Brazil; the Old Town of Galle, Sri Lanka (Figure 3); and the Churches and Convents of Goa, India (Figure 4). The study is framed by an architectural and urban planning approach and adopts a holistic perspective towards the heritage of urban environments. It considers the relationships between built forms, public spaces and the multiple layers of historical artefacts and behaviours that contribute to local cultural identity. This approach assumes that the aesthetic, socioeconomic and environmental concerns that impact on urban heritage require balanced management strategies that combine policy-based assessment with ethics, social justice and urban vulnerability.
Figure 3 - Old Town of Galle, Sri Lanka. Photo by author, 2014.

Figure 4 - Churches and Convents of Goa, India. Photo by author, 2014.
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Originality

This thesis provides an original analysis and comparison of the evolution of informal communities at heritage sites and their contribution to heritage as a dynamic process. In addition to serving as present day urban centres, the interrelated factors and dynamics of the urban environments of heritage sites have largely escaped critical attention. This work calls upon a ‘moral philosophy’ of heritage, interpreting the tangible and intangible values governing the development of heritage centres and exploring the interrelationships between these values and the urban heritage landscape, paying specific attention to urban morphology. It examines the existing urban structure of heritage sites and its associated cultural identity through its configuration and development, with particular reference to conditions in developing countries. The comparative analysis of the unique qualities of the heritage sites in Brazil, India and Sri Lanka enables such sites to be identified as registers of transience.

Definition of terms

Definitions of key terms used in this thesis were sourced from the leading professional agencies and international organisations that focus on culture and heritage, including UNESCO, the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research for the Asian and Pacific Region (WHITRAP) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). These agencies promote extensive research, organise meetings and encourage the definition of internationally agreed principles and scientific techniques in the field of cultural heritage studies. ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN are
advisory bodies for the World Heritage Centre (WHC) on the implementation of the World Heritage (WH) Convention of UNESCO. Their missions and statements are discussed in Chapter Three. Other key terms such as ‘cultural heritage’ and ‘community’ are complex, and definitions vary according to the discipline involved. Their use in this thesis defers to leading authors and scholars in the field of cultural heritage studies, in order to provide and support nuanced understandings of these terms.

Cultural Heritage

ICOMOS (2002) defines ‘culture’ as

the entire complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterise a community, society or social group. It includes not only arts and literature, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs. Culture encompasses the living or contemporary characteristics and values of a community as well as those that have survived from the past. (21)

Therefore, community is the basis for culture, composed of an array of tangible and intangible cultural aspects, transmitted throughout generations in the past and granted for future generations. Culture, in other words, is the characteristics, values and identity of a community. The painting by Tarsila do Amaral, listed as Brazilian moveable cultural heritage (Figure 5) is a great example. It represents multiple cultural values, historical because it was painted by this renowned modernist painter, and aesthetic, being characteristic of the style. In addition to its tangible cultural value, the painting also portrays the social, symbolic and aesthetic value of a landscape in a given period or moment.
Introduced in the sixth century, the use and definition of the term ‘cultural heritage’ has varied (Jokilehto 2005). The contemporary definition most widely recognised by heritage specialists is given by UNESCO in its Operational Guidelines (2013, 13), where cultural heritage is defined as constructions, monuments, buildings and/or natural sites. The Guidelines further describe cultural heritage as comprising natural and built heritage, cultural landscapes and moveable heritage such as paintings or furniture. All these components of cultural heritage will be addressed in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Jigyasu et al. (2013) provide a more comprehensive and nuanced interpretation of cultural heritage, which is particularly relevant for this thesis:

Cultural heritage today encompasses a broader array of places such as historic cities, living cultural landscapes, gardens or sacred forest and
mountains, technological or industrial achievements in the recent past and even sites associated with painful memories and war. Collections of movable and immovable items within sites, museums, historic properties and archives have also increased significantly in scope, testifying not only to the lifestyles of royalty and the achievements of great artists, but also to the everyday lives of ordinary people. At the same time intangibles such as knowledge, beliefs and value systems are fundamental aspects of heritage that have a powerful influence on people’s daily choices and behaviours. (13)

Therefore, “knowledge, beliefs and value systems” are fundamental to cultural heritage and the “everyday lives of ordinary people,” i.e., local and traditional knowledge, form the basis of the world’s cultural diversity.

**Community**

Rather than relying on the conventional understanding of ‘community’ as signifying an intentional relationship within a group of people at a certain geographic location, this study adopts an anthropological definition of the term. James (2012, 14) defines community as “a group or network of persons who are connected (objectively) to each other by relatively durable social relations that extend beyond immediate genealogical ties and who mutually define that relationship (subjectively) as important to their social identity and social practice.” This definition describes an intangible aspect of community, linking groups to more than the physical boundaries of a neighbourhood or a city through shared values, purposes, identity, and forms of social cooperation. Bruhn (2005, 12) adds that relationships within a community are “closer than casual relationships, because the group shares some common goals, values, and perhaps a way of life that reinforces each other, creates positive feelings, and results in a degree of mutual commitment and responsibility.” This mutual responsibility is important when discussing informal communities, which form tacit agreements about the use of vacant land, water, energy and other council services, if available, to which they have no legal claim and for which they pay no taxes. This mutual responsibility also generates a community identity
recognisable by others in the same community, which is built on spatial segregation and which sometimes undermines former cultural identities.

Taylor and Levine (2011, 4) remind us that “like heritage, the subject of community is hardly unproblematic, but rather obscure and, partly for this reason, politically charged with implications for how individuals and societies should conduct themselves.” Therefore, communities are entangled in the circulation and coercions of power, forming complex social and spatial relationships within a community. For example, the *favelas* in Rio de Janeiro are more often than not marginalised and maintained by exclusionary practices by the wider society, mostly because they remain communities with high levels of violence and drug trafficking (Soares Gonçalves 2006). Moreover, their informality and environmentally destructive, unsafe construction make the *favelas* undesirable neighbours. However, Lara (2013, 554) affirms that “the large majority of them [favela residents] are low-paid unskilled workers who are victims rather than perpetrators of urban violence.” Also, as discussed in Chapter Four, Rio de Janeiro’s locals treasure the *favela’s* intangible contribution to local identity through dance, music and art.

James (2012) further enlarges the notion of community by describing three ways relations between their members can be characterised:

1. *Grounded community relations*, in which the salient feature of community life is taken to be people coming together in particular tangible settings based on face-to-face engagement;

2. *Lifestyle community relations*, in which the key feature bringing together a community is adherence to particular attitudes and practices; and

3. *Projected community relations*, in which neither particularistic relations nor adherence to a particular way of life are pre-eminent, but rather the active establishment of a social space in which individuals
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engage in an open-ended processes of constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing identities and ethics for living. (14)

The *favelas* in Rio are an example of a “grounded community” because the setting allows for face-to-face interactions, a strong sense of personal belonging, an embedded lifestyle and a potentially marginalised position within the broader society. James (2012, 16) also argues that “grounded community relations can sometimes be extended over spatial distances.” This is true of the typical construction typologies and lifestyles recognisable in *favelas* spread throughout Rio. In contrast to the *favelas* in Rio, the Koliwadas in Maharashtra, India are an example of “lifestyle communities,” having migrated to Mumbai’s outskirts during many stages of the city’s redevelopment (Figure 6). The ways of life and traditions of the Koliwadas, who are considered the local indigenous people, continued in different physical localities. This thesis uses James’ understanding of ‘community,’ where social relations are formed around a self or mutual interest-based community.

![Figure 6 - The Koli community in Vasai Koliwada, Maharashtra, India. Photo by author, 2014.](image-url)
For the New Zealand World Heritage Committee (UNESCO 2007b), ‘community’ includes

the smallest groups of citizens, in whichever form they manifest themselves. They may range from groupings of peoples as indigenous, traditional and/or local peoples. They may be presented as, inter alia, community groups, tribes, nongovernmental organizations, private enterprise and/or local authorities. The defining characteristic of communities, in this setting, is what they possess. They all possess a direct connection, with relevant interests, to individual sites and often they have a connection that has endured over time. Typically, these communities share a close proximity with the sites in question. (2)

Hence, the major focus of New Zealand’s heritage specialists lies with the nation’s indigenous communities and their associated intangible heritage. The focus of this thesis, however, is not only on indigenous, traditional and/or local communities but also on low-income and/or disadvantaged communities that settle in or near cultural heritage sites. For example, after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the survivors from the Southern Province of Sri Lanka in which the Galle heritage site is located were removed to new neighbourhoods kilometres inland (Holgersson 2013). However, less than ten years after the tsunami struck, many residents returned to live by the beach because of their identification with the ocean and their strong community bonds (Perera 2005; Breece 2014) and because their economic livelihoods depended on this proximity. Their return confirms Anderson’s (2006) argument that a community is a group of people, often attached to a place, and also linked by traditions and ways of life, such as religion, trade or any other cultural aspects that contribute to formation (and reinforcement as the returning residents of Galle suggests) of a particular identity.

**Informal Communities**

This thesis understands communities to be the groups of people living within the boundaries of the urban heritage sites and their buffer zones established by heritage bodies, where the exchange of traditions and ways of life have influenced the sense of
place and identity associated with urban heritage. The term ‘informal communities’ refers to groups of dwellings that were built randomly and illegally with no right to ownership of the land and no compliance with building regulations, but whose occupants nonetheless possess and maintain a measure of rightful entitlement to occupy these zones and contribute to their vitality. As Kellet (2003, 91) contends, “informal settlements are now the dominant form of housing supply in most developing-world cities, and their manifestations vary greatly depending on the context.”

**Neighbouring Communities**

When the phrase ‘neighbouring communities’ is used in this thesis, it refers to the group of people living near to a heritage site, commonly within the site’s buffer zones. It is not difficult to find some communities living in the site’s marked boundaries, or even encroaching on its walls where these remain, as seen in Vasai (Figure 7) and Rio de Janeiro. This study references specific neighbouring communities, including some fishing communities and indigenous populations, most of them low-income. Of course, not all neighbouring communities are poor. For example, some of Paraty’s wealthiest residents are found near the heritage settlement, along with low-income and fishing communities. Likewise, not all neighbouring communities are illegal, but the case studies discussed contain areas considered unsafe for construction. According to Nakamura (2014, 280), “as a practice of the poor and vulnerable, encroachment becomes a necessary strategy of self-development in arenas with gross structural inequalities and failed state delivery.” Although Nakamura refers here to Mumbai, her observation is equally applicable to Vasai or Rio de Janeiro.
In Brazil, whose low-income communities are discussed in Chapter Five, the term ‘favelas’ has been used to stigmatise communities whose neighbourhoods are at the bottom of the hierarchy of city locations (Gilbert 2007; Valladares 2008). Davis (2006) describes such low-income communities which are equally subject to stigma as ‘slums.’ The United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) consider favelas and the Koliwadas to be slums, as they have the following characteristics: “lacking in basic services; substandard housing or illegal and inadequate building structures; overcrowding and high density; unhealthy living conditions and hazardous locations; insecure tenure, irregular or informal settlements; poverty and social exclusion; and minimum settlement size (UN-Habitat 2003, 11).” However, Rio de Janeiro’s favelas are not reducible to slums, shanties or ghettoes as they have unique identities. Warhaft (2001) asserts that the Koliwadas, the indigenous communities in Maharashtra, also have distinct identities. The use of the term ‘slum’ is generic, limited and therefore not used in this thesis. Many scholars, including Yuen and Kong 2009; Bartlett 2011; and Revi and Rosenzweig 2013, agree that “urban slums in inner cities are often located on lands that have become increasingly valuable and contested” (Revi and Rosenzweig 2013, 26). Revi and Rosenzweig (2013) further argue that
slums and informal settlements are not a stand-alone phenomenon; they are linked to urban planning and development practices. Most cities, across low-, middle- or high-income countries, face challenges in providing affordable housing and universal service coverage, especially during periods of rapid growth or decline. City housing policies and strategies sometimes fail to match supply with demand, resulting in large numbers of vacant housing units and inadequate supply of affordable ownership and rental housing. (26)

This is also true of all cases discussed in this thesis, where the failure of operative oversight by local councils has increased the number and density of settlements. This issue is discussed in later chapters.

Urban Heritage

According to the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964), an ‘urban heritage’ site encompasses not only a single building, but also the urban or rural setting in which cultural heritage is found. The 1987 Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (ICOMOS 1987a, 1) extended this definition to encompass the “values of traditional urban cultures.” However, those values can only be preserved if the relationships between the sites and the environments of which they are a part are also protected, since traditional urban cultures relate to the material cultural heritage (for example a street, a building or a temple), but also to their surroundings (for example forests, water systems and traditional vistas).

The rapid transformations of contemporary cities and subsequent changes in their heritage environments result in changes in the social, economic and cultural characteristics of urban heritage. For example, at the end of the 1980s, some of Brazil’s urban heritage was severely threatened by increasing informal communities near urban settings (Figure 8) (Brandão 2006; Mattos 2007). Traditional vistas were transformed, with contemporary construction appearing as a background. At the time, local heritage experts drew attention to the importance to heritage sites within the broader built
environment. Consequently, the First Brazilian Seminar about the Preservation and Revitalization of Historic Centres (ICOMOS 1987b, 1) concluded that urban historical sites “are to be circumscribed rather in terms of their operational value as ‘critical areas’ than in opposition to the city's non-historical places, since the city in its totality is a historical entity.” Enlarging the definition of historical sites to include the surrounding areas acknowledged the importance of the environment and the lived experiences of locals and other users of the sites.

Figure 8 - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Three of Rio’s heritage sites can be seen in this picture: the Flamengo Park, Outeiro da Glória Church and the Statue of Christ the Redeemer. All three are included in the WH listing of Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea. Photo by author, 2012.

This understanding of an extended urban area that impacts on heritage, both positively and negatively, evolved into Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL), coined by UNESCO WH experts in the Vienna Memorandum (UNESCO 2005). The Vienna Memorandum argues that

the historic urban landscape acquires its exceptional and universal significance from a gradual evolutionary, as well as planned territorial
development over a relevant period of time through processes of urbanization, incorporating environmental and topographic conditions and expressing economic and sociocultural values pertaining to societies. As such, protection and conservation of the historic urban landscape comprises the individual monuments to be found in protection registers, as well as ensembles and their significant connections, physical, functional and visual, material and associative, with the historic typologies and morphologies. (3 - article 12)

Drawing from this framing, this thesis uses the term ‘urban heritage’ to refer to the cultural heritage located within an urban landscape, considering all emotional connections between human beings and place, the natural environment that composes its character, and new urban areas as evidence of layers of development. In a holistic approach to heritage sites, Bandarin and Oers (2012) address the conservation of urban heritage sites, using the term ‘urban conservation’ and emphasizing the importance of areas adjacent to heritage properties, which are not considered historical. This is particularly evident in low- and middle-income countries, especially those areas where traditional or informal communities exist near to the heritage sites and contribute to their transient character.

**Buffer Zones**

As early as 1931, the Athens Charter (ICOMOS 1931, 1 - article 7) required that “attention should be given to the protection of areas surrounding historic sites,” acknowledging the importance not only of single monuments and their specific locations but also their adjacent locales. In its first Operational Guidelines (OG) (UNESCO 1977, 13 - article 26), UNESCO recommended the concept of the buffer zone as an effective tool to regulate the entire environment of World Heritage Sites, but only *where appropriate*. Therefore, the buffer zone was not envisioned as a compulsory policy.

Today, the delimitation of well-defined buffer zones by managers of heritage-listed properties has become integral to any conservation program, especially in rapidly
changing urban contexts. The most recent UNESCO Operational Guidelines (OG) (2013) suggest that all properties nominated for World Heritage listing should present well-defined buffer zone boundaries and provide estimates of the population residing within the property, including the buffer zone. However, they are not enforced universally or consistently. In low and middle-income countries, different local authorities are typically responsible for the urban landscapes surrounding listed historic properties that would constitute buffer zones as per UNESCO’s OG than the heritage property itself. This has resulted, in some cases, in poor zoning implementation and less strict management over these landscapes, which are often prone to ad hoc or unauthorised development due to their apparent lack of habitation (Arantes 2011).

Prior to the 1987 Brazilian Seminar, which focused on the Preservation and Revitalization of Historic Centers (ICOMOS 1987b), and the 1987 Washington Charter (ICOMOS 1987a), heritage scholarship and official heritage-listing reports treated heritage sites and their buffer zones as separate entities. More consideration was given to the core heritage entities, as seen in the applications for the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC) list of the Churches and Convents of Goa in 1986 (WHC 2015a) and the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Figure 9) in 1988 (WHC 2015d). Giving prominence to heritage sites over their buffer zones exerts a more critical influence in Rio de Janeiro, Goa and Galle, where governance mechanisms are often ineffective (Wijeratne 2005; Karmarkar 2010). Consequently, urban expansion into greenfield lands near such heritage centres is more frequent, while surveillance by council agents is more sporadic. In Paraty, for example, urban sprawl encroaches on the heritage core, and the number of inhabitants has risen from just over 16,000 in 1970 to almost 40,000 in 2014 (Brazil 2014a). The authenticity of Paraty’s historical centre, the genuine historical fabric of the town, has been affected by this growth and hence such growth can no longer be sustained. Nor can the historic district continue to serve as the main centre of the
municipality, owing to the population increase and developments outside its core, as predicted in 1976 by Leonam (1976, 1).

Figure 9 - Map presented to the WHC by Sri Lankan ICOMOS experts, indicating the ideal extension of the Old Town of Galle’s buffer zone. Image in the public domain; reproduced from whc.unesco.org, 2015.

Buffer zones are important tools for the conservation of properties listed as heritage sites and especially for those properties recognised by the WHC (Martin and Piatti 2009). The importance of these zones consists mostly of the role they play protecting sites from undesirable influences, such as deforestation, unsustainable use of resources, development pressures and other threats from neighbouring areas. Essentially, buffer zones are designed to protect and enhance the listed structures or areas. Turner (2009, 17) refers to these zones as “a dynamic and flexible element which might cushion impacts, being a neutral area separating conflicting forces, broadly speaking an area designed to separate; an area of mediation.” This is particularly true when urban sprawl encroaches on a heritage-listed area, as in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil or Maharashtra, India. In both Rio de Janeiro city and Vasai, heritage site buffer zones are occupied by informal
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communities, affecting the sites’ visual integrity and material authenticity and increasing their environmental vulnerability, among other threats.

Although legislation is not as strict in regard to buffer zones as it is to heritage-listed sites, buffer zones are of extreme importance for the preservation of the site. Moreover, they are subject to as many threats as the listed site. Less funding is directed toward their maintenance, and they are even more fragile, as usually all the focus of the community and the media is upon the listed site. Buffer zones require careful design and management to ensure the protection of the “outstanding universal value” (Jokilehto 2006b, 1) of the listed site. However, the application of ‘no change’ policies to buffer zones may contribute to the isolation of a heritage site from its long-standing social, cultural and economic contexts. Moreover, the isolation resulting from these policies may contribute to the ‘museification’ of a heritage site (Martin and Piatti 2009; Turner 2009). Consequently, buffer zones need to be managed as areas of influence with regard to the protection of the value of listed sites. For example, the Koliwada next to the heritage Vasai Fort nationally listed by the Architectural Survey of India (ASI) contributes to the preservation of the Fort’s sense of place, while physically encroaching on the Fort’s walls and polluting its ditch. The buffer zone established around the Churches and Convents of Goa guarantees its protection by the outstanding universal value (OUV) and the maintenance of the lush green area around the buildings protects important vistas.

Occupied buffer zones alter the meaning and management of urban heritage. Skylines and the proportion of new buildings compared to heritage buildings change the relationship between old and new. In the 1960s, Cullen (1961) explained the importance of the urban settings of architecture for the ‘experiences’ of clients and users and the art of relationship, thereby providing a broader perspective for surroundings and buffer zones in heritage legislation and for the legibility and integrity of the urban environment.
Cullen’s theory of townscape allows for the different meanings associated with a temple by itself or a temple set amid a cluster of small houses. Similarly, Lynch (1960, 1) affirms that “nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experience.” The new high-rise developments in Goa, new favelas occupying heritage skylines in Rio de Janeiro, and the intrusive constructions around the Old Town of Galle provide examples of the challenges posed by occupied buffer zones for heritage specialists. Consequently, the maintenance of integrity and authenticity requires the inclusion of all present and past cultural and social productions embedded in the urban centre and its buffer zones.

**Methodology**

This research adopts a holistic perspective on the heritage of urban environments, considering the relationships between built form, public space and the multiple layers of historical artefacts and meanings that contribute to local cultural identity. This approach recognizes the various aesthetic, socioeconomic, and environmental concerns impacting on urban heritage, including ethics, social justice, and urban vulnerability, and acknowledges that successful heritage management requires balanced consideration and policy-based assessment. Consequently, the research methods and phases draw on critical resources from the disciplines of architecture, urban planning, landscape, history, geography and others.

It is important to note that, following Low (2002), the research methods for this thesis were chosen according to the need to answer the research questions at a specific urban scale and within a timeframe controlling the degree of involvement, the researcher’s expertise in architecture and urban planning providing a point of reference. Methods were arranged in order of implementation, using primarily qualitative methods.
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to assess cultural values in heritage sites. Low (2002) also suggests anthropological-ethnographic methods can be used to understand communities and individuals within a community. In such a study, one must mediate between the needs and expressions of interest of multiple stakeholders in a heritage site and the need for the expertise of the heritage specialist. Although in this research the main viewpoint was that of an architect and urban planner, an anthropological-ethnographic approach is suggested as a possible future research direction.

Disaster is discussed in the three case study chapters of this thesis. In order to arrive at a useful understanding of the relevance of disaster and the vulnerability of the neighbouring communities of urban heritage sites, I refer to reports of expert groups, academics, panels and scientific committees, drawing on their comprehensive, up-to-date data. These also include the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), UN-Habitat, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the World Bank, UNESCO, ICOMOS and the International Scientific Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP). I have limited this thesis to study of eight sites of Portuguese colonization. However, I have visited additional comparable sites to form a critical perspective towards heritage integrity and authenticity and the wide range of threats that heritage properties confront today.

Comparative Case Study Analysis

A comparative analysis of six nationally listed heritage sites and their surroundings was conducted using documents, physical artefacts and built and urban forms. Three of the sites chosen as case studies — Paraty, Brazil, and Vasai and Daman in India — are locally listed, whereas Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Churches and Convents of Goa, India; and Old Town of Galle, Sri Lanka — are also World Heritage Sites listed by WHC-UNESCO.
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Comparative case study analysis provides a comprehensive and holistic research method. Groat and Wang (2002) argue that this method enables a characteristic approach towards real-life contexts for multiple cases, because of its capacity to explain links and facilitate theory development in the research design phase, its reliance on multiple sources of evidence and its capacity to extrapolate general principles, theories and research conclusions from specific cases. Such characteristics enable analysis of the mutual relations between World Heritage Sites and locally listed sites, and the informal communities within their buffer zones.

Figure 10 - World map pointing the case studies’ location (BR – Brazil, IN – India and SL – Sri Lanka). Image in public domain; reproduced from Pattern Universe. The case study method also allows the complex dynamics of urban growth in different urban heritage sites to be assessed. Yin’s (2009, 18) definition of a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” is particularly relevant when discussing the phenomena of urban sprawl. As discussed in Chapter Four, the *favelas* in Rio de Janeiro are organic housing agglomerations that start slowly with the clearing of forested land, – normally within the
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boundaries of a National Park or near green areas – then develop through the building of temporary shacks that in a short period of time, say two to three years, evolve into communities of many thousands of residents. The resulting urban sprawl, mostly occupying the hilly peripheries or hinterlands of heritage sites, changes the environment in many ways. In Goa, explained in Chapter Five, urban sprawl is mostly led by tourist development, where forests have been felled to construct high-rises, hotels and additional urban infrastructure. Moreover, as Chapter Six explains, urban sprawl in Vasai encroachment upon the Vasai Fort walls. For the most part, government agencies largely neglect these sites, allowing sprawl to occur and informal communities to establish themselves and grow unimpeded.

Furthermore, Foqué (2010, 147) argues that “case studies are research instruments for situations where two conditions are met: the parameters are mainly qualitative and subject to change, and the context is outside the control of the researcher.” Therefore, the qualitative dynamic and contexts of the case studies used in this research were clearly defined to ensure that the sites were comparable: (1) sites demonstrated comparable colonial circumstances and establishment within a similar timeframe — selected sites belong to the middle-income group of countries and were under Portuguese rule at some stage of their history; (2) each site comprises a heritage site associated with contemporary informal unauthorised built forms located around its fringe; and (3) all sites are affected by both heavy tourism and urban growth in and around the heritage site. Moreover, one WHC site was selected in each country on the grounds that they are governed by the same international heritage regulations.

All the cases studied in this project are nationally listed urban heritage sites, nominated by their local heritage body along with their buffer zones. However, the boundaries of Galle, Sri Lanka were expanded to consider the effects of natural disaster.
Locally listed sites are preserved according to local standards and tend to be accessible to the local community. However, three of the sites are also World Heritage Sites, already well researched by expert bodies and academics and thus a wide range of available information is available. The two-fold listing of local and World Heritage Sites enabled comparison between procedures and outcomes associated with each preservation method and examination of the reasons a World Heritage Sites nomination is sought after by many countries. The WHC requires listed properties to demonstrate OUV and high levels of integrity and authenticity, which excludes many other sites that are less well preserved or are not compliant with international standards of preservation. Further, World Heritage Sites are under the eyes of international expert bodies and media, which tends to control urban growth.

At least one site in each country demonstrates the challenges of informal community development near its boundaries. Consequently, further to preservation policies and procedures, the relationships between cultural heritage and the communities living in the heritage sites’ listed areas and their buffer zones were studied. Most of the communities located in the fringes of case study centres are low-income groups, although some called themselves fishing communities. This difference between socio-economic and occupational characterisation provided an opportunity to compare architectural characteristics and environmental methods of space appropriation in urban heritage settings. Additionally, the diversity of geographical settings and local indigenous (and subsequently colonised) cultures provided necessary points of difference for comparison, demonstrating a multiplicity of cultural expressions, preserved or not.
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Research Phases

Each case study was analysed in four phases: Phase One – Data Collection; Phase Two – Historical Analysis; Phase Three – Context Analysis; and Phase Four – Comparative Analysis. The research undertaken in Phase One comprised a collection of legislated approaches to urban heritage and examination of the present urban situation of each case study. Phase Two consisted of a historical analysis of each site, providing “insight into past values of the site and how perceptions and significance has changed over time…[and locating]…a particular site, place, or built form in its temporal context” (Low 2002, 32). Consequently, the historical analysis also established cultural and social similarities that characterise sites of Portuguese settlement that persist in the present day across the cases being studied.

The historical analysis was followed by Phase Three — Context Analysis, in which observational and phenomenological approaches were applied to each site’s sociocultural and environmental context to understand its relationship to its environment, its urban features and surrounding communities. In all methodological choices, context is one of the most important elements needed to give significance to the place. Context, here, refers to physical, geographical surroundings; to historical patterns and narratives; and to social processes with discernible impact on heritage and its conservation. These include the cultural, social, economic, and other conditions contributing to significance, as well as the management setting and physical surroundings of the site. (Mason 2002, 14)

Consequently, the ‘Product-Context-Process’ model devised by Foqué (2010) was used to conduct context analyses of each site. This model addresses the multi-layered characteristics that exist in cultural heritage properties. However, Foqué does not apply his methodology to architectural sites with strong cultural values, such as the heritage
sites discussed here. For example, Madgin (2015, 4) explains the need to discuss the fluidity of the past within the process of rapid urbanisation in India, emphasising that, rather than seeing the pace and scale of urbanisation as destructive, heritage experts and government leadership should consider the value of “temporal and spatial layers of cultural heritage resulting from the historical and contemporary fusion of incoming migrants with existing populations.” Therefore, this research augments Foqué’s model with Throsby’s (2002) suggestions on how these values can be incorporated into an empirical analysis relating to cultural heritage. Throsby addresses concepts of cultural capital and sustainability that quantify the characteristics that give value to heritage properties, filling the gap in Foqué’s analysis.

As Low (2002, 32) notes, a phenomenological approach proves that “the object of study is not separated from the act of perceiving.” In other words, the built architecture is integral to the experience of ‘place.’ Low (2002, 32) also affirms the importance of human culture, sensibility and values to the analysis of case studies, pointing out the importance of the individual perceiver as “empirical evidence of the world.” Consequently, the observational approach suggested by Yin (2009) was employed for this research as it is useful for adding new depths to the context, environment and phenomenon being studied. This approach involves understanding events in real time through observation and documentation of public spaces and the interactions they support.¹

Finally, a comparative analysis of the historical and contextual aspects of all the case studies was conducted in Phase Four. Human activities, environmental pressures and socio-cultural contexts were analysed in relation to urban morphology and urban

¹ Photography was the principle documentation method used in this research.
anthropology processes. Following Flick’s (2006, 142) recommendation not to “observe the case as a whole and in its complexity, but rather a multiplicity of cases with regard to particular excerpts,” this research compared the different sites and their settings “with regard to the particular excerpts” of policies and communities influencing Portuguese colonial architecture heritage sites in Brazil, Western India and Sri Lanka.

**Phase One – Data Collection**

Phase One of this research began with documentation of the present official statutory approaches to urban heritage, aiming for clarification of terms used, such as cultural heritage, intangible heritage, community and the others defined above. Detailed examination of present urban situations followed to identify possible cases of urban heritage sites with significant urban growth near to their centres. This allowed the research questions to be fine-tuned and selection of case studies. Once case studies were selected, plans, maps or photos of their original settlements and satellite views of their present configurations were collected. The main sources for this research were archival records, direct observations and analysis of physical artefacts such as buildings, architectural fabric and urban settings. Yin (2009) and Flick (2006) argue that multiple sources of evidence provide a degree of standardisation but avoid generalisation. Consequently, a convergence of evidence can corroborate facts or phenomena, providing conformity across the case studies, which nonetheless allows for the distinctiveness of each to be incorporated into the analysis. Therefore, data was collected from:

1. reports from world authorities and entities known internationally for their expertise, such as UNESCO, The World Bank, ICOMOS, ICORP and IUCN;
2. peer reviewed papers published or presented in scientific journals, congresses, and seminars;
3. government official reports; and
4. articles in magazines and newspapers.
Authority, authenticity and credibility were the main criteria when using these documents (Flick 2006), with a preference for data gathered by leading experts and scholars, in peer-reviewed documents and official reports from the government or expert bodies.

Following case study selection, information regarding each city’s heritage status, either national or international, was collected, including the limits of the preserved city centres and buffer zones established by the expert heritage body. This data provided the basis for a comprehensive assessment of the configuration of selected cities and their physical urban growth. Scholarly articles discussing the history of colonisation, urbanism, heritage, urban morphology, urban anthropology, phenomenology and the moral philosophy of heritage were examined. These sources provided a broad view of the selected cities. Following extensive research of the chosen cases, all the sites were visited for the purposes of direct observation and to validate the information collected, for as Prown (1982, 1) argues material culture is “a mode of cultural investigation in its use of objects as primary data.” Further data was collected from local archives, along with updated local photographic images and through online interaction with local scholars, universities and experts.

Document analysis, or a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents, was an integral part of the research method. Bowen (2009) affirms that documents provide data for a specific time and context in which the researcher has chosen to operate, as well as background information and historical insights that provide a means of tracking change and development. This allows the researcher to “understand the historical roots of specific issues and can indicate the conditions that impinge upon the phenomena currently under investigation” (Bowen 2009, 30). For Bowen, the basis for document analysis lies in its role in methodological and data triangulation increasing value of documents in case study research.
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However, document analysis benefits from the use of case studies (Yin 1994, Bowen 2009). Concentrated studies produce detailed descriptions, gaining understanding and developing empirical knowledge in relation to a particular problem. Consequently, in order to confirm data and corroborate findings in this research, document analysis was combined with an analysis of the built environment of heritage sites and their surroundings, and subject to peer scrutiny and academic critique throughout the process of this entire study.

Phase Two – Historical Analysis

Phase Two of this research consisted of the historical analysis, a useful approach for locating each site in its temporal context and engaging in the study of its material culture and evolution. The analysis of data collected about a site’s history allowed for an expanded context and enabled a basis for comparison. According to Low (2002, 32), “from a conservation perspective, historical approaches are very important for architectural historians, archaeologists, and others, because they can provide insight into past values of the site and how perceptions and significance have changed over time.” Historical data was collected mainly through online research and personal contacts, making use of the expertise of reputable historians in Portugal, Brazil, Sri Lanka and India. By comparing historical and personal narratives, it was possible to get closer to ‘the facts’ of a given case and to establish accurate historical patterns across case studies.

The historical analysis was mainly focused upon the settlement and physical characteristics of each region and entailed “fact-finding, fact-evaluation, fact-organisation, and fact-analysis” (Groat and Wang 2002, 165). Low (2002, 38) highlights the importance of a careful review of historical documents, arguing that “it is through a thorough understanding of the history of that site that areas of cooperation and conflict often became clear and identifiable.” Gardner (2006, 3) further explains that “history has
the power to challenge dominant assumptions because it records if in much less detail, the activities of the overlooked and the marginalized as well as elites.”

The historical research for this project oriented on the sixteenth century, specifically the period in which each site had been colonised. It focused on the urban and architectural elements established by Europeans at that time and on the settings, with particular attention to their relationship to each city’s ‘heritage’ as subsequently understood. Expanding the context of the sites to an international setting, revealed connections with European mercantile expansion and prompted consideration of the commercial importance of these colonies. Interestingly, elements from a dominant culture would have been appropriated by the colonised and reconfigured in different ways, generating different values in each of the different cases. Flick (2006, 143) stresses that “certain events and processes are analysed in respect of their meaning for individual or collective life histories.” Mason (2002, 11) concludes that “historical values are the root of the very notion of heritage.” Consequently, the extent to which Portuguese colonisation has influenced the character of each city was examined, most importantly, with respect to the range of intangible heritage and colonial characteristics.

**Phase Three – Context Analysis**

Phase Three involved analysing the historical context, urban fabric, physical description and physical integrity of each site and its buffer zones, including its geographical and environmental settings, cultural, economic, social and political processes, community values and local significance, and the management setting and local heritage legislation. Observational and phenomenological approaches were applied to collect and analyse evidence. As discussed, Foqué’s (2010) Product-Context-Process (PCP) model provided the most complete and overarching analytical process, addressing issues of multi-disciplinarity, contextuality, value sensitivity and the multiple layers of architectural
studies. The PCP model “means that product, process, and context are under investigation, not as separate entities but as mutually influencing constituencies” (Foqué 2010, 195). This model provided a structure for understanding the processes that led to the preservation of each site’s urban heritage and its contemporary condition, in order to identify whether informal neighbouring communities had developed. The PCP model consists of product analysis, including environmental, functional, construction, cost and morphological aspects; context analysis, including physical, sociocultural, historical, economic, financial and project assessments; and process analysis, including levels of decision making, types of relational networks and the degree of process continuity (Foqué 2010).

However, Foqué’s analytical model was created to address common buildings and has been used only superficially to consider places with embedded cultural character and associated issues of sustainability. As mentioned, Throsby’s (2002) principles are used to extend Foqué’s model to heritage values. The principles suggested by Throsby (2002, 104) include “aesthetic value: beauty, harmony; spiritual value: understanding, enlightenment, insight; social value: connection with others, a sense of identity; historical value: connection with the past; and symbolic value: objects as repositories or conveyors of meaning.” These principles contribute to the aggregate cultural value of the item and provide a bridge between economic and cultural discourses by applying sustainability philosophies to cultural heritage, the most important assessment in considering a heritage property. Therefore, the key tasks for each case study, adapted from Throsby (2002, 114) were to:

- identify the asset [tangible or intangible] characteristics of the cultural capital involved in the urban heritage landscape;
• measure the components of the economic and cultural evaluations of the urban heritage landscape;
• analyse the urban heritage landscape’s outcomes against the agreed criteria for sustainability; and
• arrive at an overall conclusion integrating the economic and cultural values of the urban heritage landscape.

In this phase, dimensions of cultural materialism, urban morphology and urban anthropology ‘painted the picture’ for each city. Additional information describing architectural, environmental and cultural history was gathered, as well as rich and holistic up-to-date data, allowing a solid transition into the next phase, the site comparison.

**Phase Four – Comparative Mode of Analysis**

Phase Four used comparative studies to paint a larger picture of the heritage sites of former Portuguese colonies. An alliance of cultural materialism, urban morphology and urban anthropology provides the framework for explaining the similarities and differences between the selected urban heritage centres. These fields provide a conceptual framework for the study of urban heritage, and they are useful in illustrating the process of development in the selected cases, including their physical structures, urban fabric, patterns of land use and occupancy. Flick (2006) suggests that an essential component of comparative analysis is the formation of groups for comparison and the clarification of the levels and criteria against which the comparisons are to be made. The anthropologist Castro (2004, 3) states that the comparison needs to be a translation of the existing, “and not to explain, justify, generalise, interpret, contextualise, reveal the unconscious, say what goes without saying, and so forth.” Further, Foqué (2010, 195) explains that comparative case study-led research “can discover common characteristics while revealing tendencies and new trends that lead to a better understanding of contemporary
architecture and its cultural meaning and significance.” The target for this research comprised different types of cities within the context of Portuguese colonial architecture heritage sites. To include places where accelerated urban growth could have occurred, the target was enlarged to consider the heritage sites’ buffer zones established by the national or international heritage expert bodies as spatial boundaries.

Finally, Groat and Wang (2002, 215) suggest a casual-comparative approach, where the researcher takes an intermediate position between local stakeholders and local heritage experts, selects comparable groups and then collects data on a range of pre-determined variables. This research, therefore, involved identifying similarities and differences between the case studies to determine the overall values manifest in the heritage architecture today. Informal communities were initially compared based on a similar location close to or neighbouring heritage sites. Secondly, each World Heritage Site was compared to a locally listed site in regard to shared heritage and the local approach toward World Heritage Sites. Finally, disaster management approaches were compared across two heritage sites with long-settled fishing communities, one with a WH listing and the other that is locally listed.
Structure of the Thesis

This thesis consists of three sections and seven chapters, organised as follows: The first section comprises Chapters One to Three. Chapter One introduces the research and thesis objectives, research questions, originality, significance, and case studies. It also defines the key terms used in this research, followed by an outline of the research design and methods with approaches to the collection of data. Chapter Two clarifies the theoretical approach used to analyse the moral philosophy of heritage, an approach which is concerned with issues of broader significance for heritage than simply policy documents and guidelines. Rather than address existential or ‘big-picture’ issues of time’s passage or transience and the permanence of heritage, the possibilities of heritage beyond aesthetics and the challenging perspective of heritage as a social construct are explored. Chapter Three recounts heritage guidelines currently operating in relation to the case studies, analyses shortcomings and omissions of these guidelines, and highlights disputes and divergent opinion between professional agencies and academic critiques communities concerned with heritage.

The middle section of the thesis, comprising chapters Four, Five and Six, involves the analysis of individual case studies. Each chapter pairs a theme with two or more case study sites: Chapter Four discusses heritage as a register of transience; Chapter Five, heritage integrity and authenticity; and Chapter Six, heritage vulnerability. A similar comparative approach between all three chapters demonstrates the vulnerability of the integrity and authenticity of the heritage site case studies, by informal unauthorised communities, as well as the heritage contributions made by these communities. This section draws upon phenomenology and the moral philosophy of heritage in order to understand the ethical dilemmas of cultural heritage and reflect upon the built
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environment. Taylor and Levine (2011, 19) propose that “architecture is a discipline with the potential to reinvigorate moral philosophy by addressing questions about what is right as well as what is good (or valuable) from distinct perspectives.” In other words, moral philosophy is used to investigate different realities of urban sprawl within the heritage urban landscapes in the case studies, while phenomenology addresses how sprawl is experienced, specifically in informal communities near heritage sites.

Figure 11 - Providência Hill or the old Favella Hill, located in Rio de Janeiro City Centre, Brazil. Photo by author, 2012.

Chapter Four begins the discussion of heritage as a register of transience with an outline of the interface between old and new material culture and compares the dynamics of uncontrolled urban growth evident in two case studies, Rio de Janeiro and Paraty, both in Brazil. These case studies demonstrate the disastrous impact of urban growth on heritage-listed sites’ buffer zones, exemplified by deforestation, increasing population and increasing building density – developments which contribute to landslides and flooding,
among other ‘natural’ threats. Rio de Janeiro’s favelas (Figure 11) are also under threat from small-scale hazards, such as violence, tenure insecurity, mosquito-borne diseases and social unrest. Nevertheless, the positive impact on heritage through the appropriation of characteristics derived from the favela, such as their vitality and their traditions and culture as intangible heritage, are also considered.

Chapter Five discusses heritage integrity and authenticity by exploring anthropogenic impacts on the cultural habitat and dynamics of communities neighbouring heritage sites. The case studies examined are the Reis Magos Fort (Figure 12), Aguada Fort and the World Heritage Sites Churches and Convents, all located in Goa, and the Moti and Nani Forts (Figure 13) in Daman (Goa is a state, and Daman is a union territory, both located in Western India). This discussion explores the various layers of culture, universalism versus cultural relativism, and the aims of a sustainable city program – ultimately concluding that culture contributes to heritage development, integrity and authenticity.

Chapter Six builds upon the analysis of case studies to consider heritage vulnerability, examining the effects of natural disasters on both urban heritage areas and on their neighbouring communities. Here, the case studies are Vasai Fort in Maharashtra, Western India (Figure 14), and the Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka. The scope of the chapter provides the means for discussing environmental and climate change threats, including the impact of natural disasters on the communities located in the buffer zones of heritage-listed sites. Impacts examined include the disruption of local traditions, increases in fatalities and losses to livelihoods.
Figure 12 - Reis Magos Fort, view from Mandovi River, Goa, India. Image from the public domain commons.wikimedia.org; photograph provided by Rajib Ghosh, 2014.

Figure 13 - Saint Jeronimo’s Fort, or Nani Daman, in Daman India. Photo by author, 2014.
Figure 14 - Saint Joseph Church in Vasai Fort, Maharashtra, India. Photo by author, 2014.

The final section of the thesis consists of one chapter, Chapter Seven, which describes the comparative analysis of all the case studies, concluding with a discussion of the diverse layers of heritage. Emphasis is given to the differing perceptions of heritage-listed properties, including contrasting approaches toward properties that feature in the World Heritage Centre listing and others that are locally listed. In addition, cultural diversity and the dynamics that connect heritage centres to their neighbouring communities are discussed. The chapter proposes further areas of research and additional themes that have arisen from this study and concludes by contributing to the understanding of what ‘best practice’ and ‘holistic’ approaches towards a cultural heritage site might mean, taking on board the built and urban form layer of today as a register of transience.
Theoretical Approach

The theoretical framework for this thesis draws from the moral philosophy of heritage and phenomenology, which recognize the “general understanding of how people know and feel the environment through experience” (Bermudez and Grebner 1988, 41). In this thesis, heritage environments are understood to comprise the experience of the urban heritage city centres and its buffer zones, i.e., the dynamics that connect heritage centres to their neighbouring communities, especially those threatened by disasters. A critical perspective is taken towards value, authenticity and the wide range of threats that heritage properties face today. Communities are directly tied to their urban landscapes and give intangible meanings to places through lasting interactions with their environments. This thesis applies the moral philosophy of heritage and phenomenology to each case study to
move between aesthetic interpretations and intellectual and social history (Otero-Pailos 2010). As discussed in Chapter One, critical resources from the disciplines of architecture, landscape, history, and urban planning were specifically adapted to explore the moral philosophy of heritage and heritage as a social construct. The point of Chapter Two is to understand ‘authenticity’ via reference to the twin poles of social construction and phenomenology in a manner that sees meaning arising from experience – a meaning that is a fluid component of heritage, contingent upon its historic and social constructions.

This chapter establishes the theoretical framework to understand better, interpret and review the collected data. It is divided according to the research themes: (1) Heritage sites as a register of transience; (2) integrity and authenticity with respect to heritage sites, and (3) heritage sites under stress (tourism, overdevelopment, environmental). These themes provide categories for analysis and allow for discussion between academic critiques and the views of UNESCO.

**Heritage sites as a register of transience**

Heritage sites are physical testaments to their histories – the process of their formation and the human activities performed on these urban stages. Therefore, in this study, an understanding of cultural materialism bridges past and present and allows for speculation on the transient character of cultural values. Seeking a more profound understanding of individuals and societies by using their cities as tangible evidence of these values and their transformation over time, art and cultural historian Jules Prown (1982, 1) explains that cultural materialism is “the study through artefacts of the beliefs of a particular community or society at a given time.” Thus, cultural materialism demands discussion of whether artefacts (particularly, buildings and urban forms) present at heritage sites studied in this thesis demonstrate characteristics of their colonial histories four centuries after they were established.
Artefacts may also reveal the cultural beliefs that helped shape them, and the values associated with them (Prown 1982). For example, traditional Indian mythical figures subtly embedded within the Christian altar carvings in the churches in Goa indicate the syncretism of the communities when the churches were built. Additionally, ‘high and low cities,’ largos or rossios are common building characteristics used by Portuguese explorers during the fifteenth century and are still seen in many formerly Portuguese colonies, including Rio de Janeiro, Goa and Galle. Interestingly, the daily life of the favelas with their “high and low cities” was described in a 1920s Rio’s urban-samba lyric, describing built aspects of the favelas, and highlighting that social exclusion and social unrest was common in the past as it is today. These are examples of the many cultural values reflected in Portuguese colonial buildings and vice-versa.

This thesis combines cultural materialism with David Throsby’s (2002) ‘cultural capital’ to evaluate the impacts, if any, of urban growth on the tangible and intangible values embodied in the heritage sites. ‘Cultural capital’ provides a theoretical foundation that links economic and conservation approaches to evaluating heritage, giving value to culture. Both cultural materialism and capital are vital to heritage management since, as Mutual (2011) explains, heritage buildings contribute to the significance, identity, and physical condition of a given area and enhance values related to history, continuity, familiarity, identity, and, most importantly, the social and cultural life of a community.

The social construction of heritage

A social constructivist perspective sees the material artefacts of heritage as the outcome of social processes and belief systems. A building is integrated into a system of forms and masses that qualifies it into a particular style. Historic towns can also belong to such systems and styles, but each has its own character and is composed of particular physical attributes, reflecting cultural diversity. Orbasli (2002, 9) argues that “no living environment is the product of a single historical period and even the most puritanically
planned cities have experienced change within several years of completion.” These changes result in heritage cities whose physical characters are produced by many different groups and communities that inhabited such places, i.e. socially constructed. In addition, urban conservation extends beyond the listed building or listed urban settlement and the listing of a site as heritage often impacts its surroundings and its communities as well as the physical buildings. According to Taylor and Levine (2011, 89),

by acknowledging culture to be an ensemble of practices rather than a manifestation of some unique ethical substance or ‘soul’ positioned at the core of human existence, the critic begins to understand its ‘machinery’, the subject positions it manufactures and the likely objects of attention that result.

Cultivating an approach that considers the social and political contexts of a heritage site as well as its physical characteristics promotes a better understanding of the contemporary cultural and social importance of a site.

Further, as Schwarzer (1994, 2) explains, “historic context itself is a construction, built up from competing epistemological claims and myths.” He suggests that myths of permanence and transience reside in historical sites and that the transience inherent in unbridled development reveals that there is much at stake in the play between permanence and transience. For example, “attacks against the historic preservation’s myth of permanence end up sounding antihistorical and pro-development” (Schwarzer 1994, 2). In fact, change that occurs near to heritage sites contributes positively to the well-being of its communities on some occasions. For example, the construction of a hospital or a new access road to the site becomes an asset to the community. However, community needs are more often than not subjugated to developer interests, in concert with political priorities. Schwarzer (1994, 6) argues that this is especially true in the United States of America, where the “historic preservation philosophy continues to reflect underlying antagonism between the myth of permanence and the concepts of progress and present-mindedness embodied in the myth of transience.”
Schwarzer (1994, 9) challenges this philosophy by saying that “the practice of dividing built culture into preserved or unpreserved segments is a result of the opposition between the myths of permanence and transience”. By calling these ‘myths,’ Schwarzer suggests that one not need to oppose these polar views. Unsurprisingly, urban heritage sites are marked by continuous change, clearly embodying myths of transience, especially after successive waves of immigrants and different generations of inhabitants have contributed to the continual renewal of the built architecture. Consequently, the understandings of permanence commonly embedded in heritage sites by prevailing heritage policies and their appending philosophical assumptions are constantly challenged by inhabitants. However, the resultant material culture represents the minds of the producers in any society of which they are a part, and in that sense, cultural heritage can be permanent. Schwarzer argues that neither myth is able to meet the ongoing needs of cultural preservation, and encourages the management of the built culture to be permanent within an authentic historical area and transient within the broader cultural landscape.

This research is particularly interested in the city as a transient artefact and the tensions between transience and permanence in heritage management. Urban heritage policies and guidelines require new approaches to reflect the importance of change and the reality of growth. A fluid or flexible view of heritage that supports development must allow for changes to the material fabric of a site while maintaining respect for the cultural heritage. However, how much change is acceptable in the context of historic preservation? How does change undermine the authenticity in urban heritage sites? These questions are addressed in detail in Chapter Seven, which engages the moral philosophy of heritage to discuss how attitudes toward colonial buildings and value systems governing their appraisal have changed over time.
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Honesty and layers of time

Although Beynon (2010, 179) is correct when he states that “in the past, the relative autonomy and isolation of local cultures and traditions meant that architecture could readily be identified with particular places and peoples,” many contemporary cultures have been subject to the normalising forces associated with globalisation, along with the need to satisfy international tourism markets. The authenticity of many sites is challenged by adaptations to provide the modern comforts that cater to international tourists or simply to furnish necessities for local residents challenges. As Waitt (2000, 836) argues, “although authenticity is used as a promotional device, what is ‘real’ is open to interpretation...the commodification of the past has provided a mechanism whereby city authorities can refashion sites and direct the tourist gaze toward a limited range of interpretations.”

Heritage buildings are often seen as products for tourist consumption or even as victims of the ‘art of sanitization.’ Waitt (2000, 844) explains the ‘art of sanitisation’ as a process of ‘purifying’ heritage so that “any evidence suggested by this built environment of generations of social inequity, austerity, discord, distress, and suffering has been removed.” This evidence is removed during rehabilitation of the built environment to provide a purified image tailor-made for the tourist's eye and palatable to users and patrons who finance and justify these alterations and omissions. This approach creates a romanticised representation of the past, “challenging the concept of authenticity” (846). Consequently, preferred memories, traditions or material objects are selectively chosen and displayed. Waitt further argues that “specialisation within a particular tourist experience is essential if nations and/or localities are to differentiate and effectively market themselves within global tourism” (839). A living and honest landscape that presents the layers of time is therefore not a product for tourist consumption. Brett (1996, 8) asserts that heritage “is a product of the process of modernization which, by eroding
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customs and expectations, forces us to re-articulate our sense of past; even, in extreme examples, the experience of time itself.” The cultural tourism market is often the goal when developing an urban cultural site and therefore, preservation policies and practices are aimed – at least partly – at promoting a narrow understanding of ethnically-grounded identities.

Graham (2002, 1005) demonstrates that transient heritage can exist in different cultures and explains the dissonance between “multi-sold and multi-interpreted” heritage properties. Hence, places can be sacred to some groups while simultaneously being landscapes of tourism consumption to others. Beynon (2010) further supports the relationship between culture and architecture and shows how today’s definitions of culture are different depending on its context. He argues that “globalised forces are implicit in conceptions of both regionalist and nationalist architecture, late twentieth and early twenty-first-century flows of material consumption, human migration and technological change have led to further questioning of contemporary identity and the roles of tradition, locality and architectural expression” (182) The case study comparisons in this study clarify the sway and significance of context. What is appreciated as a traditional heritage site in India differs from a site in Brazil, even if both are former Portuguese colonies. The merging of cultures, layered over hundreds of years, produce different identities, creating a unique contemporary identity.

According to the Nara Document of Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994, 46), selecting “conservation of cultural heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage”. This imparts a measure of certain ‘honesty’ relative to time. However, additions such as environmentally adapted sewage systems, rooms equipped with air-conditioning or heating systems, convenient parking, accessibility, and other amenities affect the site’s authenticity. As an example, external units of air-conditioning, power cables and vehicles are present in almost every streetscape of the
traditional village inside Galle Fort, in Sri Lanka. Those modernisations provide comfort for users of this World Heritage Site and contribute materially to the heritage of the site. Significant refurbishment or rehabilitation is necessary to adapt – and hide – these and similar modifications, in order to accommodate tourist expectations of an authentic streetscape. Rehabilitation changes include repaving in a traditional manner, insulating roofs, concealing electricity cables and sewage systems and adapting streets to accommodate vehicular traffic. Rehabilitation, therefore, does not leave the built environment in its past condition. Graham (2002, 1004) notes that “even the tawdriest pastiche is likely to be based in some vestige of historical circumstance, heritage does not engage directly with the study of the past.” For Graham, meanings chosen for display in heritage sites are those that yield more value, either financial or cultural. To illustrate, Reis Magos Fort in Goa, India, discussed in Chapter Five, was refurbished to accommodate a cultural centre. The heritage experts in charge of the restoration project prioritised the 1707 version of the fort because that version conveyed more cultural and financial value to the centre (Reis Magos Fort Website 2013). I propose a phenomenological understanding of heritage, one that is sensible and honest and that consciously recognises social processes and the layers of time.

**Heritage Integrity and Authenticity**

Integrity and authenticity are highly significant concepts that can mean a historical, material or phenomenological genuineness. The Nara Document of Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994, 47), states that “our ability to understand these values depends, in part, on the degree to which information sources about these values may be understood as credible or truthful”. In this thesis, integrity and authenticity mean ‘truth’ and refer to the value associated with heritage sites that are intrinsically connected to the site being overall truthful to its culture, rather than being only physically authentic. In Chapter Six, the Koliwada community of Vasai is discussed as authentic (Wharhaft 2001; Jaisinghani
2009; Peke 2013), because it is truthful to its culture and its people despite being located in flood-prone, reclaimed land and adjacent to an Indian nationally listed heritage site. Importantly, the value of that community lies in their intangible cultural attributes, passed through generations and accommodated on specific material remains from another culture, a Portuguese fort built in the 1500s. The Vasai Koliwadas community forms an additional layer of time, essential to understanding this heritage site.

Heritage academics from all over the world, including Mason 2002, Low 2002, Stovel 2007, Harrington 2009, Shaw 2009, Arantes 2011, Mutual 2011, and Jigyasu 2014a, among many others, have identified key challenges in conserving urban heritage sites. They identify common patterns of cultural change and trends evident in historic urban settlements, including relating significance and value to the area to be protected, the scale, function and use of the site, tourism-related developments, and economic pressures. Most importantly, they all agree that historic urban environments are living sites shared by many diverse users such as visitors, owners, managers and residents, and are thereby under constant pressure to respond to the needs of these diverse actors, who in turn share the responsibility to preserve these sites. The conservation of historic urban places is associated with intangible matters in that the preservation of local traditions and symbolic characters are now central to the maintenance of local cultural integrity. Although the recognition of intangible culture as fundamental for the existence of a historic urban fabric is basic for local cultural integrity, assessing values can be difficult.

Values are even more critical in the case of shared architecture – instances of shared urban forms where the same form or building can be meaningful for different communities – as in the case studies chosen for this project. Mason (2002, 17) stresses that the participation of stakeholders in the research and assessment process is essential and argues that choosing methods to achieve this “is not only a matter of choosing among different expert/academic discourses; it also embodies a political gesture as to whose
analysis and values are included in the decision-making mix.” In addition, heritage properties need to be assessed by fair-minded experts with the ability to understand and value each culture. As “places of hybridity” (Beattie 2003, 155), polarities such as ‘East’ and ‘West’ or ‘self’ and ‘others’ must not exist, and local culture needs to be acknowledged and respected.

Heritage values, as “things that have been inherited from the past which are valuable in themselves and which yield value to those who enjoy them in one way or another, both now and in the future” (Throsby 2002, 101), have and continue to be complex and entangled with their diversity. Mason (2002, 9) acknowledges the difficulties in characterising values and suggests a typology of heritage values to guide stakeholders to a fair evaluation. He argues that the significance of a heritage property should be considered in a manner that will give all stakeholders the chance to have their views considered and suggests “identifying all the values of the heritage in question; describing them; and integrating and ranking the different, sometimes conflicting values, so that they can inform the resolution of different, often conflicting stakeholder interests” (5). Therefore, phenomenology and moral philosophy are used as reference points for this research when assessing the case study heritage sites.

Value

Historical, cultural and socio-economic values are intrinsic to urban heritage sites. Jokilehto (2006b, 2) suggests that value is a “social association of qualities to things.” Mason (2002, 8) elaborates, arguing that “value suggests usefulness and benefits. Heritage is valued not as an intellectual enterprise but because (as one aspect of material culture) it plays instrumental, symbolic, and other functions in society.” Both authors agree that value is essential to the formation of a place’s character, which demonstrates that the concept has changed radically since the establishment of the WH Convention in 1972.
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The cultural values most commonly associated with heritage sites are aesthetic, spiritual, social, and historical or symbolic (Mason 2002; Throsby 2002). To Throsby (2002, 104), “cultural value may be a significant determinant of economic value”, whereby a physical heritage building can acquire economic value derived from its physical and cultural attributes. Historical value is part of the very notion of heritage and demonstrates the “capacity of a site to convey, embody, or stimulate a relation or reaction to the past is part of the fundamental nature and meaning of heritage objects” (Mason 2002, 2). The experience of visiting or living near an urban heritage site and the sentimental response to feeling part of an imaginary historical community is one of the heritage centre’s most valuable assets. This reaction creates a sense of place directly linked to the site’s identity.

However, the value of such sites is subject to change in our increasingly globalised environment. According to Zancheti and Jokilehto (1997, 41), values “are in constant transformation. They tend to change over time, following the movements of the cultures of societies.” With the rapid urbanisation of many low- and middle-income countries associated with migration and rapid changes in patterns of land use, the management and preservation of values is now one of the key issues in urban historic conservation areas (Sawkar et al. 1998, Mckercher and Du Cros 2012, Vaz et al. 2017). Consequently, Zancheti and Jokilehto (1997, 44) define urban conservation as “a process that seeks to co-ordinate and regulate the process of continuity and change of an urban structure and its values.”

Authenticity and integrity

In heritage studies, the value of a site is intrinsically connected to integrity and authenticity. According to Jokilehto (2006a, 2), authenticity refers “to several attributes of the heritage resource from form to substance and other qualities.” To guarantee the authenticity of cultural heritage, an object has to remain authentic vis-à-vis its “creative
process, the documentary evidence, and the social context” (2) and to differ in substantial ways from replicas of the same object. Integrity differs from authenticity, where integrity is “a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes’ that suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect” (UNESCO 2013, 23).

The issue of authenticity is a fundamental challenge in heritage studies (Jokilehto 2006a; Jokilehto 2006b; Araoz 2008; Bandarin and Oers 2012). Jokilehto (2006a) explains that different cultures perceive authenticity in different ways and argues that European-based cultures tend to value the physical component of heritage, whereas East Asian cultures tend to value their intangible meanings. For example, in Japan, the regular maintenance of historic buildings does not compromise their value for the local people because changing the physical parts of the building does not impact its intangible meaning. Japanese historical buildings thus retain their value. Whereas for Brazilians, the authenticity and integrity of the physical components of historic buildings are necessary for maintaining cultural value. Consequently, the Nara Document of Authenticity produced by UNESCO asserts that responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of it belongs, in the first place, to the cultural community that has generated it and subsequently to the community which cares for it (ICOMOS 1994), highlighting the importance of cultural relativism over universalism. Despite this, a fundamental principle of UNESCO is that the cultural heritage of each is the cultural heritage of all and does not belong to one specific group or community. In reality, however, decision making is often in the hands of few.

Waitt (2000) challenges the notion of authenticity in situations where heritage is dealt with as an economic commodity, where “the ‘real’ itself is socially constructed, born of particular power relations within society and legitimising selective political and economic interests” (848). Nonetheless, authenticity is an important factor in attributing
value when assessing the integrity of cultural heritage. Focusing on economic value alone would lead to the commodification of heritage and therefore loss of authenticity. Understanding authenticity is essential to a fair judgment about values attributed to cultural properties of any kind (Jarzombek 2011) and “critical judgement is required based on research and documentary evidence to decide about the quality, integrity and values of the cultural responses represented” (Jokilehto 2006a, 15). Authenticity is linked to a wide range of criteria depending on the nature of the cultural heritage artefact itself. It should be based on tangible and intangible factors that are internal or external to the object being analysed and importantly, all layers of history should be acknowledged (ICOMOS 1994):

Dynamic cultural sites, such as historic cities and landscapes, may be considered to be the product of many authors over a long period of time whose process of creation often continues today. This constant adaptation to human need can actively contribute to maintaining the continuum among the past, present and future life of our communities. Through them our traditions are maintained as they evolve to respond to the needs of society. This evolution is normal and forms an intrinsic part of our heritage. Some physical changes associated with maintaining the traditional patterns of communal use of the heritage site do not necessarily diminish its significance and may actually enhance it. Therefore, such material changes may be acceptable as part of on-going evolution. (47)

Harrington (2009) engages an anthropological view toward such criteria, suggesting that cultural heritage includes all actual and potential positive characteristics of a site, a building or a culture and referring to their usefulness and their benefits. For Mason (2002), everything that is recognised as heritage has an intrinsic value and is socially and spatially constructed. Therefore, value and authenticity are produced through the interaction of an artefact with its context and assessment must consider the diverse contexts of an artefact.

State Parties – the countries that have adhered to the World Heritage Convention – often have difficulty in assessing authenticity and integrity values. Stovel (2007) identifies six aspects of authenticity different for each type of site in relation to archaeological sites, historic towns, architectural monuments and complexes and cultural
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landscapes. The aspects are “wholeness, intactness, material genuineness, organization of space and form, continuity of function and continuity of setting” (32). These aspects enable the categorization of integrity and authenticity of a cultural property. For example, Stovel reinforces the importance of including “all those districts and neighborhoods [sic] [in historic towns] which are directly associated with the ‘outstanding universal value’ (OUV) of the nominated property” (32). Additionally, Stovel argues that a historic town should be in a good state of repair to guarantee its value, intactness and continuity of social and economic conditions; that particular patterns of spatial organization need to be respected, including their evolution and possible transformation; and that “development controls in an associated buffer zone should be sufficient to protect the character of the existing setting in ways compatible with the OUV of the property” (33). However, these recommendations were not fully considered in the 2013 OGs, and Stovel’s later assertion about development controls in buffer zones remains open to interpretation, indicating how challenging interpretation and policy remain.

Loss of integrity and authenticity may not appear as harmful to heritage as loss exacted by a natural disaster. Nonetheless, it undermines the meaning and value of heritage and heritage experts continue to be divided on how to approach heritage at the diverse cultural sites around the world. Many Eastern European and Asian countries have pursued a European preservation style or have mimicked other approaches to heritage sites, focusing on tourism market-driven redevelopment rather than enhancing basic cultural worth (Shaw 2009; Fong 2014). Countries contain diverse and temporally layered and merged cultures, and each culture should be dealt with in a unique way to guarantee its integrity, authenticity and the maintenance of its value while remaining flexible enough to adapt to change and carry the values of ‘heritage’ onto a rapidly evolving world stage. In this research, matters associated with authenticity and the perception of
authenticity of heritage in the face of uncontrolled development are examined from a phenomenological perspective.

**A phenomenological perspective**

Wells and Baldwin (2012, 385) establish the importance of historic sites given the experiences of everyday people and suggest a phenomenological approach to heritage “by looking at the valuation of historic places through the concept of the lifeworld – the subjective, taken-for-granted experience of being in the world.” Tangible and intangible heritage includes the subjective experiences of all traditional, indigenous, and local communities and “ordinary people” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 13). Recognising the importance of these experiences, UNESCO’s Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2003, 2) describes intangible heritage as:

> The practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.

This definition provides a broad sense of the value of intangible heritage and enlarges the definition of cultural heritage presented earlier.

Following Wells and Baldwin (2012), I have borrowed the *lifeworld* concept from phenomenology to understand better the intangible values of urban heritage landscapes associated with everyday and ordinary people. “Lifeworld” or *lebenswelt* was proposed by Edmund Husserl in 1936 (Zelic 2008; Wells and Baldwin 2012; Honer and Hitzler 2015). It is “the self-evident, unquestioned foundation of all everyday lived experience (*erleben*) and action, and of all dreams, phantasms, and theories” (Honer and Hitzler 2015, 2). Husserl describes his engagement with the environment such that “experience is the performance in which for me, the experiencer, experienced being ‘is there’, and is
there as what it is, with the whole content and mode of being experienced itself, by the performance going on its intentionally, attributes to it” (cited in Otero-Pailos 2010, 14). Otero-Pailos refers to Husserl to explain the interaction between humans and environment, drawing on phenomenology to describe phenomena such as heritage “in the manner in which they appear, that is, as they manifest themselves to consciousness through and in experience” (15). Built heritage is thus unquestionably phenomenological and contributes to the lifeworld of the inhabitants of urban heritage landscapes. It is also linked to and surrounded by intangible features and experiences which should be acknowledged as vital parts of urban heritage landscapes.

The inhabitants of urban heritage landscapes, therefore, form spatially constructed communities, which gain intangible meanings through their longstanding interactions with them. Berleant (2003, 45) argues that “as humans we are inescapably embedded in a life-world that incorporates our physical bodies, our personal and communal histories, our social education and practices and, not least, our cultural ethos.” For Norberg-Schulz (1980), things, such as buildings and material artefacts, convey information of their own making and Lynch (1960, 1) agrees, suggesting that “nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences.” Further, the process of creating such meanings occurs through environmental, sociological, familial and spiritual or psychological associations with place (Menin 2003).

A place acquires meaning through the realisation of “our human condition as expressed by the drama of our actions performed upon the stage of these places” (Robinson 2003, 144). Therefore, the creation of meaningful places is directly tied to the activities engaged in by its inhabitants; activities that give character to a material space and form the built heritage. For Norberg-Schulz (1980, 5), material space “implies that the spaces where life occurs are places, in the true sense of the word. A place is a space
which has a distinct character.” He further asserts that character “is at the same time a more general and more concrete concept than ‘space’. On the one hand it [character] denotes a comprehensive general atmosphere, and on the other the concrete form and substance of the space-defining elements” (13). Hence, as the stage of a wide range of cultural productions, including the urban-samba and Carnival, Rio de Janeiro’s *favelas* contribute to the spatial heritage of Brazil.

We are participants of the creation of space, where the cityscape works as a stage for people’s experiences. Therefore, people are tied to place by emotional bonds that create meanings, which are only recognizable by a person that also experienced a place in that way or by others who have engaged with it. Ballantyne (2003) points out that a work of art or a building in one culture may have a completely different meaning and cultural value in another culture. This is even more evident in multi-cultural communities that share common (built) heritage, whereby the same architecture, such as Portuguese colonial architecture, may be built in slightly different ways that reveal singular characteristics. Colonial architecture in Goa, India looks slightly different from other colonial buildings of the same period in Rio de Janeiro despite following the architectural principles from the same home country of Portugal. This reinforces the importance of the intangible features associated with buildings, where they could be physically similar, like Goa and Rio, but which call upon different identities.

A person may relate to a site through an intangible sense of identity towards a *place*. Berleant (2003, 42) defines ‘place’ as the setting in which human events occur. It is “the locus of action and intention, present in all consciousness and perceptual experience”. This locus can be a topographical feature or reference point, such as a temple, a building or a harbour. The Australian Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia 2013) gives ‘place’ broad scope, including features that are natural and cultural:
A place can be large or small: for example, a memorial, a tree, an individual building or a group of buildings, the location of an historical event, an urban area or a town, a cultural landscape or a garden, an industrial plant, a shipwreck, a site with in situ remains, a stone arrangement, a road or a travel route, a community meeting place, a site with spiritual or religious connections. (2)

If we add human sensibilities and interactions to a place, it gathers meaning. The Burra Charter implies that the meaning of a place could be elicited by a cultural event or a tradition, thereby giving it an aesthetic or sensuous dimension. Berleant (2003) calls this dimension a cultural sensibility and asserts that “such features, then, as distinguishing physical identity and coherence, together with the consciousness of significance, can contribute to the sense of a distinctive presence that we associate with the special character of place” (44). Wells and Baldwin (2012, 386) concur, arguing that the idea of place “is more than a geographic location; rather, experienced space creates place.” Therefore, the set of cultural and social values linked to a particular place contributes to creating a sense of place and intangible heritage. For example, Paraty in Rio de Janeiro recognises its festival of the Divine Holy Spirit (seen in Figure 16) as a national intangible heritage asset (IPHAN 2013). Local people have organised this celebration since the eighteenth century, and knowledge of traditions and performances associated with it have been regularly transferred from the elderly to young members of the community (UERJ 2009). Thousands of visitors come to Paraty every year to join in the Spirit festival, thereby establishing their own emotional bonds to the place and contributing to the community’s remarkable identity. The festival was nominated as having a heritage value to preserve the integrity of Paraty’s cultural traditions for future generations (UERJ 2009, IPHAN 2013).
A sense of place may be “both mental and, through detailed examples from a variety of specific contexts, material, or may, indeed, be only mental with little material manifestation” (Menin 2003, 1). Further, a sense of place can be given to cohesive settings, such as a historic district or a place with a high degree of similarity, compatibility and scale (Berleant 2003). Regardless, a sense of place is intangible, mostly represented by a mental or emotional sensation associated with a physical setting. For Smith and Akagawa (2009, 6), “heritage only becomes ‘heritage’ when it becomes recognisable within a particular set of cultural and social values, which are themselves ‘intangible’.”

Further,

beyond the material evidence, heritage sites can carry a deep spiritual message that sustains communal life, linking it to the ancestral past. This spiritual meaning is manifested through customs and traditions such as settlement patterns, land use practices, and religious beliefs. (ICOMOS 1996 – Consideration and Analysis 4)
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Smith and Akagawa (2009, 7) also recognise that heritage is intimately linked with identity – exactly how it is linked and its inter-relationship are yet to be fully understood – however, a key consequence of heritage is that it creates and recreates a sense of inclusion and exclusion. At global, national and local levels, heritage, however defined, is used to define a sense of place. Current and dominant definitions about ‘tangible’ and ‘world heritage’ establish an international hierarchy of cultural relevance, status and sense of place.

For Zukin (1995, 229), cities are a “fluid process of forming, expressing, and enforcing identities of individuals, social groups, or spatially constructed communities.” Consequently, intangible heritage is a clear expression of human and social development and most importantly, cultural diversity. The historical isolation of some cultures means that a building or a tradition can be easily identified with particular places or people (Beynon 2010). However, most of our cultural heritage has been subjected to forces of development and globalisation, threatening fragile communities and their intangible traditions – a theme that will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Casey (1997, ix) reinforces the importance of experience and the intangible for heritage places when he states that “whatever is true for space and time, this much is true for the place: we are immersed in it and could not do without it.” However, accessing experiences and therefore intangible values, in the historic environment, especially for those with “much less lived experience” can be difficult (Wells and Baldwin 2012, 385). The favelas in the central area of Rio de Janeiro provide an example of this challenge. While existing for more than a hundred years, they have only recently been accepted as permanent built forms by the wider society, and they are not considered to possess heritage or cultural value by any heritage regulation. However, several of their cultural practices and artefacts (such as urban-samba performances, carnival costume-making and traditional food) are listed by various heritage bodies in Brazil and Rio de Janeiro. This paradoxical situation – where cultural practices and artefacts are listed, but not the place or stage within or upon which they occur – is not uncommon. Therefore, a
phenomenological approach that recognizes both cultural practice and physical site as mutually engaging and relevant is vital.

Shared heritage

Shared heritage holds particular challenges for heritage managers. Contemporary heritage site management involves meeting the needs of multi-layered cultures with different identities and communities and accepting the “diversity of values, understating each perspective in its distinctive context and its role in the wider scene” (McBryde 1995, 8). Heritage management requires recognising a diverse range of values and guaranteeing a continuing sense of place for all the communities involved. Each layer of heritage is essential to an understanding of the true meaning of place.

Some of the customs and traditions identified as important by ICOMOS (1996) may have been transported from other places into newly colonised ones, thereby laying the ground for the novel mixing, including domination, of indigenous and non-indigenous cultures, in the former Portuguese colonies around the world. Consequently, multiple layers of cultural heritage exist in these countries, where some layers are distinct, others are present concomitantly with other cultures, and others contribute to new cultural identities. Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka is a good example of a shared heritage. Portuguese explorers founded Galle in the 16th century, and it reached the height of its development in the 18th century before the arrival of the British. Today, it is valued by Sri Lankans, Portuguese, British and Dutch as part of their common historic cultural heritage. Similarly, in Goa, India, Portuguese and Indians share its so-called Indo-Portuguese heritage. Shared heritage is also spread across different countries, for example, where the boundaries of individual countries have changed over time vis-à-vis the interdictions of various state-based actors and their interests, as is common in many Eastern European and Western Asian countries. The Citadel of Ani in Turkey, between the borders of Turkey and Armenia, commonly referred to as “the city of one thousand
and one churches” (WHC 2015f), is indicative of such territorial changes. Despite its location in contemporary Turkey, the Citadel possesses cultural importance for Armenians.

In the context of this research, it could be argued that the Portuguese background is paramount. Architectural heritage derived from Portuguese colonial influences in Brazil bears greater material and aesthetic resemblance to comparable heritage sites and structures in Portugal, than they do in India (Goa, Daman and Vasai) or Sri Lanka (Galle). One of the reasons for this difference is the complex material culture extant in India and Sri Lanka before colonisation. Generally, sites of Portuguese colonisation in Asia had built cultures that were well established by the sixteenth century, whereas in what is now Brazil, indigenous peoples lived in small communities and were nomadic, occupying few, if any, permanent building structures (Abreu and Brakel 1998). Cultural mixing in Asia was substantiated, i.e. given existing material form, by the construction of urban settlements and buildings that reflected local circumstances and existing cultures (Śirodkara, Mandal and ASI 1993). This mixing can be seen in most of the Christian churches built by Portuguese settlers in Daman (Figure 17) and Mumbai, which have different characteristics than in churches in other colonies, for example, strong mythical ornaments in the interior carved wood work and unique triangular gables. These buildings are tangible examples of the diversity of the shared Portuguese colonial heritage in the world.
The diversity of shared Portuguese colonial heritage and the evolution in the intangible ways of thinking and vectors of influence embedded in a particular culture must both be considered when interpreting the character of a place. Ballantyne (2003) draws interesting parallels with the field of philosophy and psychology when describing ‘place-making.’ He also refers to Deleuze’s understanding of lines and vectors to describe the philosophy of an ensemble of ideas that form a group identity. This theory understands that there are different ways of approaching a place and different influences on the way it is interpreted, reflecting the importance of each instance of cultural interaction in the minds of different groups of people with respect to other groups. Consequently, such understandings influence heritage policies and decisions, depending on the group responsible for them. The 1994 Nara Document of Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994) recognizes the potential for discrimination and the impacts on cultural diversity, values and authenticity in cultural heritage, arguing that,
in a world that is increasingly subject to the forces of globalization and homogenization, and in a world in which the search for cultural identity is sometimes pursued through aggressive nationalism and the suppression of the cultures of minorities, the essential contribution made by the consideration of authenticity in conservation practice is to clarify and illuminate the collective memory of humanity. (46)

In this thesis, I understand shared heritage to mean a common cultural heritage – be it tangible or intangible – that derives from more than one community’s history, identity and memory. The cases explored here, with their diversity of architectural features and cultural traditions, illustrate this point. Portuguese and Brazilians, Indians and Sri Lankans value historical urban landscapes such as Paraty, Rio, Goa, Vasai and Galle as their cultural heritage. Although these sites were developed by European explorers, they were built on existing sites by local workers who made their own distinctive contributions and interpretations of local needs and aspirations, creating styles and traditions still grounded in those communities.

Authenticity and integrity are vital to the question of how much change to an urban cultural heritage site is acceptable and influence responses to any likely measure of change. If communities did not exist in urban heritage locations and buffer zones specifically, heritage sites would be frozen in time or transformed into living museums. However, people are essential to the local sense of place and hence places are by nature dynamic and subject to change. Consequently, transience is inherent to the authenticity and integrity of any heritage site. Therefore, the many differences in local values and contributions of cultures and communities should be considered carefully and respectfully to protect the authenticity of urban heritage sites.

**Heritage sites under stress**

“Cultural heritage is exposed to a number of threats from urbanization, development pressures, socio-economic transformations, unsustainable tourism and lack of resources” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 15). Rapid urbanisation in developing countries often results in the
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formation of low-income communities in the vacant areas near heritage sites. Consequently, urban heritage sites become vulnerable to overdevelopment and natural disasters, because of environmental degradation and patterns of dense urbanisation.

Sustainable development and cultural heritage

Figure 18 - Students from Mumbai visiting Vasai Fort, Maharashtra, India. Photo by author, 2012.

In this thesis, I discuss the need for considered and sustainable urban development in the buffer zones of heritage sites and argue that this is achievable by focusing on culture and cultural heritage. As Brundtland (1987, 16) suggests, “sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” Therefore, if as Brundtland suggests future generations are the focus of development, including the preservation of cultural heritage is preserved, then existing local communities are essential to sustainable development (Figure 18). The phrase ‘sustainable development’ is used in different fields of study, such as economics, culture, sociology, and tourism, among others, and is not restricted to
environmental matters. Sustainability theory began to attract attention in the field of heritage studies in the 1980s, when the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) drew attention to the need for long-term solutions to protect the environment and the need for integration of environmental and developmental objectives to conserve the vitality and diversity of the Earth (Turner 2012).

This thesis builds on an anthropological understanding of development as a necessary social dynamic “with all its intended or unintended outcomes – that brings about a significant and patterned shift in the technologies, techniques, infrastructure, and/or associated life-forms of a place or people” (James 2012, 9). Urban cultural heritage evolves in response to these social shifts effected by local communities, producing various layers of identities at the same locality, at different times and by different communities. James argues that “development is something that comes from within communities rather than something that can be imposed from the outside” (9). Consequently, acknowledging the existence of those various layers of culture and tangible and intangible change is essential for the implementation of more sustainable urban development in and near heritage sites. However, local communities should be considered the main actors involved in the cultural dynamics of any site.

Therefore, sustainable communities are vital for the successful sustainable management of heritage sites and so the essential needs of the fragile communities and peoples living near heritage properties, especially those dependent on the environment for their livelihood, must be considered. For James (2012, 11), community sustainability is crucial to “the long-term durability of a community as it negotiates changing practices and meanings across all the domains of culture, politics, economics, and ecology.” The WH Committee New Zealand (UNESCO 2007b) further argues that the inclusion of community consultation and meaningful involvement of human communities in the management of WH properties is necessary for achieving sustainability. This
involvement ensures that communities are empowered to preserve their physical cultural heritage, traditions and cultural expressions (both tangible or intangible), contributing to the sustainability of people’s lives and their environments. At the same time, government agencies need to invest in strategies to promote economic growth, respect zoning regulations and the improvement of local infrastructures.

Here I return to Throsby’s (1999) use of cultural capital to understand the dynamics associated with sustainability because he positions cultural capital against an economic background. For Throsby, cultural capital “is the stock of cultural value embodied in an asset. This stock may, in turn, give rise to a flow of goods and services over time, i.e., to commodities that themselves may have both cultural and economic value” (6). Consider the urban samba created in the *favelas* of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (Figure 19). At the beginning of the twentieth century, the composition and performance of this type of music and dance required the investment of time and resources by a small group of *favela* dwellers. Today, it is the major profitable and regular event performed in the City of Rio de Janeiro, attracting tourists every year and boosting the local economy. It is a key economic asset both to Rio’s *favelas* and to the city Council owing to its cultural worth and is now listed as Brazilian national intangible heritage.
Figure 19 - Pedra do Sal, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The urban samba began on the granite stone of these carved steps. This site is recognised as tangible and intangible Brazilian heritage for its social and historical values, and material integrity and authenticity. Photo by author, 2002.

Importantly, Throsby (2002, 106) also draws a parallel between environmental and cultural capital, insisting that “cultural capital has arisen from the creative activities of humankind.” Both environmental and cultural capitals impose a duty of care on everyone and Throsby identifies neglect of this duty as the essence of the sustainability problem. Hence, sustainable development is directly linked to culture. Revi and Rosenzweig (2013, 36) further insist that “diversity of cultures, in the form of heritage and knowledge, is a vital part of cities integral to their identity and dynamism as hubs of social and human development. Culture provides identity, agency, and tools for communities to fight poverty.” Although the urban poor is partially responsible for rapid and informal development in unsafe areas, the collective sense of identity and community contributes to reinforcing socio-cultural bonds, local development and resilience. A heritage
management approach that values the contributions of informal communities to heritage sites and accepts them as a cultural layer for that site empowers those entrusted to maintain traditions, celebrate festivities and protect valuable cultural assets.

**Neighbouring Communities**

Low-income communities in developing countries are often located in unsafe or green areas due to rapid urbanisation (Yuen and Kong 2009). The vacant areas neighbouring heritage sites are frequently green, mostly due to preservation constraints on development and are, therefore, in many cases, informally occupied by the urban poor. Consequently, urban heritage sites become vulnerable to overdevelopment and natural disasters, because of environmental degradation and patterns of dense urbanisation. Importantly, Bartlett (2011) argues that climate change has a significant impact on the health conditions in low-income districts. Health in these communities is at risk from physical hazards generated by floods, landslides and other physical occurrences, but also “from extreme temperatures, increased risk of some diseases and constraints on food availability” (Bartlett 2011, 672). In turn, socio-economic activities, such as agriculture, fishing or tourism, are affected, which in turn impacts social, physical, economic and cultural development.

Nevertheless, neighbouring communities are highly engaged in the cultural dynamics of sites connected to the heritage system. They help maintain traditions, celebrate festivities and create a sense of place. They are entrusted with the recovery of the heritage sites after catastrophic events, with the protection of economically valuable physical assets and preserve practices, history and environment as well as a sense of continuity and identity (Jha et al. 2010).
Disaster

According to the International Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP) experts, “more cultural heritage is lost in disasters than is ever fully accounted” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 15). Moreover, the effects of disasters are increased near heritage precincts in the low and middle-income countries are typically exacerbated by the overdevelopment of those communities that are their neighbours, making the events even more catastrophic than they would otherwise be (UNISDR 2005, Jayawardane 2006, Perry and Falzon 2014). The informal communities located in disaster-prone areas or sites unsafe for construction, such as the Rio de Janeiro favelas (Figure 20), are particularly problematic as they generate further risk to life, health and properties and leave themselves vulnerable to the effects of climate change (Yuen and Kong 2009; UNESCO 2010). In addition, a cultural property may be more at risk from the secondary effects of a disaster than from the precipitating event (the earthquake or tsunami, for instance) itself (Jha et al 2010), where risk is defined as “the combination of the probability of an event and its negative consequences” (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction - UNISDR 2009, 25). Such secondary effects include infrastructure repairs, looting, and rescue or relief measures that disregard heritage values (Jha et al. 2010).
Figure 20 - Dona Marta *favela* is located in the foothills of the WH listed Christ the Redeemer statue in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. This informal community suffers from threats of landslide and eviction. Photo by author, 2012.

Disaster is defined as “a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources” (UNISDR 2009, 9). Disasters can be caused by natural hazards, such as floods, earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes, cyclones and volcanic eruptions, or they may have human-induced causes, such as wars, pollution, extreme violence, industrial accidents and nuclear explosions, among others (Cohen et al. 2008). Large-scale disasters usually result in loss of life and livelihood, social and economic disruption, environmental destruction, health impacts and, sometimes, civil unrest (Cohen et al. 2008). However, “small-scale hazards, while less dramatic than [natural] hazards have serious aggregate impacts” (UN-Habitat 2008, 8). Small-scale hazards include crime, violence, tenure insecurity and forced eviction, among others, and they can have impacts on communities as severe as disasters. Consequently, the definition of disaster should be expanded to include cultural loss.
Local economies suffer negative consequences after a disaster when tourism declines and local people lose their livelihoods. Consequently, the vulnerability of already at-risk communities increases. UN-Habitat (2008, 4) argues that vulnerability may be defined as the probability of an individual, a household or a community falling below a minimum level of welfare (e.g. poverty line), or the probability of suffering physical and socio-economic consequences (such as homelessness or physical injury) as a result of risky events and processes (such as forced eviction, crime or flood) and their inability to effectively cope with such risky events and processes.

Although this definition of vulnerability refers to housing, it fails to consider the added vulnerability of low-income communities near heritage sites, where most receive a “minimum level of welfare” and are characterised by an inability to cope with risky events. Jigyasu et al. (2013, 21) note that “experience has shown that degradation of natural resources, neglected rural areas, urban sprawl and poorly engineered new construction increase the vulnerability of communities to disaster risks.”

As discussed, disasters can be natural or human-induced. However, Taylor and Levine (2015, 3) attribute some degree of human origin to ‘natural’ disasters, asserting that “there is a prevailing view that all disasters, including ostensibly natural ones, are social phenomena.” Although events derived from anthropogenic factors can be predictable, anthropogenic hazards in urban heritage sites expose the vulnerability of neighbouring communities and affect the environments in and around the built heritage. The frequency of geophysical and hydro-meteorological hazard events increases (UNISDR 2009). In addition, the effects of climate change can increase some of the existing urban and environmental pressures on the landscape (Cohen et al. 2008), threatening tangible and intangible heritage and community identity (Wijeratne et al. 2005).

Importantly, cultural heritage increases the resilience of local communities. UN-Habitat (2008, 4) defines resilience as “the capacity of an individual, household or
community to adjust to threats, to avoid or mitigate harm, as well as to recover from risky events or shocks. Resilience is partly dependent upon the effectiveness of risk response, as well as the capability to respond in the future.” Jigyasu et al. (2013, 22) have observed during disasters that “people search desperately for identity and self-esteem. Traditional social networks that provide mutual support and access to collective assets are extremely effective coping mechanisms for community members.” They conclude that “resilience would be applied to people, to the built and natural environments, and it would be shaped by both physical and social factors” (22). Some of the threats may not appear as catastrophic as natural disasters although, in the long run, they are equally devastating to heritage sites and their neighbouring communities.

**Conclusion**

As discussed in this Chapter, heritage landscapes are understood as a dynamic between heritage sites and their neighbouring communities. This dynamic increases the vulnerability of heritage sites due to accelerated, unplanned and unauthorised urban growth in the buffer zones of heritage sites. This poorly controlled growth includes deforestation, pollution, and inadequate infrastructure. Further to these physical stressors, the tensions between preservation of existing heritage values and contemporary community values also cause stress in historic urban areas. The perception of heritage authenticity in the face of uncontrolled development should be examined from a phenomenological perspective that recognises heritage as an outcome of social processes and belief systems, embedded in the transient character of the urban landscape. Most importantly, heritage management needs to consider the unique and layered contemporary identities of heritage sites, formed by diverse tangible and intangible cultures.

To do so, the development of heritage policies and guidelines are examined in the following chapter. The history of heritage thinking is described, and the emergence of
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UNESCO heritage policies are discussed. These policies are used as the basis for heritage policies around the world. Hence, the heritage guidelines currently operating in relation to the case studies are analysed. I also highlight legislative acknowledgement of the effects of explosive urban growth and contributions of neighbouring communities to heritage policy.
In 1901, Ruskin raised the important issue of value, in particular, the value of heritage and the intangible features of a building. His so-called “waves of humanity” (339) have passed through villages, streets, homes, and temples; each has contributed to the character of heritage centres and buildings, to the traditions they have sustained, and also to their integrity and authenticity. Ruskin’s humanism also helps us understand the historical, material and cultural contexts of heritage based on the integrity and authenticity of local heritage sites.

Mindful of Ruskin’s observations, this chapter discusses the current operative heritage guidelines and the role of the World Heritage Convention in safeguarding the integrity and authenticity of the urban heritage site case studies discussed in this thesis. The chapter provides a general overview of urban conservation processes in local and international scenarios, describing the origins of protection policies for urban heritage and the international policies and strategies governing urban heritage sites. It contributes to discussions of urban heritage in international charters, drawing on the particular foci of this thesis – urban growth, intangible heritage, economic development, tourism, buffer zones and disaster. The chapter concludes with discussion of the specific national
approaches to the case studies and contributes to the debates about heritage policy in each country.

Diverse charters and policies intended to help preserve and maintain the world’s cultural diversity have been created by international societies and groups of heritage experts. Until recently, preservation relied on social conventions and the protection of heritage values was more or less guaranteed by their remoteness from other communities. Contemporary globalisation means that modernity, consumerism and information technology are almost ubiquitous, particularly and rapidly affecting urban landscapes. Consequently, management practices for urban heritage have had to evolve dramatically in line with development, explosive urban growth and climate change. Heritage management policies and legislation are largely inadequate to accommodate the pressing concerns of heritage sites and tend to neglect the contributions of impoverished informal communities. Consequently, this following discussion focuses on the evolution of and tensions in heritage practices relevant to sites facing urban sprawl and increased development that threaten the authenticity and integrity of cultural heritage environments.

In this chapter, I identify the evolution of heritage policies worldwide from the instrumental and material preservation of built environments to the contemporary holistic and humanist oriented conservation of tangible and intangible heritage. This shift is indicated by the Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia 2013, 2), which describes conservation refers to “all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance,” whereas preservation involves “maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.” Conservation is a common planning and policy practice implemented to holistically protect cultural heritage around the world, acknowledging cultural diversity as fundamental to the urban heritage landscape. However, as the discussion shows, appropriate implementation of such policies is challenging, as legislatively mandated management practices for heritage sites often
neglect to consider the transient conditions of buffer zones or the cultural contributions of the informal communities within them. Consequently, I assess the effectiveness of various policies and discuss strategies that could be implemented to protect the intangible and tangible heritage of heritage-listed sites in Brazil, India and Sri Lanka in the face of increased urbanism and growth.

**Overview of Urban Conservation Practices**

Urban conservation practices around the world have evolved from the protection of outstanding monuments to the safeguarding of landscapes traditionally linked to the oral and intangible heritage of humanity. In 1960, UNESCO campaigned to safeguard the Nubian monuments at Abu Simbel and Philae in Egypt against the construction of the Aswan Dam (WHC 2015c). This listing was one of the first actions taken by UNESCO towards preserving what would become known as world heritage. In 2012, UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention listed the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province, Indonesia (WHC 2015b). This listing shows the evolution of heritage thinking, where the 2012 listing reinforced the intangible importance of surroundings for the Balinese people, in particular, of the Subak System of cooperative water management of canals and weirs as a manifestation of the local philosophy that brings together the realms of spirit, human and nature (WHC 2015b). The World Heritage Convention sought to protect the spiritual character of a local culture associated with its temples and farming processes. This listing is significant because it protects an intangible cultural asset, thereby safeguarding the integrity and authenticity of community heritage threatened by development.

**Cultural heritage pre-twentieth century**

The first documented reference to cultural heritage started as early when Theoderic the Great sent a letter to the Prefect of Rome describing “the value of the world’s splendidorous architecture” (Jokilehto 2005, 9; my translation). Classical civilizations in Europe, India
and Japan have attributed high importance to architecture since their early days. The architectural conservation movement we know today coincided with the wide availability of the printing press in Europe during the nineteenth century (Jokilehto 1999). The publication of newspapers facilitated public debate about heritage and the formation of membership associations whose purposes were to discuss the philosophy and practise of preservation and conservation.

One of the early proponents of preserving such heritage was the French architect Eugène Viollet-le-Duc (1814–1879). Viollet-le-Duc recommended the restoration of buildings to a state of completeness that may have never existed (Kuhl 2000). He was aware of the many layers a building acquires throughout its existence and their importance for understanding the history of the building. However, his restoration efforts were focused on what he considered to be the most important stylistic aspect of a building and he would romantically add features not formerly part of the building. Kuhl (2000) argues that to Viollet-le-Duc, “restoring was essentially bringing back a building’s potential unity to represent a particular style or time period” (29; my translation), with no consideration for cultural changes. Therefore, Violet-le-Duc understood authenticity as permanent and static and interpreted value romantically.

John Ruskin (1819–1900) criticised Viollet-le-Duc’s restoration philosophy as idealistic (Kuhl 2000). Ruskin argued that architectural management should respect the age of a given building and its transformation over time; if it appeared as a ruin, it should remain a ruin. He valued the layers or accretions of time in a building and insisted that the most recent layer should be preserved. This theory gave relatively new meaning to the tangible and intangible characteristics acquired by buildings over time, representing the first understandings of heritage sites as a register of transience (Kuhl 2000). The Vasai Fort, India provides a contemporary example of Ruskin’s philosophy. The sixteenth-century fort is in ruins today and was being ‘restored’ by labourers hired by the
Archaeological Survey of India during a site visit in 2012. The labourers were breaking rocks found on the site into smaller pieces and reinstating them into the walls using a different construction system from the original. The base of the fort walls looked original, and the rest of the walls incorporated both new and reinstated original material. Authenticity, in this case, can be understood as visual integrity, rather than adherence to a single construction method. This process is common in some Asian cultures, including India, Japan, and China, where the value of heritage lies in a site’s intangible features more than its physical materials (Winter 2009).

Camillo Boito (1836–1914) adopted a position on building restoration between the extremes represented by Viollet-le-Duc’s and Ruskin’s views. Boito encouraged the historical analyses of heritage buildings and recommended that new construction be clearly distinguishable from historic remains so that addition of new material and/or ornaments to the heritage building would be obviously novel interventions (Kuhl 2002). Boito was the first theorist to reinforce the importance of interpretation and attendance to the various phases of a building’s existence and the stages of conservation work (Kuhl 2002). Here, physical legibility stages experience in a “continuous succession of phases” (Lynch 1960, 2). Boito’s theories indicate the beginnings of the appreciation of the historical value of a site.

Contemporary heritage conservation theories are based on Alois Riegl’s early twentieth century explorations of the value of monuments and their historical development. Bandarin and Oers (2012, 7) argue that “the key theoretical development came from…Alois Riegl (1858–1905), whose ideas defined the role of heritage in contemporary society.” Reigl (1996 [1903]) asserted that the value of monuments is multi-faceted and lies in a combination of age value, historical, deliberate commemorative value (to keep a moment in history perpetually alive), use value, and newness value. These key values are found in many contemporary policies and charters.
governing the preservation of historic buildings. Interestingly, Choay (2001, 139) argues that Riegl’s view of cultural heritage transformed material artefacts into cult objects, noting that “relics from a lost world, engulfed by time and technology, the edifices of the pre-industrial era became, in Riegl’s terminology, the object of a cult”. Riegl’s view of material artefact excludes memories and past experiences that contribute to the comprehension of an object. Choay’s observation problematizes the understanding of heritage, particularly where ‘fixing’ heritage sites in time and space make it difficult to recognise and incorporate surrounding contexts and dynamics. So, Riegl’s view is the beginnings of a critical tradition that seeks to identify the promise and challenges of ideas and practices as regarding an evolving heritage context.

Heritage in the twentieth century

Jokilehto (1999, 26) argues that “the most remarkable characteristic of the twentieth century is certainly the development of a [heritage] framework for international communication and collaboration.” International communication and collaboration about urban heritage between European countries began following the First World War, attempting to address the challenges posed by many war-damaged cities and importantly, encourage shared responsibility for heritage. ICOMOS (2015b) notes that “cultural internationalism, as we know it today, was an outcome of the First World War, with the creation of the League of Nations.” However, following the war, European cities were reconstructed by their nations according to the competing theories of Viollet-Le-Duc and Ruskin, creating an urgent need for coherent policy. Then,

sustained by C. Boito and G. Giovannoni in Italy and A. Riegl in Austria, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the principles of conservative, instead of ‘stylistic’ restoration, gained international support; these were introduced into the declaration of the first international meeting on architectural heritage, in Athens 1931. (Jokilehto 1999, 18)

The Austrian architect Camillo Sitte (1843–1903) was influential in this process, as he viewed the city as a “historical continuum that must be fully understood in its
morphological and typological development, in order to derive rules and models for the development of the modern city” (Bandarin and Oers 2012, 10).

Organized by the International Museums Office, a UNESCO corporate body that existed between 1926-1946, the Athens Conference in 1931 was concerned with the restoration of historic buildings and inspired a growing consciousness among heritage specialists around the world by introducing the concept of international heritage (ICOMOS 2015b). The conference resulted in seven main resolutions that made up the 1931 Athens Charter (ICOMOS 1931, 1):

1. International organizations for Restoration on operational and advisory levels are to be established.
2. Proposed Restoration projects are to be subjected to knowledgeable criticism to prevent mistakes which will cause loss of character and historical values to the structures.
3. Problems of preservation of historic sites are to be solved by legislation at national level for all countries.
4. Excavated sites which are not subject to immediate restoration should be reburied for protection.
5. Modern techniques and materials may be used in restoration work.
6. Historical sites are to be given strict custodial protection.
7. Attention should be given to the protection of areas surrounding historic sites.

The Charter set out parameters still valid today and most importantly drew attention to the protection requirements of areas surrounding historic sites. The notion of a buffer zone protecting heritage sites, a key term and concept in this thesis, emerged. In addition, Resolution 3 empowered locals to identify protection priorities, during a time when heritage decision making was Eurocentric.

Following the Second World War, the United Nations Organisation and UNESCO formed, and societies interested in the conservation of heritage sites in Europe and around the world increased, including the expansion of the National Trust from the United Kingdom to the United States and Australia (ICOMOS 2015b). The Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) was also founded in the same period (Jokilehto 1999) – arguably, one positive outcome of colonialism. In recognition of the value of international regulation of World Heritage and following to the 1931 Athens Charter
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(ICOMOS 1931) recommendation for resolution of problems at local level, the First Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings 1957 recommended that countries which still lack a central organisation for the protection of historic buildings provide for the establishment of such an authority and, in the name of UNESCO, that all member states of UNESCO join the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) based in Rome. (ICOMOS 2015b)

Conservation policies following the Second World War began to consider the intangible importance of material artefacts that form the urban landscape. Jokhileto (1999, 23) argues that “the destruction of historic cities during the Second World War gave rise to community awareness of the values of lost or severely damaged familiar neighbourhoods.” In recognition, the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) was created following the Venice Charter in 1964 to protect historic cities and to respect community values and the diversity of traditional cultures, heritage and practices.¹ ICOMOS is a non-governmental organization that functions as an advisory body for UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre. Today, its extensive network of heritage experts representing 144 nationalities hold seminars and workshops to “contribute to improving the preservation of heritage, the standards and the techniques for each type of cultural heritage property” (ICOMOS 2015b).

The Venice Charter establishes the importance of preserving an urban heritage setting, following on from Article 7 of the 1931 Athens Charter recommendation to preserve areas surrounding historic sites. Article 1 of the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964, 1) states that

the concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time.

¹ The Venice Charter was proposed by UNESCO in 1964 during the Second Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings.
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Article 6 further states that “wherever the traditional setting exists, it must be kept. No new construction, demolition or modification which would alter the relations of mass and colour must be allowed” (ICOMOS 1964, 1). Although Article 6 relates to a single construction rather than a whole settlement or a landscape, it was the beginning of the contemporary understanding that the construction belongs to a setting. The Venice Charter, therefore, opens international policy to the concept of the urban heritage landscape

One of the foundational propositions for the Venice Charter was Cesare Brandi’s (1906–1988) principle that the value of a heritage building lies in the real circumstances of its physical condition, its patina and historically significant changes and transformations (Brandi 1977, 17). He emphasized the “need for a critical process where the work of art could be identified and defined in its actual state, taking into account the artistic concept, as well as the historically significant changes and transformations, the patina and the physical condition of the object or structure” (Jokilehto 1999, 19). Brandi considered the uniqueness of each work of art, whether a painting, a building or a piece of furniture, and attributed value to it. He encouraged an approach that includes the context of heritage properties and their transient aspect.

The UNESCO World Heritage (WH) Convention and its heritage guidelines were formally established in 1972, based primarily on the policies of the Athens Charter and the Venice Charter. The Convention valued artefacts as registers of a static time rather than transient and were drawn from European heritage values, particularly the concept of outstanding universal value. Its main statement of value is: “Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration” (WHC 2015g). Harrison (2012, 139) argues that “the [WHC’s] categories and definitions of ‘World Heritage’ shifted in response to challenges to its broadly Euro-American model of
heritage,” particularly during its inception. This model was “codified in the Convention text, as attempts were made to apply this model globally to people and places with radically different models of heritage” (Harrison 2012, 139). The current World Heritage Convention includes intangible heritage and local population for a more balanced approach, reflected in the strategic objectives of the Convention: credibility, conservation, capacity-building, communication and communities (UNESCO 2007b). The Convention provides each country granted with a heritage nomination by UNESCO with a sense of international significance by investing responsibility for preserving artefacts contributing not only to the country’s identity but also to the world’s cultural diversity. It also promotes public awareness of the importance of cultural heritage and is the most frequently cited set of guidelines for determining heritage properties.

The role of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention

The World Heritage Convention is responsible for registering world heritage sites. Its mission is to

- Encourage countries to sign the World Heritage Convention and to ensure the protection of their natural and cultural heritage;
- Encourage States Parties to the Convention to nominate sites within their national territory for inclusion on the World Heritage List;
- Encourage States Parties to establish management plans and set up reporting systems on the state of conservation of their World Heritage sites;
- Help States Parties safeguard World Heritage properties by providing technical assistance and professional training;
- Provide emergency assistance for World Heritage sites in immediate danger;
- Support States Parties' public awareness-building activities for World Heritage conservation;
- Encourage participation of the local population in the preservation of their cultural and natural heritage; and
- Encourage international cooperation in the conservation of our world's cultural and natural heritage. (WHC 2015g)
As of 2018, the Convention is composed of 167 countries (referred to as State Parties) and 1073 properties on the World Heritage list. Listed properties are cultural, natural or mixed sites. Currently, 54 properties are on the Convention’s danger list (WHC 2015g) because they are under threat from armed conflicts, lack of maintenance, natural disasters or development:

The [danger] list may include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves. (WHC 2015g)

In 1980, UNESCO introduced the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) to its Operational Guidelines (OGs), establishing OUV as the most important feature of a heritage property. This means that any “cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity” is to be preserved (UNESCO 2013, 14). Consequently, “the Convention aims at the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value” (UNESCO 2013, 2). As an example, the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province, Indonesia, home to a unique farming system, was listed in 2012 (WHC 2015b). Bali’s system of rice terrace irrigation is linked to religious beliefs and a communal philosophy that is highly vulnerable to the urban growth and dense population that challenge the island. As a cooperative farming and water management system, its preservation is essential for local sustainability and development. By enhancing legal protection, development upstream, pollution of the river, and other threats generated by rapid growth have been avoided. Jokilehto (2006b, 1) argues that “The World Heritage Convention is certainly the most visible international achievement of the modern movement in the conservation of cultural heritage.”
However, the Convention clearly distinguishes between that which is of universal value and that which is of national or local significance:

The Convention is not intended to ensure the protection of all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint. It is not to be assumed that a property of national and/or regional importance will automatically be inscribed on the World Heritage List. (UNESCO 2013, 14)

In fact, Smith and Akagawa (2009, 4) argue that

The very act of creating a list is not only an act of exclusion, it is also a performance of meaning making. In this process, ‘heritage’ is ‘identified’ and ‘accessed’ against predefined ‘criteria’. This process inevitably recreates or over-writes new meanings and values onto the heritage in question. Whether we are dealing with tangible or intangible heritage, the primary values and meaning of that heritage become framed and understood through its position on a list and its status against a set of criteria.

Jigyasu et al. (2013, 13) further question whether the heritage protected by the Convention belongs to the “everyday lives of ordinary people,” referred to in Chapter One. In fact, such ordinary people that contribute to and constantly modify urban landscapes may threaten a listed site, putting it on the Convention danger list. Consequently, although the protection and conservation of natural and cultural heritage having OUV contribute significantly to the world’s diversity, excluding heritage not eligible by international criteria, showcases a small and fragmented sample of a culture.

The World Heritage Convention’s Operational Guidelines

First published in 1977, the WH Convention’s most recent OGs were published in 2013. The Guidelines consist of procedures to facilitate the implementation of the convention, the inscription of new properties, and the conservation of the listed sites. They define the various World Heritage Convention categories of heritage: cultural and natural heritage, mixed cultural and natural heritage, cultural landscape, movable heritage, and the OUV. They also set procedures for granting international assistance through the WH Fund, which derives from compulsory contributions paid by State Parties, private and public
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donations, and partnerships and can assist international State Parties where there is an identifiable need.

To qualify for the WH list, a site must comply at least one of the ten criteria listed by the OG and “meet the conditions of authenticity and integrity, in short, to have ‘outstanding universal value’” (Jokilehto 2006a, 1). The criteria used to determine the OUV of nominated properties are as follows (UNESCO 2013, 20-21):

(i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. [The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria];

(vii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

(viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

(ix) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals; and

(x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of science or conservation.

These criteria were established to ensure that the sites vying to be on the World Heritage list are authentic representations of history, culture, living traditions or significant natural
settings. The criteria help State Parties identify which important features of their sites should be emphasised when nominating a property for the WH List and assist the managers of WH listed properties to prioritise maintenance. Sites nominated by State Parties for inclusion on the WH list are evaluated by the advisory bodies to determine whether these sites have OUV and meet the authenticity and integrity requirements stipulated by the OGs. They also consider reports guided by the OGs. The final decision whether to include a property on the list is made by the WH Committee.

The WH Convention also requires State Parties to submit periodic reports about their properties, including the state of conservation and updated information. The maintenance of a properties’ OUV is considered to be the most important and relevant task, due to the difficulties involved in sustaining significance over the years. Therefore, the OGs also suggest a monitoring process, whereby the protection and management of the OUV of World Heritage properties, including their integrity and authenticity, is enhanced.

The OGs discuss the importance of boundaries for the effective protection of nominated properties, including all areas where “a tangible expression of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property” is present (UNESCO 2013, 25). The inclusion of a buffer zone is recommended: “wherever necessary for the protection of the property.” The OGs state that

for the purposes of effective protection of the nominated property, a buffer zone is an area surrounding the nominated property which has complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection. The area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through appropriate mechanisms. Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, should be provided in the nomination. (UNESCO 2013, 26)

The OGs also recommend the nominated properties have management systems to ensure effective protection, including short, medium and long-term action plans that include the
buffer zones and broader settings. However, buffer zones are not compulsory and the effective management and control of buffer zones and their sites’ broader settings are not in evidence for any of the WH-listed properties examined by this thesis. Rio de Janeiro is the only case study that has submitted a management plan to the World Heritage Convention (WHC 2015e). While this plan acknowledges all the issues of overdevelopment and environmental pollution related to the site, it does not effectively decrease threats to the site, as Chapter Four describes. The WH Committee recommends establishing a reactive monitoring process and periodic reporting to ensure the OUV of listed sites is maintained. However, such procedures are only effective if the properties are properly managed in the first instance.

The committee can also put properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger or delist a property (UNESCO 2013). Properties will only be delisted in exceptional cases. The criteria for including properties on the Danger list are “ascertained danger” with loss of authenticity and integrity; serious deterioration of materials, structure or ornamental features; serious deterioration of architectural or town planning coherence; serious deterioration of urban or rural space or the natural environment; and “potential danger.” Potential dangers occur when

the property is faced with threats which could have deleterious effects on its inherent characteristics. Such threats are, for example:

i) modification of juridical status of the property diminishing the degree of its protection;

ii) lack of conservation policy;

iii) threatening effects of regional planning projects;

iv) threatening effects of town planning;

v) outbreak or threat of armed conflict;

vi) threatening impacts of climatic, geological or other environmental factors. (UNESCO 2013, 49-50)
Although the addition of a property to the Danger list is likely to attract negative publicity, in most cases, this designation draws attention from the wider heritage community and occasionally international cooperation as an avenue for addressing issues.

Specific types of properties are inscribed by the OGs, i.e., cultural landscapes, historic towns and centres, heritage canals and heritage routes (UNESCO 2013, Annex 3). All case studies analysed in this thesis fit in the cultural landscapes denomination, where

Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the “combined works of nature and of man” designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. (88)

Cultural landscapes are classified according to three main categories: “landscape designed and created intentionally by man,” “organically evolved landscape,” and “associative cultural landscape” (88). Historic towns or town centres are classified into the three main categories: “no longer inhabited,” “still inhabited,” and “new towns of the twentieth century” (89). If Vasai Fort in Maharashtra, India was a WH site, it would fit into the category of historic towns that are no longer inhabited. The other case studies discussed in this thesis are towns that are still inhabited. The OGs describe four additional categories of historic town:

a) Towns which are typical of a specific period or culture, which have been almost wholly preserved and which have remained largely unaffected by subsequent developments. Here the property to be listed is the entire town together with its surroundings, which must also be protected;

b) Towns that have evolved along characteristic lines and have preserved, sometimes in the midst of exceptional natural surroundings, spatial arrangements and structures that are typical of the successive stages in their history. Here the clearly defined historic part takes precedence over the contemporary environment;

c) “Historic centres” that cover exactly the same area as ancient towns and are now enclosed within modern cities. Here it is necessary to determine the precise limits of the property in its widest historical dimensions and to make appropriate provision for its immediate surroundings;
d) Sectors, areas or isolated units which, even in the residual state in which they have survived, provide coherent evidence of the character of a historic town which has disappeared. In such cases surviving areas and buildings should bear sufficient testimony to the former whole. (90)

The annexes to the OGs refer mostly to forms and formats of reporting and how to nominate sites and procedures for the WH properties. Annex 4 consists of the Nara Charter, which, along with the Athens, Venice and Burra charters, is an important document produced by UNESCO’s advisory bodies. They are particularly important as they are what heritage practitioners normally refer to, or should refer to when accessing cultural heritage. Heritage charters addressing urban heritage is the focus of the next section of this chapter.

The World Heritage List “recognises, authorises and validates certain cultural expressions as ‘heritage’” mostly framed by a Western view (Smith 2006, 111), and I argue, by a romantic view of wealth. Choay (2001, 140) contends that “the globalisation of Western values and references contributed to the ecumenical inflation of heritage practices” within UNESCO’s heritage guidelines. Smith and Akagawa (2009) concur and insist that UNESCO’s understanding of ‘universal value’ needs to be contested to accept diverse value systems. For example, Rio de Janeiro’s World Heritage nomination does not address or highlight the existence of its low-income communities, nor does it acknowledge the vital intangible culture derived from those places (WHC 2015e). Moreover, culturally determined interpretations of value are no longer suitable responses to heritage value: “this can only be nurtured through both cross-cultural knowledge and awareness with an ability to read into situations, contexts and behaviours that are culturally rooted and be able to react to them appropriately” (UNESCO 2015). The temporality and experiences of heritage authenticity must be considered, described by those who hold the relevant cultural understanding.
Choay (2001) further argues that the universalization of Western values in the OGs allowed for the transformation of culture into business and later into the tourism industry. She criticises the WH Convention as a “planet-wide process of conversion to the religion of heritage” and argues that “the number of monuments inscribed on the world heritage list tends to be taken as a sign of international prestige” (141). The development of heritage as a marketed commodity and the choice of values for the benefit of tourism is discussed further in Chapter Five of this thesis, where I question the effects of different approaches towards WH-listed properties and local level-listed sites in India today. However, it is important to note that countries have pursued the declaration of heritage sites within their boundaries either to enhance national pride, as confirmation of their sovereignty over heritage sites within national boundaries or to increase tourism profits (Bourdeau, Gravari-Barbas and Robinson 2016, Bauer et al. 2016, Giraudo 2016). For example, visitor numbers to Goa rose exponentially following its World Heritage nomination (India 2015), as seen on Chapter Five of this thesis.

**Urban Heritage in the Charters**

Three advisory bodies assist the WH Committee in its assessments and discussions: ICOMOS, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). ICOMOS is a “non-governmental international organisation dedicated to the conservation of the world’s monuments and sites” (ICOMOS 2015b). The IUCN assists the WH Committee with natural heritage sites, and ICCROM is an intergovernmental body focused on training and restoration techniques. All three organisations are highly engaged internationally and are dedicated to heritage conservation. Consequently, the managers of heritage sites inscribed on the WH list also benefit from expert advice via an
extensive list of publications, manuals, preservation measures, monitoring systems, management plans, and expert assistance when natural disaster threatens.

ICOMOS is specifically responsible for the “evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by States Parties, and providing input and support for capacity building activities” (UNESCO 2013, 10). For the 50 years of its existence, ICOMOS has hosted seminars and meetings that have generated the policies and international standards used by expert heritage communities. The most influential documents have been the previously mentioned 1931 Athens Charter and the 1964 Venice Charter, but also include charters, resolutions, and declarations that serve as a basis for any intervention or approach to a heritage property, such as those referred to in this thesis. They include the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (1987), the International Cultural Tourism Charter - Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance (1999), and The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (2011). The following sections discuss those international policies that influence this thesis, particularly those related to the three themes mentioned earlier: (1) heritage sites as a register of transience, (2) a heritage site’s integrity and authenticity, and (3) heritage sites under stress. This discussion is organised around the concepts of heritage and urban growth, intangible heritage, economic transformation and globalisation, tourism, buffer zones, and disaster.

**Heritage and urban growth**

Transformations in or near urban heritage districts and landscapes are especially complex due to conflicting planning, social and political agendas relating to mixed development and conservation needs. Although many developments occur outside protected areas, heritage sites are not free from the direct or indirect impacts of new projects. Heritage
can be a result of time and change, a register of transience. However, this change can also challenge the authenticity of a site. The unique status that some historic cities have acquired through time is particularly threatened by economic transformations and urban growth. Heritage sites like Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and Macao in China face rapid development that puts stress on the historical precinct. The construction of high-rise buildings in or near heritage areas, for example, establishes a new sense of scale, overshadowing the character of the original buildings and permanently impairing the formal designation of heritage precincts.

Italy instigated the debate about the definition of the centro storico (historic centre) in the 1950s, “leading later to a systematic development of appropriate methodologies for the analysis and rehabilitation of historic areas” (Jokilehto 1999, 24). The 1972 Recommendation Concerning the Protection, at Natural Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage was a first international document to effectively link “cultural heritage, communities, socio-economic development and the historic areas of cities” (Rodwell 2007, 133). Until then, heritage-listed buildings were treated as independent monuments, where physical conservation was more important than conserving otherwise intangible features that contribute to the urban landscape, such as traditions, beliefs, and folklore.

The cultural production of heritage cities was discussed at the First Brazilian Seminar about the Preservation and Revitalization of Historic Centers in 1987 (ICOMOS Brazil), generating the basic principles for the preservation of historic centres. The Washington Charter: Charter on the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas was created a few months later, which guarantees that heritage cities “necessarily shelter both the universes of work and of everyday life, through which the more authentic expression of society’s heterogeneity and plurality are brought out” (ICOMOS 1987b, Article 5). The Charter highlights the importance of the permanence of traditional
residents and of investing in the housing and maintenance of traditional activities within historic centres. The Seminar was held in Ouro Preto, Brazil, a mining town from the 1700s that contains a university campus in its historical core. The preservation of this World Heritage town is exemplary due to the combination of student vibrancy and public incentives for small traditional shops and restaurants – change and authenticity are both accommodated.

The Washington Charter (ICOMOS 1987a, 2) states in its first article that “the conservation of historic towns and other historic urban areas should be an integral part of coherent policies of economic and social development and of urban and regional planning at every level.” It reinforces the importance of community participation and the engagement of all stakeholders, especially in terms of the development and maintenance of housing units inside the heritage centre. It also lists the qualities to be preserved in historic urban areas, including “material and spiritual elements” such as

a) Urban patterns as defined by lots and streets;

b) Relationships between buildings and green and open spaces;

c) The formal appearance, interior and exterior, of buildings as defined by scale, size, style, construction, materials, colour and decoration;

d) The relationship between the town or urban area and its surrounding setting, both natural and man-made; and

e) The various functions that the town or urban area has acquired over time. Any threat to these qualities would compromise the authenticity of the historic town or urban area. (ICOMOS 1987a, 2)

The Charter also refers specifically to the construction of major motorways where they impact on the landscape, asserting that, planners need to improve access to historic cities but must not penetrate the historic urban area as happened in Goa in 1971 with the construction of part of the National Highway 4A across the WH site (addressed in Chapter Five). Most importantly, motor traffic inside a historic urban area must be controlled and parking planned to avoid further damage to heritage buildings and the environment
(ICOMOS 1987). The case study Paraty, Brazil, is subject to the policy and cars are not permitted inside the heritage boundaries. However, parking in Paraty is not planned, damaging the streetscape near the boundaries and causing chaos to the neighbourhood around it (discussed in Chapter Four).

The Washington Charter (ICOMOS 1987a) forms the basis for the Valetta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (ICOMOS 2011b) that acknowledges the importance of the neighbouring areas by expanding the area outside heritage boundaries. The Principles also consider “intangible values such as continuity and identity; of traditional land use, the role of public space in communal interactions, and of other socioeconomic factors such as integration and environmental factors” (2). These factors are of utmost importance in the preservation of urban areas. As highlighted in the Principles, urban heritage is part of a wider urban ecosystem and is an essential component to ensure harmonious urban development. The main objective of the Principles is to propose strategies to deal with the historic environment, including listed areas and their surroundings, reinforcing the notion that a wider urban historic environment has helped form the character of a heritage area over time:

The modifications reflect a greater awareness of the issue of historic heritage on a regional scale rather than just confined to urban areas; of intangible values such as continuity and identity; of traditional land use, the role of public space in communal interactions, and of other socioeconomic factors such as integration and environmental factors. (3)

Further, they acknowledge that “historical or traditional areas form part of daily human life. Their protection and integration into contemporary society are the basis for town-planning and land development” (3).

Additionally, the Valletta Principles specifically describe how to address issues of urban areas such as elements to be preserved, new functions, contemporary architecture, public spaces, facilities and modifications, mobility, tourism, risks, energy
saving, participation, conservation and management plans and governance. Most importantly, the Principles stand as the first document to stress the link between urban heritage, neighbouring urban areas and their transient qualities. The links between urban heritage-listed sites, neighbouring urban areas and their intangible characteristics are essential to this thesis. Heritage-listed urban centres do not function without their interactions (social, cultural, economic and possibly other dynamics) or their local inhabitants, who maintain the intangible assets of the heritage centre.

**Intangible heritage**

As discussed in Chapter One, intangible heritage is the soul of a heritage site, preserved in large part by collaboration among the local inhabitants. Intangible heritage, including national styles of music (for example, Rio's urban samba) is something the people of a culture often take as a given. Such an inheritance is “not a truly historical phenomenon at all, but a cultural inheritance of a genetic kind, that resists change. It is indeed a heritage in a quasi-biological sense” (Brett 1996, 24). Subtle changes to tradition occur of course. These are frequently due to economic transformation and globalisation and challenge the understanding of ‘authentic’ inheritance (Bourdeau, Gravari-Barbas and Robinson 2016). For example, in its beginnings in the 1900s, urban samba existed on the margins of society, adopted by the poor (IPHAN 2015). Now it is part of the local culture and enjoyed by everyone without the prejudice of earlier generations because of its shift in cultural significance, reflected in its recognition as contributing to the site’s heritage listing (IPHAN 2015). Despite its importance, formal recognition of intangible heritage in ICOMOS Charters is recent.

The *Tlaxcala Declaration on the Revitalization of Small Settlements* (ICOMOS 1982) expresses concern for the well-being of the communities living in small settlements in terms of guaranteeing respect for their traditions and traditional ways of life, asserting
that any initiative with a view to the conservation and revitalization of small settlements must be designed as a part of a programme embracing the historical, anthropological, social and economic aspects of the area and the possibilities for its revitalization, failing which it would be fated to be superficial and ineffectual. (Recommendation 1)

However, even this seemingly inclusive document attends exclusively to settlements on the boundaries of heritage-listed centres, not their broader surroundings. Small settlements as repositories of ways of living are discussed generically, thus leaving room for the interpretation of guidelines so that values integral to intangible heritage could be threatened. Additionally, although concerns about the identities of communities are raised, the concept of intangible heritage is not discussed.

The Washington Charter (ICOMOS 1987a, 1) incorporates the “spiritual elements that express historic character” into policy. Spiritual aspects could have religious or mystical connotations or could relate to identity and traditions. However, spiritual aspects of surrounding communities are not included. Additionally, the Charter clearly states that the “participation and the involvement of the residents” are essential to the success of the conservation programme (2). However, only the residents and not all the stakeholders are involved, again leaving room for mixed interpretation. In the 1950s, in both India and Brazil, low-income or informal communities were not considered resident or legitimate and were not included as stakeholders in the consultation process. Despite this, such communities affect site conditions, such as the Koliwada outside the walls of Vasai Fort that has been encroaching on the Fort for more than 60 years. Similarly, the inhabitants of favelas of Rio de Janeiro that have existed for more than a century and encroach on heritage sites are not consulted although part of Rio de Janeiro’s intangible heritage listed by the World Heritage Convention derives from the favelas (discussed in Chapter Four).

Intangible elements of heritage contributed by the inhabitants are formally recognised in the Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place (ICOMOS 2008), which describes a “spirit of place” as follows:
Recognizing that the spirit of place is made up of tangible (sites, buildings, landscapes, routes, objects) as well as intangible elements (memories, narratives, written documents, festivals, commemorations, rituals, traditional knowledge, values, textures, colors, odors, etc.), which all significantly contribute to making place and to giving it spirit, we declare that intangible cultural heritage gives a richer and more complete meaning to heritage as a whole and it must be taken into account in all legislation concerning cultural heritage, and in all conservation and restoration projects for monuments, sites, landscapes, routes and collections of objects. (3)

Further, the *Paris Declaration on Heritage as a Driver of Development* (ICOMOS 2011a) situates local communities as the main target of the overall development plan of a site. The *Declaration* encourages local communities to take ownership of their heritage and to engage as stakeholders in local cultural tourism. Most importantly, the *Declaration* aims to promote “the long-term impacts of heritage on economic development and social cohesion” (5). It argues that managers should

place people at the heart of policies and projects; emphasise that ownership of heritage strengthens the social fabric and enhances social well-being; involve local communities at a very early stage in development and enhancement proposals; raise awareness, particularly among young people; develop training for professionals. (5)

*The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Australia ICOMOS 2013) acknowledges the value of heritage and considers different individuals or groups for their contribution to intangible cultural heritage, recognising Australia’s cultural diversity. After many revisions, the *Burra Charter* defines cultural significance or cultural heritage value as having “aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups” (2). It also acknowledges intangible heritage as an essential part of cultural significance. This concept goes beyond the universalising WH OUV because it recognizes the importance of all cultures. The loss or substitution of traditional cultures can have a significant impact on small settlements, especially those with traditional ways of life, leading to identity or population losses (UNESCO 2010).
Economic transformation and globalisation

Living in heritage buildings can be costly as the buildings can be expensive to maintain. Thus traditional owners move to the outskirts of historic sites. These owners include not only the urban poor but also inhabitants of sections which have become gentrified. Gentrification is a common process in urban heritage centres that can threaten the spirit of the place and community identity. People are also drawn to heritage sites for employment, a better life, an established network of services around the old centre, and even the cultural life that heritage brings. Therefore, some also benefit from moving to the outskirts of historic sites. Legislation is not as strict in peripheral areas and building costs in the periphery can be less expensive, enabling the expeditious refurbishment of existing housing or the construction of new homes (Cristina 2012; Gravari-Barbas, Robinson Bourdeau 2016). Hence, the introduction of new assets to heritage or peripheral sites often occurs due to the need for modernization. It also results from the social pressure of the new community living in the heritage core, which does not share the identity and social behaviours of the previous inhabitants. These social pressures can lead to patterns of consumption and behaviour foreign to traditional cultural heritage.

Gentrification and movements of populations to or from heritage centres are significantly influenced by globalisation. The effects of globalisation are recognised in the *Tlaxcala Declaration* (ICOMOS 1982), which urges governing bodies to consider its effects:

They [delegates who organised the Tlaxcala Declaration] further observe that the introduction of patterns of consumption and behaviour foreign to our traditions, which make their way in via the multiple communications media, assist the destruction of the cultural heritage by encouraging contempt for our own values, especially in the small settlements; they therefore urge governments, institutes of higher education and public or private bodies interested in the Preservation of the heritage to use the media at their disposal for the countering of the effects of this process. (Article 5a)

Askew and Logan (1994) argue that globalisation has a particularly strong effect on traditional communities, resulting in an impulse for change from within. Therefore, there
was an urgent need for heritage management to clearly understanding of how to deal with traditional communities. The *Valletta Principles* (ICOMOS 2011b, 1) note that the “globalization markets and methods of production cause shifts in population between regions and towards towns, especially large cities.” They are concerned that the loss and/or substitution of traditional uses and functions, such as the specific way of life of a local community, can have major negative impacts on historic towns and urban areas. If the nature of these changes is not recognised, it can lead to the displacement of communities and the disappearance of cultural practices, and subsequent loss of identity and character for these abandoned places. It can result in the transformation of historic towns and urban areas into areas with a single function devoted to tourism and leisure and not suitable for day-to-day living. (6)

For example, the community of Quilombo Do Campinho, located near Paraty’s heritage centre, is composed of 80 families descended from freed slaves (Frayssinet 2009). The community used to survive from subsistence agriculture and hunting and gathering (Beares and Cabral 2008). However, hunting is no longer permitted, and arts and crafts provide the main income source for this group. Not only has the local economy been altered, but also the transformation of Paraty into a major tourism centre has been accompanied by rising real estate values, and the *quilombo* community is constantly threatened with eviction (Frayssinet 2009, 1).

**Tourism**

Many historic urban areas have achieved a certain prestige because of their well-preserved landscapes and have therefore become icons of global cultural tourism. In developing countries, such sites are important economic assets. Their historic locations are promoted as stylish destinations full of interesting historic sights, alternative lifestyles, and historic and artistic events that attract not only tourists but people who want to live there and profit from them (Arantes 2011). Consequently, attracted by the profit generated from tourism, many medium and low-income countries pursue official WH listing. In areas with widespread unemployment and economic deprivation, the promotion of heritage is important to the local economy (Brett 1996).
Generally, tourism at heritage sites brings more benefits than not. It acts as a major source of employment and profit for local people and creates possibilities for external funding, thus encouraging further cultural activities, educational opportunities and the preservation of traditions, as I demonstrate in this thesis. However, it is also important to consider that “historic towns and urban areas run the risk of becoming a consumer product for mass tourism, which may result in the loss of their authenticity and heritage value” (ICOMOS 2011b, 7). Di Giovine (2010, 8) argues that “heritage tourism is considered a means of economic development, employment and poverty alleviation, but also of neo-colonialism, inauthenticity and museumification.” Consequently, many countries attempt to define traditions to ensure a market value associated with their heritage properties and therefore potential tourism (Logan 2002; Ooi and Shaw 2009).

In response, an international charter governing tourism development in heritage centres was established in 1976, later replaced by the International Cultural Tourism Charter: Managing Cultural Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance (ICOMOS 1999). This Charter provides “the basis of a dialogue and a common set of principles to manage the relationships between the stakeholders involved in the preservation of touristic heritage sites, including host communities, indigenous communities, traditional custodians and visitors” (ICOMOS 2002, 1). It attends to the everyday people involved in heritage sites, especially the inhabitants of the favelas in Rio de Janeiro, quilombos in Paraty, and the Koliwadas in Maharashtra, and anticipates the need for a wide-range of stakeholders:

A major reason for undertaking the protection, conservation and management of heritage places, the intangible heritage and collections is to make their significance physically and/or intellectually accessible to the host community and to visitors. Unless there is public awareness and public support for cultural heritage places, the whole conservation process will be marginalised and not gain the critical levels of funding or public and political support so necessary for its survival. (ICOMOS 2002, 2)
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The widespread support of heritage centres and their residents is vital lest communities like the quilombos and Koliwadas disappear because of their eviction owing to rising real estate values. Therefore, buffer zones that include these communities are essential to the integrity of cultural heritage conservation.

**Buffer zones**

The first WH OGs stated that “a buffer zone around the property may be applied where appropriate” (UNESCO 1977, IV.25; my italics). Buffer zones were designed primarily to maintain the OUV of a site and were arbitrarily defined. The 1980 revision of the OGs gave priority to “an adequate buffer zone that should be foreseen and should be afforded the necessary protection” (UNESCO 1980, 4; my italics). However, buffer zones tended not to be included in properties listed as WH sites before the 1990s. The inappropriate development during the 1990s threatened living historic sites such as historic towns or natural landscapes, and buffer zones are now a highly recommended measure rather than merely an extra layer of protection.

The First Brazilian Seminar about the Preservation and Revitalization of Historic Centers (ICOMOS Brazil 1987) ensued following threats to the traditional cityscape of the Historic Town of Ouro Preto, listed as a WH site in 1980, from the over-development of the surrounding hills. The Seminar drew the attention of the international heritage community and government bodies and resulted in the Washington Charter. However, no such oversight was exercised (at least effectively) towards Rio; developments on the hills and open areas continue to grow largely uncontrolled. Participants at the Seminar concluded that historic centres “are to be circumscribed rather in terms of their operational value as ‘critical areas’ than in opposition to the city’s non-historical places since the city in its totality is a historical entity” (ICOMOS 1987b, 2). They recognised that that totality gives character to the historic centre. Consequently, the Washington Charter establishes the need for buffer zones, stating that
urban historical sites are part of a wider totality, comprising the natural and the built environment and the everyday living experience of their dwellers as well. Within this wider space, enriched with values of remote or recent origin and permanently undergoing a dynamic process of successive transformations, new urban spaces may be considered as environmental evidences in their formative stages. (Article 2)

The Valletta Principles (ICOMOS 2011b, 4) consolidate the definition of a buffer zone to “a well-defined zone outside the protected area whose role is to shield the cultural values of the protected zone from the impact of activities in its surroundings. This impact can be physical, visual or social.”

Buffer zones cannot exist alone; they must exist for the sustainability of the listed features or areas of concern. The Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas (ICOMOS 2005) recognises the importance of buffer zones, stating that

heritage structures, sites or areas of various scales, including individual buildings or designed spaces, historic cities or urban landscapes, landscapes, seascapes, cultural routes and archaeological sites, derive their significance and distinctive character from their perceived social and spiritual, historic, artistic, aesthetic, natural, scientific, or other cultural values. They also derive their significance and distinctive character from their meaningful relationships with their physical, visual, spiritual and other cultural context and settings. (2)

The Xi’an Declaration also stresses that diversity should be considered when dealing with heritage and its buffer zones by acknowledging different types of heritage and the different governmental, religious, cultural and socio-economic contexts in which they may be found. In addition, differences and conceptual relationships between core and buffer zones should be considered as well as the intrinsic influences that the heritage core exerts over the buffer zones and vice versa.

One of the roles of a buffer zone is to integrate authenticity and integrity, ensuring that the value of a heritage site is respected. They are also crucial to providing heritage areas more protection in the event of a natural disaster and recognise that misuse of the environment and activities that increase pollution can harm heritage values by aggravating threats from climate change, social and economic development, and
development pressures. However, policies use buffer zones to preserve the “integrity and authenticity” of a given heritage site but tend to not consider explosive urban growth and its broader effects. If the areas near the heritage port of Galle had been integrated into the urban heritage landscape as part of the heritage management area, a few more lives might have been saved after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. If a disaster management plan had been in place, construction in buffer zones or in safety setbacks would be limited and existing communities would have been included in the prevention, mitigation and recovery plans.

**Disaster**

European pre-industrial cities were related to their topography in ways that facilitated a sensible relationship with the environment, whether it was the sea, a river, mountains or forests (Rodwell 2007). Rodwell argues that communities in these cities were dependant on this relationship and used a range of local materials, such as rocks and timber, and local craft skills. Contemporary cities have been transformed into dense urban areas, and their biggest environmental impacts are deforestation, the silting of rivers, and water pollution. In low or medium-income countries, informal communities still use traditional construction materials, such as concrete, clay bricks and metal frames. However, construction technology is low, and communities subsist at a much higher density than in villages. Therefore, informal communities are at risk in the event of a natural disaster, as more people are affected and more often than not construction techniques are inadequate for local environmental threats.

The International Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP - ICOMOS), provides the latest information about risk reduction measures and cultural dimensions in risk communication and post-disaster recovery, thus extending awareness about disaster risks to cultural properties. The *Washington Charter* (ICOMOS 1987a) was the first charter to clearly address the effects of a disaster on an urban heritage site, stating that
“historic towns should be protected against natural disasters and nuisances such as pollution and seismic vibrations in order to safeguard the heritage and for the security and well-being of the residents” (3). The Lima Declaration (UNESCO 2010) raised awareness about the importance of having disaster risk management plans for all heritage properties and included a range of recommendations and actions to assist governments and to establish a network of organizations, institutions and committees to enhance and promote disaster risk reduction programs. The Valletta Principles (ICOMOS 2011b) further note that

historic towns and their settings must be protected from the effects of climate change and from increasingly frequent natural disasters. Climate change can have devastating consequences for historic towns and urban areas because, in addition to the fragility of the urban fabric, many buildings are becoming obsolete, requiring high levels of expenditure to tackle problems arising from climate change. (5)

Finally, the Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values (ICOMOS 2015a) provides strategies to empower communities affected by the disaster:

Community involvement with cultural heritage sites affected by disaster and conflict offers opportunities for healing and reconciliation. In rebuilding the fabric of their own lives in the face of painful memories, communities retain or create physical memorials in the landscape recording the psychological damage of “crimes against humanity” or devastation of disasters in terms of human lives lost. In turn, as visitor attractions, opportunities arise for a range of community interpretations and ongoing dialogue with tourists. (Article 1.1d)

Many World Heritage Sites and local-listed areas are under stress because of their location in disaster-prone areas and therefore, subject to transience. Heritage management is highly challenged by such partially foreseen and largely uncontrollable, sudden or catastrophic stress. The prospect of disastrous scenarios requires a reconceptualization of “integrity and authenticity” and for heritage disaster specialists to consider urban vulnerability and resilience. For, “heritage contributes to social cohesion, sustainable development and psychological wellbeing...[and] protecting heritage promotes resilience” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 9).
International urban conservation practices are applied in a global scenario, where heritage is temporal and based in peoples’ experiences. Harrison (2012, 229) explains that heritage is “an active assembling of a series of objects, places and practices that we choose to hold up as a mirror to the present, associated with a particular set of values that we wish to take with us into the future.” Those values should be determined by the local peoples and described by those who hold specific cultural understanding. Consequently, local and national heritage policy developments are crucial to local heritage and its communities.

**Current Policy Developments at National Levels**

Having outlined how international policies establish heritage sites as entities registering transience, integrity and authenticity, and various stresses, it is necessary to look at factors bearing on the implementation of policy at national levels. Urban growth, intangible heritage, economic transformation, tourism, buffer zones and disaster play out differently in different countries. Further, understanding the contexts relating to specific national heritage policies allows for more detailed and nuanced analysis of the case studies. Each country discussed in this thesis has its own legislation and legal provisions in regard to heritage sites. However, they all rely on the World Heritage Convention OGs as a framework. ICOMOS has a presence, and its charters are used as legal documents in the three countries discussed in this thesis. Considering size and population differences between the three countries, it is understandable that Sri Lanka has fewer national heritage sites than Brazil and India. Nevertheless, the Asian countries have a longer history of heritage preservation than Brazil, as local heritage legislation was introduced to both Sri Lanka and India during British colonisation.
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Heritage policies in Brazil

More than 1113 monuments and 78 urban centres are listed by the Brazilian federal heritage register, The National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN), as significant to Brazil’s culture (IPHAN 2015). IPHAN was created in 1937 by Rodrigo de Mello Franco de Andrade (1898-1969). Academics and intellectuals of that period took on the task of establishing what was true Brazilian tradition and culture, as the country was in the midst of the Estado Novo (New State), a dictatorial period (1937–1945) of political restructuring, led by then-President Getulio Vargas (IPHAN 2015). IPHAN established constitutional protective duties in listed places, governing intangible heritage and movable heritage items (Brazil 1937). More importantly, IPHAN has the final say regarding any listed heritage site. Before any intervention, change or maintenance work can be carried out at any heritage site listed by IPHAN, it is necessary to have a heritage assessment completed by qualified professionals according to the guidelines suggested by ICOMOS charters and doctrinal documents. The most commonly used charters in Brazil are the Athens Charter, the Venice Charter, the First Brazilian Seminar, and the Valletta Principles.

The state of Rio de Janeiro has more than 200 listed cultural heritage items and seven urban heritage centres under the federal protection of IPHAN and many more under the State and Municipal Register. Paraty and Rio de Janeiro City, encompassing Rio’s historic colonial centre, are two of those urban heritage centres. Rio de Janeiro City became a WH listed site in 2012.

Heritage policies in India

The archaeological and historical significance of monuments in India was recognized as early as 1784 by authorities such as Sir William Jones (1746–1794), who formed the Asiatic Society in Calcutta (India 2011). The Society developed into the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), the government organization responsible for India’s national
heritage. It protects, preserves and maintains more than 3600 monuments. All Indian monuments discussed in this thesis are protected under ASI and its legal acts, which were enacted for better preservation and maintenance of monuments and also to prevent illegal trafficking of antiquities and art treasures. Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment and Validation) Act, 2010 Antiquities and Art Treasures Act, 1972. In addition to the above periodical amendments and regulations were added to cope with the changing scenario and to protect the monuments. One such action is the declaration of Prohibited area, 100 m from protected limits and further 200 m as Regulated Area from the prohibited limits, to prevent encroachments and unregulated constructions near protected monuments. (India 2011a)

As indicated, the legislation recognises the importance of buffer zones for the protection of heritage sites. The Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) assists with regulating, preserving and raising awareness of India’s heritage. Founded in 1984, it has chapters in 170 Indian cities and is responsible for supplementing ASI’s heritage list and accounting for several other unprotected historic buildings (INTACH 2004). In Goa, for example, 21 buildings are ASI listed, 51 are state-protected, and 359 are recognised by INTACH, but unprotected by any list (Fernandes 2014). ASI cultural heritage projects are all based on the 2013 WHC OGs recommendations and recorded in the new National Cultural Heritage Sites List (ASI 2013), which reinforces a universal ‘outstanding Indian value’ that is based on the WHC OUV.

**Heritage policies in Sri Lanka**

Preservationist thinking in Sri Lanka started as early as 1877 with Sir William Henry Gregory (1817–1892), the then British Governor of Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and the creation of the national museum in Colombo (Sri Lanka 1940). However, heritage was not legislated until 1940, when a government heritage document included an ordinance to provide for the more effective preservation of antiquities, sites and buildings of historical or archaeological importance. Last reviewed in 2005, this document still states that all buildings erected before 1815 are to be considered “ancient monuments” (Sri Lanka 2005).
1940, 165). It also outlines the ownership of properties, offences to cultural heritage and policies governing cultural heritage sites, such as:

Article 24 (1) - Regulations may be made prohibiting, or restricting subject to the prescribed conditions, the erection of buildings or the carrying on of mining, quarrying, or blasting operations on any land within the prescribed distance of any ancient monument situated on State land or any protected monument. (169)

Sri Lanka has eight WH listed sites and 10 nationally listed sites. All regulations and policies regarding these sites are the responsibility of the Department of Archaeology and are subject to the 1940 Antiquities Ordinance (WHC 2015d). The Urban Development Authority, which dates from 1978, controls development activities. The Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications were listed by the World Heritage Convention in 1988, and the management of the site has been the responsibility of the Galle Heritage Foundation since 1994 (WHC 2015d).

National heritage policy differences

Brazil, India and Sri Lanka have based their policies concerning the protection of heritage sites on international guidelines, but each nation has its own peculiar circumstances that impact on the protection of heritage properties. Brazil has many heritage properties, and national government heritage departments have the final say over any development proposal. Consequently, heritage properties in Brazil are well protected given the country’s governmental capacities and resources. Government incentives for investing in heritage sites are limited, relying mostly on privately funded initiatives and tax deduction plans, and it is no different in India and Sri Lanka.

In Brazil, heritage legislation mirrors European guidelines, while India and Sri Lanka mostly value intangible heritage. To illustrate, the remains of the Vasai Fort in Maharashtra, India, are in constant ‘repair’ by the ASI. Its value in the Indian heritage lies in part in its image as a well-kept site, with clean concrete paths and rebuilt walls, in
accordance with its cultural significance rather than its physical authenticity (Menon 2016). The authenticity of heritage sites in India and Sri Lanka comes from a pristine sense of care and completeness. The physical integrity of local heritage sites in Brazil differ from those in Asia, where the former appear almost as quixotic earlier periods preserved in time-capsules, and the latter as evolving sites. At the Brazilian sites, an “imagined past was being brought forward as a possible present, and it was to be achieved by contemporary means” (Brett 1996, 19).

**Conclusion**

Throughout this chapter, I have addressed the international charters as reflections of the heritage and academic mind of a particular time. However, most are still current and used as the basis for heritage policies around the world. I also stressed the importance of legislative acknowledgement of the effects of explosive urban growth and subsequent tangible and intangible contributions of the communities inhabiting heritage sites.

The following section of this thesis discusses heritage strategies used and reflected in the historical urban landscapes of today, especially those facing increased urbanism and growth near heritage-listed sites. Chapters Four, Five and Six discuss issues of preserving visual hierarchies potentially threatened by contemporary development, underscoring the *raison d’etre* and urban morphology of the original settlements and consequently their authenticity. Consequently, they challenge contemporary understandings of the integrity and authenticity of urban heritage landscape, arguing that the heritage concept “holds out the false promise that something can be preserved that will not melt away in air, that is not subject to ‘everlasting uncertainty and agitation’ and which provides a transhistorical security” (Brett 1996, 158).

In the three next chapters, I also draw on the three interlinked themes – (1) heritage as a register of transience, (2) heritage integrity and authenticity, and (3) heritage
vulnerability – to determine whether heritage policies are geared to consider the effects of explosive urban growth and the prospect of heritage benefits to those urban heritage landscapes. Chapter Four begins with an outline of the interface between old and new material culture and compares the dynamics of uncontrolled urban growth evident in two case studies in Brazil, Rio de Janeiro and Paraty, to untangle heritage as a register of transience. Chapter Five explores anthropogenic impacts on the cultural habitat and dynamics of communities neighbouring heritage sites, pairing it with theme (2) heritage integrity and authenticity and case studies in India, specifically Reis Magos Fort, Aguada Fort, the World Heritage Sites Churches and Convents all located in Goa, and Daman Moti and Nani Forts. Chapter Six builds upon the analysis of case studies affected by natural disasters on both urban heritage areas and on their neighbouring communities, exploring theme (3) heritage vulnerability, where the case studies are Vasai Fort in Maharashtra, India, and the Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka. The discussion enables comparison of transient heritage sites and the notion of authenticity and integrity in heritage areas experiencing explosive growth and heritage under stress.
The following section, or three chapters of this thesis, comprises analysis of each of the themes and the case studies. The case studies provide this thesis with real world examples to engage, compare and discuss challenges for heritage management such as urban growth, economic transformation, tourism and disasters. Historical context is provided to examine the rapid evolution of early sixteenth and seventeenth-century colonial settlements into contemporary busy and dense city centres. I focus on the difficulties that this accelerated urban growth presents for cultural heritage management. In Chapter Four, I focus on the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and their importance to local culture, in particular, the contribution to intangible culture produced by those communities in spite of their rapid and sometimes unsafe growth in the city’s green areas. I compare heritage management approaches between the WH listed site of Rio de Janeiro and the locally listed site of Paraty and discuss theme (1) heritage sites as a register of transience. Chapter Five explores theme (2) heritage integrity and authenticity, addressing the risks of tourism to the authenticity and integrity of Western Indo-Portuguese heritage sites and discussing the interactions between local values and conservation approaches. The WH listed Convents and Churches of Goa is compared with locally listed sites in Goa State and Daman and Diu Territory. Finally, Chapter Six discusses theme (3) heritage vulnerability and the fragility of communities neighbouring heritage sites in the face of environmental

(Santos 1961, best known as Jamelão; my translation)
threat. The locally listed Vasai Fort in Maharashtra, India and the WH listed Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka are compared. Analysis and comparison of these sites provide an opportunity to reflect on the risks posed by the dynamic relationships between urban heritage sites and their neighbouring communities.

As Davis (2006) explains, cities, especially in the developing world, are transforming into megacities where the boundaries between rural and urban are becoming unclear. The challenge of conserving Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) has become critical because of rapid urbanisation over the past decade (Cherry et al. 2010). Moreover, the boundaries between heritage sites’ buffer zones and low-income communities in some parts of the developing world are quickly disappearing. Often driven by poverty, this trend creates multilayered and dynamic communities around urban heritage centres.

In the following chapter, I discuss transience with respect to heritage in two cities in the Brazilian state of Rio de Janeiro: Paraty and Rio de Janeiro City. The city of Rio de Janeiro is large and complex, and so this study focuses on the heritage-listed city centre and its immediately adjacent neighbourhoods, called South Zone (Figure 21). These cities were chosen as case studies because they share a history of urban heritage forms and explosive urban sprawl around their heritage centres. The heritage nucleus of Paraty is clearly defined and physically bounded by road barriers (Figure 23). The city outside these boundaries is a mix of old buildings with low authenticity levels, such as new buildings masquerading as historical ones, contemporary architecture, and informal low-income communities. In contrast, boundaries do not exist in Rio de Janeiro. Areas of heritage value are spread throughout the city, merging with contemporary architecture and informal low-income communities (Figure 22). In Rio de Janeiro City, most of the urban sprawl is caused by immigrants, seeking for a way to survive in an economically challenging system and living close to work (Galdo 2011a), while in Paraty, tourism
development is one of the main reasons for sprawl, particularly around the heritage listed area (Cristina 2012).

Figure 21 - Rio de Janeiro, seen from the statue of Christ the Redeemer. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 22 - Rio de Janeiro City Centre and South Zone highlighted purple. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe. (accessed January 31, 2016)
This chapter describes the context and formative influences of neighbouring communities near the heritage sites in the landscapes of Rio de Janeiro and Paraty. Secondly, it analyses the indirect pressures on historic urban centres that arise from the neighbouring urban developments and the visual, environmental and cultural impacts of the informal low-income communities. Thirdly, it questions the everyday dynamics between heritage sites and their neighbouring communities, including their positive influences on the local economy and society. The chapter identifies characteristics related to theme (1) heritage sites as a register of transience, in particular, the dynamics between heritage precincts as they are commonly understood and their relations with the surrounding, often unplanned communities. Furthermore, it promotes a concept of heritage that includes the “everyday lives of ordinary people” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 13), as discussed in Chapter One, and argues that their cultural activities and vitality provide a new form of heritage for future generations, where the contribution of ordinary people fully characterises transience in heritage sites and enriches the understanding of heritage.
The chapter concludes by reflecting on challenges extending beyond physical pressures of population growth and uncontrolled development on the outskirts of heritage centres. It reinforces that neighbouring communities are vital to the integrity of urban heritage sites and considers the various influences and exchanges they contribute. It demonstrates that sustainable and holistic development is required, especially if we retain any hopes of improving the quality of life for neighbouring communities. Finally, it argues that heritage conservation must accept modernising forces, where transformation is valued not only for the maintenance of local values but also for the identity of a community. Therefore, the importance of historical and cultural accumulation to heritage and its surrounds requires the reinterpretation and revision of heritage legislation and policies to include change.

**Case study areas**

Rio de Janeiro and Paraty are former Portuguese colonial ports located on the coast of Brazil (Figure 24). Rio de Janeiro was once the capital of Brazil and is a large and densely populated city (Table 1), while Paraty still holds an identity of a small fishing village. Rio is one of the wealthier cities in the country, whereas Paraty is still mostly rural and its revenue is derived from fishing and tourism. The wealth distribution of Rio is lower than that of Paraty (Table 1). However, both cities have higher inequality than many European countries and the other case studies of this thesis. They are both highly dynamic cities, and both are experiencing threats coming from rapid urban growth near their heritage centres.
Figure 24 - Location of case study sites in Brazil. Adapted from image in the public domain; reproduced from Pattern Universe.

Table 1. Statistics for Paraty and Rio de Janeiro City centre and South Zone. Statistical information is for the period 2011 to 2017. Data from IBGE (2010, 2014 and 2015), except where indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Rio de Janeiro centre and South Zone</th>
<th>Paraty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land area (km$^2$)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>928.4$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential density (inhabitants per km$^2$)</td>
<td>9,794</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle income revenue per month (average in US$)</td>
<td>1,249.02$^b$</td>
<td>639.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini$^c$</td>
<td>0.6391</td>
<td>0.5375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential density of surrounding communities (inhabitant per km$^2$)</td>
<td>6,316 (Providência Hill)</td>
<td>1,800 (Parque da Mangueira &amp; Ilha da Cobras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land area of surrounding communities (km$^2$)</td>
<td>0.95$^d$</td>
<td>5$^e$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The municipality of Paraty consists of 80% of national parks and green protected areas. The area of Paraty’s historic centre is 1.6km$^2$.
b. (SEBRAE 2015, 6)
c. The Gini coefficient is a measure of wealth distribution and income inequality (IBGE 2010).
d. (Duarte et al. 2015, 5)
e. (Garcia and Dedeca 2012, 13)

Rio de Janeiro City Centre and the South Zone have the biggest number of heritage properties original to colonial and imperial times in the City. The World Heritage nomination was recognized in 2012 acknowledging the “exceptional urban setting encompassing the key natural elements that have shaped and inspired the development of the city” (WHC 2015e). This recognition was awarded to Rio without the inclusion of the informal communities within the heritage listed boundaries. However, those communities
in Rio have developed since the 1900s and today, all districts in Rio de Janeiro would have at least one of those communities in their boundaries (Figure 25). Rio de Janeiro is a city of many aesthetic values, hence the World Heritage listing for its cultural landscape.

In the WH nomination, it lists heritage values from Botanical Gardens established in 1808 and other colonial buildings, the Sugar Loaf and cable car established in early 1900s, the modernist Flamengo Park designed in 1960s among other parks and landscapes “shaped by significant historical events, influenced by a diversity of cultures, is perceived to be of great beauty, and is celebrated in the arts, through painting and poetry in particular” (WHC 2015e). A cultural heritage landscape that includes ‘historical events’ and a ‘diversity of cultures', but not one from today.

The heritage centre of Paraty was nationally listed in 1956 in recognition of its well preserved colonial character. The neighbouring communities of Parque da Mangueira and Ilha da Cobras (Figure 26) developed in the outskirts of the heritage centre, over the last thirty years. This growth was largely due to the construction of the national highway through the area in 1972, granting easy access to the area to the general public, including migrants (Leonam 1976). The urbanization of Paraty was and still is, influenced by tourism and rural migration seeking for economic prosperity (Leonam 1976; UERJ 2009). Because of their differences in population, density, culture and socioeconomic character, Rio and Paraty are excellent case studies to examine the role of transience in the management of heritage in rapidly developing countries.
Historic landscapes, urban growth and cultural sensibility

Cities today are bigger and busier than in previous periods (Davis 2006; Rodwell 2007; Yuen and Kong 2009). In many places, the city centre remains the location for business
and other kinds of exchanges, as well as where services and infrastructure are established. This growth also happens within the buffer zones of a heritage centre (Oers 2010). In the countries studied in this thesis, heritage buffer zones also contain a number of different types of green areas such as parks, forests and safety setbacks that preserve the site’s ambience. The combination of green areas, housing deficit and ineffective supervision by local councils has created perfect conditions for the uncontrolled sprawl of the urban poor (Yuen and Kong 2009) into the buffer zones of heritage sites. Communities in buffer zones tend to grow informally, especially if housing and support are inadequate.

Additionally, heritage sites are important assets for low and middle-income countries as tourism is a profitable industry. According to Bandarin, Hosagrahar, and Albernaz (2011), culture contributes directly to economic development. Therefore, people are drawn to live near urban heritage sites to seek jobs, better lives, access the established network of services around the old centre, or even to stay connected to the cultural life heritage brings. Consequently, the high density and informality of new settlements can challenge the authenticity of heritage centres. UNESCO (2012, 51) notes that such challenges “may be due to excessive building density, standardized and monotonous buildings, loss of public space and amenities, inadequate infrastructure, debilitating poverty, social isolation, and an increasing risk of climate-related disasters.” The organisation argues further that such “unmanaged changes in urban density and growth can undermine the sense of place, the integrity of the urban fabric, and the identity of communities” (52). As a result, some historic centres in the developing world are in an ongoing struggle with their surroundings.

Historic townscapes are settings for everyday life – placemaking is an ongoing cultural, social, economic and physical experience. Such continual placemaking challenges understandings of heritage preservation that rely on the sense-of-place. Menin (2003) notes that the interaction of human perceptions and emotions with a place creates
meaning and that the most important influence in the creation of a unique way of life is a state of mind that produces an environmental, social, familial, spiritual or psychological reaction to the process of place-making. Further, Harrington (2004, 307) describes heritage as a “social phenomenon,” that includes “practices and traditions and the web of meanings that reinforce belonging and communality and act to make place.” Smith (2006) also associates heritage with experience, describing it as “a cultural process that engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present, and the sites themselves are cultural tools that can facilitate, but are not necessarily vital for, this process” (44). Hence, the everyday life of heritage sites is dependent on the inhabitants of neighbouring communities, who are often responsible for the maintenance of traditions valuable for the maintenance of heritage.

As indirect pressures from neighbouring urban development increase, the historic, cultural and environmental assets of heritage centres may be threatened. However, neighbouring urban development also contributes to a heritage centre’s sense of place by reinforcing vitality in the centre or engaging more people in the preservation of local crafts and traditional festivities. UNESCO (2012, 51) considers that “urban heritage is for humanity a social, cultural and economic asset, defined by a historic layering of values that have been produced by successive and existing cultures and an accumulation of traditions and experiences, recognized as such in their diversity.” Rapoport (1966), Fitch (1982), Tung (2001), among others, assert the importance of maintaining diversity, a sense of place and local identity within historic areas. Such intangible characteristics are dependent on the original residents who ensure that traditions retain integrity and are transmitted through the generations. They are an integral part of the heritage, and hence heritage is fundamentally transient.

Menin (2003) suggests that the materiality of a place is entangled with the different perceptions of an environment and the diverse influences involved in its
construction. The dynamic between formal urban heritage, communities associated with heritage centres and low-income informal settlements presents a complex reality of social injustice, in which the cultural production of the poor is not recognised by broader society as part of the urban cultural identity. Menin (2003, 7) argues that “the process through which humans comprehend, mark and settle in both natural and man-made settings…includes aspects of both the mental and material construction of place that are too often ignored, too easily missed, and too easily destroyed.” Hence, the architecture of informal communities reflects the persistent economic, social and political systems that made the growth of those communities viable. In Brazil, Soares Gonçalves (2006) notes that although the informal communities are not considered to be legal, the construction of these communities is not impeded by the local political system, which has allowed the slums “to become a space at the same time marginal and permanent in the urban landscape of the city, it caused a kind of legal vacuum that disregarded the influence of the state on the slums” (21; my translation). This lack of political interest has created a layer of informal communities spread throughout Brazil. Although these communities, which have existed in Rio de Janeiro for over 100 years, are essential to the city’s vibrancy contributing to the intangible value of the place, their construction is unregulated and often dangerous to inhabitants (Fernandes, Lagüëns, and Netto 1999, Smyth and Royle 2000). Hence, the urban dynamic emerges from the built environment and intangible heritage and socioeconomic issues.

Effective urban heritage management requires acknowledgement of the complex dynamic between authenticity and urban growth and the fundamental transience of heritage. Such recognition is necessary before inappropriate transformation becomes irreversible and centres experience permanent loss of historical authenticity and cultural significance. Managers must consider whether they are able to manage development sustainably to preserve the historic authenticity and cultural significance of heritage sites.
They must ask themselves whether conventional policies of preservation are suitable to address rapid urban growth and the influences of neighbouring informal communities. The loss or deterioration of significant historic places can directly affect the identity and visual integrity of these settings, as well as the inhabitants’ quality of life and sense of belonging.

A holistic approach that recognizes growth and change as inherent to heritage and manages it accordingly is urgently needed. The HUL approach suggested by UNESCO (2012), discussed in Chapter One, incorporates urban heritage areas into broader urban planning policies, practices, governance and management. It recommends “the need to better integrate and frame urban heritage conservation strategies within the larger goals of overall sustainable development, in order to support public and private actions aimed at preserving and enhancing the quality of the human environment” (52). It also addresses the historic fabric as one layer of HUL, where all layers are culturally interlinked. Bandarin, Hosagrahar, and Albernaz (2011, 6) further observe that “culturally sensitive approaches not only help make development strategies relevant to the communities concerned, they also enable them to engage with globalization on their own terms, with dignity and empowerment.” In other words, culturally sensitive approaches both guarantee the authenticity of a heritage area and allow sensible growth to occur.

Having established heritage as a register of transience, the historical contexts of this chapters case studies are discussed to provide a baseline for what is considered to be culturally valuable today. The following section provides a general overview of the approaches used by Portuguese colonisers to build their outposts in Brazil, focusing on the urban and architectural elements of the sites. The periodic colonial settings and their relationship to the remaining heritage buildings are discussed, demonstrating the change inherent in the built environments of each site.
Historical context

On April 22, 1500, the Portuguese commander Pedro Álvares Cabral arrived in Brazil with a fleet of 13 ships carrying soldiers, traders, adventurers and Franciscans (Abreu and Brakel 1998). They first set foot in Bahia, today a north-eastern state of Brazil. The first Portuguese settlement of Porto Seguro, meaning ‘safe harbour’ and named by the commander, still stands today.¹ At that time, the coast of Brazil was populated by indigenous people speaking different dialects, mainly living as hunter-gatherers with minor cultivation of fruits and tubers. The indigenous people did not build permanent structures because they were semi-nomadic, following the availability of resources, and constant wars between the different indigenous groups made permanent settlement difficult. Shelters were rapidly dismantled or left behind.

Consequently, most Portuguese settlements in sixteenth-century Brazil originated in areas of coastal virgin forest and operated as administration and military ports that allowed the flow of Brazilian goods to Europe. Initially, King João III of Portugal granted land rights to early settlers, dividing the coast into 15 Captaincy Colonies. In 1549, these individual colonies were united into the Governorate General of Brazil, which became a viceroyalty in the eighteenth century. Brazil at that stage was fundamentally agrarian, based on livestock farming and mono-culture plantations of sugarcane, grains and other smaller crops. Thus, landowners were the most economically powerful people in the early settlements. They lived in mansion-like farmhouses near their plantations and often had urban manor houses.

As in other Portuguese colonies such as Vasai and Daman in India, the Brazilian colonies each included an expansion zone, or rossio, administered by the council. These

¹ Cabral continued his voyage to India via the Cape of Good Hope.
were rural areas where pastures or small crops were established and that served as a basis for urban growth. Araujo (2015, 1) notes that

> each urban centre founded in Brazil was always an ongoing project. Such places remained open, above all, to their growth as centres of population, establishing their own expansion areas for this purpose [rossio]. But, in addition to this, the method by which they were built could itself be described as a profoundly procedural form of urbanism, since it was essentially based on a sensible and intelligent management of their respective pace of development. The paradigmatic expression for describing this method is the Portuguese word arruamento, which means nothing more than the gradual creation of streets, controlled and supervised either by officials from the city council or by military engineers, depending on the case.

Urban growth and ongoing development was, therefore, part of the Portuguese colonial modus operandi, making it remarkable that ‘expansion’ is so contested today, even considering its scale.

After the primary nucleus of a coastal town was formed, houses and religious and civil buildings were built along the bay, forming the main street. Subsequent streets were constructed perpendicular to the main one, heading inland towards the rossio area. Godfrey (1991, 24) notes that the “coastal towns of colonial Brazil took on polynuclear and linear forms, focused on a series of squares along the waterfront” and “despite the apparently picturesque confusion of streets adapted to the topography, Portuguese settlements adhered to flexible but coherent principles of spatial order.” According to Teixeira (1996), this spatiality corresponds to a medieval urban morphology that respected

> a clear hierarchy, alternating front and rear streets, crossed by transversals; with long and thin blocks, each with the same number of lots; urban lots that would go across blocks, with frontage to the front street and the other to the rear street; and the location of empty spaces on the periphery of this urban grid, which would acquire functions of square. (573; my translation)

Although town squares were not common in the Portuguese medieval urban morphology, features such as a dominant hilly area, a gate or fort walls served the same purpose, that is, as a gathering or market place. Gathering places began to be constructed next to an important building, such as a church or town hall, during the sixteenth century (574).
Called *largo*, these features gave perspective to the building – an aesthetic function rather than practical. Buildings were constructed mainly with local materials; the earliest buildings were constructed from *taipa*, or rammed earth, and with thatched roofs. Later, materials such as granite, lime mortar, lime wash and ceramic tiles were used.

In the seventeenth century, inland mines began producing metal that was required by the settlements. Mining increased rapidly due to the discovery of rich mineral resources – mainly gold, at that stage. Urban areas such as Ouro Preto (Black Gold), Mariana, Tiradentes and S. J. Del Rey boomed in the eighteenth century and sent all their gold through to the port settlement of Paraty and then on to Portugal.

**Rio de Janeiro**

Rio de Janeiro began with a little house by the Carioca River in 1531, and a provisional settlement was established in 1565 in the shadow of Sugar Loaf Mountain following an unsuccessful French invasion in 1560 (Pessôa 2015). By 1567, a permanent settlement was established at Castelo Hill for defensive purposes, which included a 4.4m wall, a church for the Jesuits, a three-nave cathedral, a town hall and jail, warehouses and two-storey houses (Mem de Sá quoted in Cavalcanti 2004). The National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (Brazil 2014b) records that

the first occupations of the coast at the entrance to the Guanabara Bay were military: with the Fort of Santa Cruz (at the foot of Pico Hill, in Niterói) and Fort of São João (at the foot of Sugar Loaf, in Rio de Janeiro), built in the mid-16th century to defend the entrance of the Bay. The Fortress of São João, built in the same spot where the city had been founded in 1565, is a military complex including, in addition to three small forts, the São José Fort, the third oldest in Brazil, founded in 1578. (26)

Consequently, the initial town was built according to the Portuguese colonial preference for a safe and sheltered bay with a hilly area that provided protection and views for controlling boats and ships approaching the port. Pathways to the port and the water springs were the first routes constructed (Cavalcanti 2004).
Although development was based on the Portuguese urban style of an upper city and a lower city (cidade-alta and cidade-baixa), as found in Lisbon, Salvador, and many other cities, the town adapted to the topography, growing around the four hills. A college was built on the top of each hill by each religious order; the Jesuits and Benedictines were followed by the Franciscans and the Carmelites (Coaracy 1988). Pathways were created between the hills and later between the chapels of each religious order (Gerson 2000). Direita Street connected the Jesuit chapel on Castelo Hill to the Benedictine chapel on São Bento Hill in 1590. The city grew from Direita Street towards the rossio, reclaiming land from mangrove swamps and adapting to the natural topography. Pathways with houses on each side were established in the lower city (Coaracy 1988; Gerson 2000). By 1637, the Castelo Hill settlement was already considered the old city and new public buildings appeared on Direita Street. “Urban development in Rio de Janeiro has been characterized by fragmentation and discontinuity of the territory, especially because the city’s geomorphological site” comprised many mountains and hills (Rio and Alcantara 2009, 126). Development continues to adjust to the topography of the city, as discussed later in this chapter.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were marked by the construction of military and religious buildings and private homes. Forts and fortresses were built to protect the city from invasion (Figure 27) and there were six forts by 1650 (Fridman 1999). In 1743, the Governor’s house was built on Direita Street next to a large square, in the style of a Baroque manor house with courtyards. This house is specifically part of the WH listing in the historic centre of Rio (WHC 2015e). The XV Square was established to give the desired aesthetic perspective to the Governor’s house, and as part of the

---

2 Direita Street is a common street name in many Portuguese colonial settlements and derives from the word direta, which means ‘straight to’ (e.g. from Castelo Hill straight to the Benedictines’ hill).
Portuguese urban character, later acquired a water fountain. All these features remain. The Governor’s house was transformed into the Viceroy’s palace in 1763 when the colony administration moved from Salvador to Rio de Janeiro. The urban area grew quickly – shops and houses aligned with the streets, constructed wall-to-wall and sometimes rose to three stories (Gerson 2000). The buildings were made of granite, bricks, and taipa with a timber structure, white lime wash mortar and clay roof tiles. By the early nineteenth century, the city had spread to adjacent neighbourhoods, and the city centre assumed a commercial character. The outer neighbourhoods were characterised by private mansions.

![Figure 27- Fortification project for the city of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1713. Image in the public domain; Reproduced by João Massê (Serviço de Documentação da Marinha) Wikimedia Commons.](image)

In 1808, the Portuguese crown transferred to Brazil in a warless escape from Napoleon, advised and protected by the British (Cavalcanti 2007). Dom João VI, King Regent of Portugal, migrated with the royal family and court, totalling 400 people. This event marked the transformation of Brazil and especially Rio de Janeiro. Brazil was no longer
a colony and in 1815 became part of the United Kingdom of Portugal, Brazil and the Algarves. King João VI commissioned French architects, artists and engineers to beautify Rio de Janeiro, transforming it into the royal seat. He also built the Brazil Bank, a powder factory, botanical gardens, an art academy, a concert hall and medical and military schools. In 1822, King João’s son Pedro declared Brazil to be independent of Portugal and himself the Constitutional Emperor. By then, Rio de Janeiro had attracted many immigrants, especially from Portugal, and the town started to take on the shape it has today.

Rio de Janeiro grew explosively in the twentieth century (Mattos 2007). Colonial houses were demolished and replaced with commercial skyscrapers in the name of city embellishment, contrasting with the few remaining heritage buildings successfully preserved by IPHAN. Today, the aesthetics of the dense urban surroundings differ greatly from the historic cityscape. The important colonial architecture in the historic centre and many of the twentieth-century interventions in the urban area, along with its parks, forests and vistas, resulted in Rio de Janeiro being granted WH status in 2012. However, informal communities in its green areas and near urban heritage areas continue to grow rapidly, as discussed in the next section of the chapter.

**Paraty**

Paraty is a small city on the coast in the southernmost part of Rio de Janeiro State and is surrounded by a lush tropical forest that lies between many protected environmental areas and the Atlantic Ocean. These protected areas are occupied by the Goianas; indigenous communities already present when the Portuguese first arrived (Teixeira 1993) and quilombos, remote villages whose residents are descendants of freed slaves from the colonial period. The urban heritage centre of Paraty is located between two rivers, the Perequê-açu River to the north and the Patitiba River to the south. This area was settled
by Europeans who followed the indigenous paths from the mountains of Serra do Mar in the west to the bay. Portuguese settlement followed the discovery of gold in Brazil’s hinterland in the early sixteenth century. Gold was transported over the indigenous mountains paths from the mines to the port at Paraty and thence to Portugal.

The first settlement, Defesa Fort, was built atop a hill on the side of the Perequê-Açu River at the end of the sixteenth century (UERJ 2009). Later, houses were built in the hilly area. Throughout the seventeenth century, Paraty served as an important port for the exportation of gold from the interior mines to Portugal (UERJ 2009). A number of significant and extant churches were built in the lower part of the village attracted housing (Figure 28). Thus, the town formed according to the traditional Portuguese lower and upper city layout. Urban growth in Paraty was characterized by its movement towards the rossio. However, it was limited by the natural boundaries of ocean and river, which preserved heritage sightlines and vistas from the impact of explosive growth. After gold mining declined, coffee was exported from the port until the abolition of slavery in 1888 (UERJ 2009). The port was then used primarily for local transportation, and the town fell into near obscurity, becoming a small fishing village accessible only by water or tracks.
Following the creation of SPHAN\(^3\) in 1937, Paraty was ‘rediscovered’ as an example of a pure Brazilian style of art and architecture (Leonam 1976). The town has a quasi-grid plan adjusted to the topography, where the main streets intersect side streets at slightly curved right angles, with “seven streets running from east to west, and six from north to south” (IPHAN 2014, 1). Its architecture is high density and very homogenous, composed mainly of private homes and religious buildings. The buildings were and still are painted in white lime wash, furnished with colourful windows and doors, giving rhythm to the facade openings (Figure 29) Although Paraty acquired town status in 1660, most of the remaining buildings are from the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, with colourful limestone corner pieces, facades decorated with geometrical paintings, and metalwork housing lamps and other decorations. The lots are traditional Portuguese long rectangles with the shorter side facing the street. The front facades reveal the social status

\(^3\) The Brazil’s National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute was created in 1937 first as a Service (SPHAN), later becoming an Institute (IPHAN) in 1994 (IPHAN 2015).
of the owners, and houses with an upper floor and more doors and/or windows facing the street were considered signs of wealth (UERJ 2009).

Figure 29 - A street within the listed historic centre (Centro Histórico), Paraty. Photo by author, 2016.

Paraty’s historic city centre was listed as culturally significant by the State Heritage Council in 1945 and nationally listed by SPHAN in 1956 (Brazil 1966). The city centre has been well preserved as a national heritage site since 1958 and features rows of colourful two-storey colonial architecture houses, churches, markets, two forts and four squares, three located next to churches serving as largos and one facing the newer part of the settlement, towards the rossio. The system of cobblestone paving is noteworthy for its arched form, with high kerbs, which helps the water flow through the city to the ocean. The construction manages flooding during high tides, when seawater flows into the urban heritage centre up to two blocks away from the foreshore, and during a heavy summer
rain. Cars are not permitted within the heritage centre and traditional festivities are dating from colonial times are still performed there.

In 1954, the first road connecting Paraty to neighbouring localities opened, enabling immediate development in the area (Leonam 1976). In the 1970s, the federal government built a secondary coastal highway to link Rio and São Paulo, the two major Brazilian cities at that time, which passed just off Paraty. Once the highway opened, the preserved site of Paraty was only a four-hour drive from Rio, paving the way for rapid population growth around the heritage centre (UERJ 2009). Leonam (1976) notes that in 1947 “outside the preserved perimeter there was virtually no new construction. Over the years, other constructions appeared, interfering somehow with the old centre” (24, my translation). In 1976, the Brazilian government requested SPHAN conduct an extensive study following concerns regarding heritage risks due to informal development in the area.

**Urban change: Informal communities in Rio de Janeiro.**

In Brazil, the informal development of low-income communities often envelops and penetrates heritage centres. The city of Rio de Janeiro and Paraty both possess outstanding colonial architecture and rapid development of low-income informal communities near their heritage cores. Informal communities directly affect livelihoods and wellbeing and transform the shape of a city in ways that may threaten the heritage they surround. However, their activities also enliven and maintain the existing culture, an alternative approach to the interpretation of place and local tradition preservation.

Rio de Janeiro city has the largest number of nationally listed heritage buildings in Brazil (IPHAN 2015), most of which are located in the City Centre with others spread across surrounding neighbourhoods. Heritage areas are clustered within the busy daily life of Brazil’s second-biggest city, alongside modern high-rises and intensive car and
foot traffic. These buildings are survivors in a complex reality, where heritage and environmental bodies struggle to protect the cultural fabric, green areas and forests and government is ineffective and does not provide housing, policies or funds to avert the chaos of urban development. Caught between, the urban poor take advantage of the governance absence to construct almost anywhere. Things are no different in Paraty, despite containment of its well preserved nineteenth-century heritage precinct in an enclosed colonial city centre area that presents as a romantic fishing village. Outside the heritage boundaries, Paraty is tourist-driven, and the heritage buffer zone contains low-income and high-density developments, clearly delineating old and new.

According to the 2010 national census (IBGE 2010), 6 per cent of Brazil’s total population lives in so-called “subnormal agglomerations,” defined as low-income settlements of at least 51 units on public or non-public vacant land. According to Lara (2013) these subnormal agglomerations “have a wide range of qualities and vulnerabilities” (554) that will be discussed in this chapter. These settlements are colloquially known as favelas. However, the Brazilian government coined “subnormal agglomeration” in 1980 to avoid the pejorative favela (IBGE 2010). In Rio, 14.4 per cent of the population lives in such settlements, including Providência Hill (IBGE 2010). Most favelas now have basic access to infrastructure and utilities such as water, energy, garbage and sewage collection, nevertheless, many still “have very different degrees of access to water and electricity, but are generally very low on sewage connections” (Lara 2013, 554). There are stark differences between the services provided by the council to these low-income communities and those provided to up-market or heritage areas, which are sometimes in the same neighbourhood, as seen in all Rio de Janeiro City centre and South Zone (Galdo 2011a). Unsurprisingly, this inequality is also evident in Parque da Mangueira and Ilha da Cobras in Paraty. Rio’s first informal low-income community emerged in the late nineteenth century when displaced soldiers returned from the War of
Canudos in Bahia, a state in northeast Brazil. While waiting for their government wages, the veterans occupied Providência Hill in Rio’s city centre, which they renamed “Favella Hill” in reference to the favela, a skin-irritating tree native to Bahia. They considered themselves to be as irritable to the government as the native trees (Mattos 2007). The word favela is now associated with poverty, segregation, violence and drugs, but also signifies a place of solidarity and sociability (Valladares 2008), charity and community among disadvantaged Brazilians. After its establishment, Favella Hill became home to many former African slaves as well as immigrants from Europe and the poorer, rural areas of Brazil (Mattos 2007). At that time, residents lived in timber shacks without public infrastructure (Figure 30). Other favelas grew around Rio’s city centre, and by the beginning of the twentieth century, three major settlements existed: Providência (Favella) Hill, Santo Antonio Hill and Misericordia, close to Castelo Hill.
Outside the *favelas*, the urban poor lived in collective houses or tenements, often unsanitary colonial-era buildings that housed hundreds of people (Vaz 1986, Mattos 2013) with common facilities and few, if any, windows. Following a global trend, the city council decided to enforce so-called ‘sanitary measures’ (Mattos 2103) by evicting inhabitants and demolishing those colonial buildings. Displaced inhabitants used materials from demolished buildings to erect structures in Favela Hill. This and the other three communities soon became associated with violence but were constantly overlooked by the law (Mattos 2007). Samba lyrics were a way for disempowered communities to protest government measures. The following lyric was composed in 1927 by famous samba composer Pixinguinha about Providência Hill and the removal of housing units to a new housing project called Cidade Nova (New City) (Pixinguinha 1927; my translation):

```
My “girl” the *favela* will go down
...
The little wooden house
That fills our heart with affection
...
For us the trickery and the Favela hill
Now see the ingratitude of humanity
...
That dull lives by city
Imposing homelessness to our people in the *favela*
...
Because there the moonlight is different
It's not like the moonlight you see in the *favela*
...
I will then live in the New City
But my heart will get back to the Favela hill
```

Following many unsuccessful attempts to remove *favelas*, Brazil’s military dictatorship between 1962 and 1978 enabled Rio’s administration to formalize a plan to eliminate them. Between 1962 and 1974, 80 *favelas* were destroyed and more than 130,000 people evicted (Mattos 2007), relocated to new public housing complexes on the edges of the city (Frisch 2012). However, the *favelas* grew in number and density in the
city centre and other parts of Rio despite the plan, largely because the new public housing units could not accommodate all those in need. Moreover, not all favela inhabitants wanted to leave. Their houses were close to their work places and social connections. Residents responded to the oppressive relocation policies by forming communities and associations that reinforced their political and social organisation and enriched their sense of identity. The government initially cooperated with these associations, seeking to control them (Correia 2006). However, the cooperation was politically motivated: favelas were so ingrained in Rio that the government was under pressure by the public to be socially accountable.

During the 1970s and 1980s, Rio experienced a period of uncertainty regarding urban policies, which led to major growth in the favelas and the deterioration of urban spaces (Brandão 2006). The government’s urban policies were so ambitious they were often left unfinished, frequently due to inadequate planning. Hence, uncontrolled development of favelas in some areas began to threaten a number of the city’s important cultural symbols, leading heritage community groups to demand the preservation of some areas, especially within the city centre. Brandão (2006, 45) observes that “until that time, traditional planning in Rio had very often neglected built and natural environments.” Moreover, increasing drug trafficking and violence in the favelas during the 1980s, caused the broader population to fear the favelas and their proximity. For the first time, heritage groups had the support of civil society in their push for the government to act towards preserving historical precincts from new favelas.

In 1988, three years after democracy was re-established in Brazil, the new Brazilian Constitution included an entire chapter on urban policies (Senado Federal 1988). These policies sought to establish the most appropriate methods for the regulation of the favelas and management of the urbanisation process, seeking a socially responsible outcome. Favelas began to be identified as low-income communities in need of
government assistance rather than violent outlaws. As an example of this new approach, squatters were granted ownership of an occupied property after five years of residency. The policies removed all indications of illegal property, banned all eviction programs and made municipalities responsible for transforming the favelas into proper neighbourhoods and integrating them into the rest of the city. The new democratic government, seeking socially responsible outcomes, led the changes.

However, in the 1990s, Rio experienced unprecedented levels of urban violence and illegal use of public urban spaces (Brandão 2006), which expanded to occupy empty green areas such as hills and national parks (Figure 31). The total freedom from zoning regulations and construction codes, allied with the failure of the government agencies to protect informal urban growth or provide enough housing for those in need, allowed the favelas to expand. Despite almost a century of urban interventions led by municipal and federal governments, non-profit organisations and local communities, Rio’s informal settlements continued to grow. Consequently, in 1992 the municipality of Rio developed a Strategic Plan (PCRJ 2009) that identified Area de Proteção do Ambiente Cultural (APACs), or areas of special cultural interest or built heritage in an urban context, which required conservation. The APACs were comprised of heritage precincts threatened by the growth of informal communities and over-development within their buffer zones. A number of Rio’s municipal buildings and areas were listed as heritage, at local and national levels, including areas of the city centre and Providência Hill.
Figure 31 - Uncontrolled urban growth in the National Park and WH buffer zone adjacent to the Christ the Redeemer Statue, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Photo by author, 2012.

Figure 32 - Heritage sites such as Outeiro da Gloria church are embedded in favelas. Photo by author, 2012.
In 1994, following the Strategic Plan, the municipality initiated the Favela-Bairro (Neighbourhood-Favela) program to urbanise its “subnormal agglomerations.” The program aimed to respect the inhabitants’ investment, to increase access and services and to treat those settlements as ‘real’ neighbourhoods (Soares Gonçalves 2006). It attempted to integrate the favelas into the existing urban fabric, primarily by naming streets and numbering houses, to beautify the city through urban design and make it more attractive for both tourism and investment (Rio and Siembieda 2009). The program is recognised as “an excellent example of social and environmental sustainability and benefited more than 500 000 people in 143 favelas throughout Rio de Janeiro” (46). However, the favelas did not receive the same level of infrastructure and services afforded to other neighbourhoods, mostly because of the social and economic profile of their inhabitants.

For example, Providência Hill partnered with the program in 2005. Streets were paved, sewage and electrical networks improved, and a child-care centre and health facility built. Interpretation for an Open Air Museum was prepared (Savova 2009), where tourists could walk along the narrow lanes, stop at viewpoints and learn about Rio’s Carnival and Urban
Samba (Brandão 2006). Nevertheless, the program was not able to access some areas of the neighbourhood, such as land occupied by drug traffickers or at high risk of landslide and therefore listed for removal (Soares Gonçalves 2006).

Despite these obstacles, the federal government expanded Rio’s program and invested in community housing by creating the Growth Acceleration Program (PAC) in 2007 (Ministry of Cities 2012). This program benefited communities throughout Brazil by supporting the construction of schools, child-care centres and health units. It also improved infrastructure by widening and paving streets and implementing proper water supply and power networks (Ministry of Cities 2012). One positive outcome of the program for Providência Hill was the installation of a cable car for locals to access the top of the hill. This also enabled tourists visits to the Open Air Museum, the City of Samba and the Olympic Villa and contributes to the vitality of Rio’s heritage centre.

The municipality also addressed the issue of drug trafficking. In 2008, the Police Pacification Unit (UPP) program was implemented in a number of favelas, including Providência. By 2013, 32 favelas were free of drug traffickers (Rio de Janeiro 2010). Unlike other favela programs, UPP focused on empowering citizens, building community-police partnerships and enforcing military takeover of zones previously occupied by drug cartels (Suska 2011). With the provision of proper services to these communities, violence and crime in the favelas have decreased, property values have risen, and quality of life has improved.

The historical importance of the favelas has been proven by its resistance in the landscape, and its cultural presence in paintings, poetry, music and many other cultural forms since the 1900s. Its transient character adapts to cater for new comers and extended families, with their expandable built form and its open lifestyle. The favelas controversial character might impede heritage organisations to point a direct and practical framework
of preservation. However, as presented in the next section, its values appear to be slowly recognised by the wider public.

**Favelas today**

After more than 100 years of existence, most *favelas* are no longer illegal, and many residents now have land tenure and urban services, and construction typologies are stable or standard (Figure 34). In fact, many of the communities are now recognised as “ex-favela” by local newspapers (Daflon 2011). Rio’s *favelas* have historical value, and some are places of cultural interest in their own right. For example, the success of the Open Air Favela Museum on Providência Hill has enhanced the community’s pride and identity and is emulated in other communities (Savova 2009). Books on local cuisine are published, guided *favela* tours are available, and guesthouses are starting to appear, bringing additional revenue to the inhabitants (Philips 2013).

![Figure 34 - Providência Hill in 2012. Photo by author.](image-url)
The *favelas* are self-built by inhabitants (*favelados*) who lack formal architectural or urban training but have mastered the concept of ‘reduce, reuse, and recycle.’ The maze of streets and small alleyways contributes to the aesthetic value and local ambience. Businesses such as family restaurants and beverage shops are common along the larger passages. The entire community shares its public open spaces; children wander around, and neighbours engage anyone who walks by. This community lifestyle has generated several cultural expressions, or intangible heritage, that even the wider population recognises, including food, linguistic conventions and music, reflecting the importance of those social values and cultural expressions for local identity.

To most *favelados*, the requisition and building of a home in such circumstances is acceptable. These homes are typically brick and mortar and are built according to a family's needs. In the early twentieth century, shacks were built to protect inhabitants from the weather, but *favela* homes now have a more permanent character. However, it is common to leave the outside facade unfinished and the upper slab ready for the addition of a second storey to save costs as the family grows. Larger communities also have bank branches, mobile phone stores, dry cleaning services, restaurants, bars and a wide variety of commerce facilities on their main streets. These communities provide homes, services and some degree of infrastructure, even without State support. But the State cannot regulate or tax the majority of the *favelas*, some communities still have high levels of violence and drug trafficking, and their environmentally devastating nature and lack of construction safety awareness make *favelas* undesirable neighbours. In Rio’s case, the city’s historic fabric extends over most of its urban environment, and urban growth is explosive and unregulated, so it is common for a heritage-listed building or cultural precinct to neighbour or even be located within a *favela*. The longevity of these heritage and cultural clusters in such transient environments indicates their value to the *favela* community.
In Rio, there is a unique sense of belonging embodied in the collective memories of its people and its cultural system of symbols that represent the community and the environment, including the favelas. This sense of belonging has resulted in considerable care for the city’s cultural environment, which is recognized by the WHC in Rio’s WH listing description (WHC 2015e) The Urban Samba is an example of this care and samba lyrics often include the symbolic value of Rio’s natural environment and daily life in the favelas. The lyrics of Wonderful City, composed by Andre Filho for the 1934 Carnival parade (Borges 2006), demonstrate this value: “Wonderful city, full of thousand charms, Wonderful city, heart of my Brazil! Birthplace of samba and beautiful songs! Who lives in the soul of people. Is our heart’s altar. Singing happily!” (my translation and common knowledge). This song has become a cultural institution and is still sung at most Carnival parties. It is why Rio is known today as the Wonderful City. José Bispo Clementino dos Santos (1913-2008), best known as Jamelão, composed the epigraph of this chapter and was a samba celebrity in Rio, writing about life in the favelas where he lived. He was awarded the Brazilian Order of Cultural Merit in 2001 for his exceptional contribution to enhancing the cultural value of samba in Rio de Janeiro and Brazil.

Carnival is the biggest festival in Rio. The composition of the themes and songs, and design and development of the costumes, parade cars, and much more, happens in the favelas. The four-day parade of favela samba groups (Figure 35), or Samba Schools as it is called locally, provides significant income for the favelados as well as profit and tourism for the municipality. Smaller Carnival Samba Schools are also held in many places around Rio, gathering people from all cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds and reinforcing local identity and intangible value. This vital contribution of the favelas to the culture of Rio reinforces UNESCO’s (WHC 2015e, 211) recognition that “the dramatic landscape of Rio de Janeiro has provided inspiration for many forms of art,
literature, poetry, and music.” However, the WHC has failed to recognise the contributions of Rio’s *favelas* to this aesthetic heritage (WHC 2015e).

![Image of the Samba parade in Sambódromo, Rio de Janeiro.](image)

**Figure 35 -** The Samba parade in Sambódromo, Rio de Janeiro. Image in the public domain; photograph provided by Hao Luo, 2013 Wikimedia Commons (accessed January 31, 2016).

**Urban change: Informal communities in Paraty.**

Construction of the highway between Rio and São Paulo in the 1970s increased tourism to the heritage listed town and employment opportunities drew rural inhabitants into the town’s centre. As discussed, urban growth and adaptation were accepted and encouraged in the development of Rio de Janeiro and Paraty, including homogenous, high-density architecture with the gradual creation of streets, controlled and supervised by officials from the city council (Araujo 2015). Paraty’s urban population swelled from 4,169 in 1970 to 33,695 in 2006 (UERJ 2009). Urban growth has been particularly aggressive in the outskirts of Paraty along the Patitiba River in the neighbourhoods of Parque da

---

4 Similar characteristics are apparent in most of the case studies of this thesis.
Mangueira and Ilha da Cobras. These neighbourhoods have the same characteristics of the IBGE “subnormal agglomerations” and are informally referred to as favelas. However, they are not registered as such by IBGE because they are officially considered to be neighbourhoods of Paraty (IBGE 2010; Garcia and Dedeca 2012).

Although the density of new developments is lower in Paraty than in Rio de Janeiro, the impact on the heritage centre vistas, services and inadequate governance is equivalent in the cities. D’Escragnolle, a leading Brazilian heritage expert in the 1970s argued that “containing and preventing the development of favelas near the boundaries should be as important as protecting the historic district” (cited in Leonam 1976, 24, my translation). Informal growth with high-density development and crowded streets surrounding the heritage centre are similar to Rio’s favelas (Figure 36). However, unlike the mixed communities of Rio, there is a visible border between heritage and favela in Paraty.

Figure 36 - Informal communities just outside Paraty heritage centre along the heritage border of the Patitiba River. Photo by author, 2012.
Despite the growth of adjacent informal communities, the heritage centre is well-preserved with a unique cultural setting and identity. Cars have not been permitted in the city centre since the 1970s (Leonam 1976), except once a week for deliveries to restaurants, shops and locals. Heritage tourism is the region’s main source of income, as well as the production of cachaça – a local spirit made from sugarcane – and local fisheries. According to Brazil’s major newspaper, O Globo, Paraty municipality has today 38,000 residents and hosts 1 million tourists per year (Cristina 2012). Visitors are attracted by the impressive aesthetic value of the heritage centre with its built and intangible heritage (Cristina 2012), including folklore, traditional crafts and traditional festivities, and its tourist infrastructures, such as restaurants, craft shops and nearby natural attractions.

However, low-income inhabitants and others are excluded from the city centre as the cost of living within the heritage boundaries is high. Tarrisse (cited in Cristina 2012) observes that the “houses in the old city centre are very valuable, and [those born in Paraty] cannot afford to buy inside the boundaries. Most inhabitants are foreigners” (3; my translation). Although tourism generates employment opportunities and increases local revenue, it also contributes to urban growth in neighbouring communities, shaped by low-income people employed in the urban economy or gentrified groups from the historic core, and that is what happened in Paraty. These communities are socially and symbolically connected to the heritage system, maintaining intangible heritage by conveying cultural meaning, performing and transmitting traditions through generations, supporting local tourism and providing additional stakeholders in and assistance to the heritage structure.

Thousands of tourists are attracted to a number of popular celebrations held in Paraty, including the Divine Holy Spirit’s Party (Figure 37), which has been recognized by IPHAN as significant to Brazil’s intangible heritage (IPHAN 2013). This tradition
began in the sixteenth century (IPHAN 2013), imported by Portuguese colonisers, and is celebrated in other parts of the world that experienced Portuguese influence, including Goa in India, Malacca in Malaysia, and Macau in China. The celebration is deeply rooted in everyday life and reinforces local identity. Recent parties have included contemporary performances of local funk and hip hop (IPHAN 2013). This is a clear example of heritage changing to incorporate contemporary patterns of sociability.

![Figure 37- Paraty during the 2012 Divine Holy Spirit party. Reproduced by permission from Rego.](image)

**Urban dynamic of low-income communities in Rio de Janeiro and Paraty**

The dynamism of communities highly engaged with established heritage centres is important for rethinking heritage. Population growth, development, and rapid cultural change demand that heritage is reconceptualized. There are several ways to conceptualise culture and cherish past and present values, and the heritage landscape can be the stage
for sustainable and inclusive development. Impoverished areas are often altered by the inhabitants to meet their current needs while preserving what they feel deserves protection at that moment, despite the ambiguity regarding what should be preserved for future generations.

How, then, did the heritage listings of both cities neglect to mention the favelas or low income neighbouring communities? Moreover, how does urban growth influence how we understand change and heritage? Nevertheless, in order to secure it, the concept of heritage needs to be rethought considering the terms in which memory and identity are usually held, to allow for a more nuanced definition more open to recognising low-income communities as the embodiment of a culture, worthy of preservation.

The challenge of preserving a heritage site’s sense of place extends beyond physical pressures of population growth and uncontrolled building. Each site’s stakeholders are responsible for preserving the site while creating and maintaining a local identity. Because of the combination of cultures, ideas and various vested interests that contribute to each site’s unique identity, the WHC sometimes identifies sites as having ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ (OUV). World heritage sites of OUV are “directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance” (UNESCO 2013, 21). The diverse identities that have built, used and occupied these sites over the years are responsible, to varying degrees, for the formation of a historic urban environment. Every aspect of that environment is essential to understanding and, and ultimately, preserving a given site.

Rio’s local prejudices also present a dynamic that can manipulate and possibly skew understanding of what is valuable and perhaps worthy of preservation. To the majority of Rio’s inhabitants, the favelas are a ‘parallel power’ or a ‘city within the city’ and still associated with drug lords and violence. Accordingly, the favelados are often
perceived as dangerous, pitiful people on the edges of society who are complicit with or beneficiaries of the drug lords; they and their culture are therefore often marginalised (Brum 2009, 12). Perlman, however, (2010, 15) affirms that *favelados* are not marginal to society but tightly integrated with it – giving a lot and receiving very little in return. It is the locals who create clear boundaries, and the growth of gated communities, gated buildings and security equipment in each home only intensifies the discourse of fear and violence (Low 2001, 45).

![Figure 38](image_url) — Copacabana Beach, with its WH listed coastline and one of the neighbourhood’s *favela* Pavao-Pavaozinho appearing behind the high-end buildings. Photo by author, 2012.
According to Tung (2001, 16), it is very common for people to destroy their own city, either by demolition, war, faith or continuous environmental misuse, but urban renewal has been one of the most destructive forces of this century, as Rio has demonstrated. For some, the occupation of the slopes by crowded informal settlements harms the landscape, wastes valuable land and devalues the neighbouring properties. As persisting organisms in this urban chaos, the favelas can positively contribute to the city’s image, as every neighbourhood in Rio has at least one ‘subnormal agglomeration’ (Figure 39) within it, but in Rio, favelas on deforested hills create areas of instability on the slopes, subject to landslide especially after the heavy summer rains, and the risk is often compounded by the accumulation of rubbish (Magalhaes 2010, 14). The hills are composed of a thin layer of soil overlaying granite. When heavy summer rains hit the city, this thin layer of soil, formerly protected by forest but now supporting only unstable housing constructions, becomes wet and heavy and slides downhill, sweeping away everything in its path and taking people’s lives. Such landslides cause enormous distress not only to the
communities involved but also to official bodies. Furthermore, poor urban infrastructure maintenance, irregular land use, silting rivers, blocking street drainage passages with an accumulation of rubbish and other misuses of the land make residents even more vulnerable to the chaos following climate events such as storms, floods and landslides. Urban floods and landslides are the most common natural threats in Rio (Fernandes, Lagüén, and Netto 1999, Smyth and Royle 2000, Fernandes et al. 2004), directly damaging built heritage and cultural artefacts by increasing levels of humidity and stressing historical structures with debris and water infiltration. They also affect intangible heritage by resulting in the cancellation of festivities, performances and the production of arts and crafts (RJ 2011).

Development also has a visual impact on the heritage core and can sometimes be detrimental, as taller buildings are constructed adjacent to and sometimes overlooking the heritage structure. The typologies of new constructions can mimic original buildings but higher densities threaten integrity and authenticity, and as populations increase can cause additional problems across a region. They may pollute rivers, diminish open green spaces in cities and overpower understaffed city councils with demands for additional services. As a consequence, it may be subject to ineffective supervision and control, constructed without restrictions, proper building approvals or plans. When left unmanaged, the cumulative effects of such growth are often irreversible. In Paraty, informal development is already threatening the fragile heritage centre: untreated sewage from the communities around the centre is polluting water streams, and illegal sewage connections within the heritage core are destroying the city’s old paving and exposing untreated sewage (Cristina 2012, 3). The resulting constant maintenance works threaten the centre integrity and authenticity, alarm tourists and affect revenue.

Returning to Rio’s historic centre, a number of iconic buildings and sites dating back to when it was the capital of the Portuguese Empire (1808–1821) and even further
back to earlier periods. These buildings are material icons of historical, social, symbolic and aesthetic value that, more often than not, communities and experts have carefully preserved. In some areas of Rio, however, the *favelas* are easily seen in the background of the city skyline. For example, Gloria Church, dating from 1739, is located at the top of Gloria Hill. The Portuguese Royal Family held its religious celebrations there, and it is now a well-known landmark listed specifically within UNESCO’s site limits, but two Subnormal Agglomerations identified by IBGE (2010), or *favelas* as they are commonly referred – Vila Santo Amaro and Tavares Bastos – are growing explosively within the church’s sightlines. Heritage privileged sightlines perhaps require a nuanced interpretation of values and therefore legislation, to handle the seemingly unavoidable consequence of *favelas* and their transient character in one's sights.

*Favelas* increasingly dominate the Rio landscape and the tangible and intangible effects of these communities on the city heritage is evident, including its formation, maintenance and adaptation. However, UNESCO’s (WHC 2015e) *Inscribed Property Map for Rio*, which clearly identifies the nominated site limits and buffer zones, does not mention the *favelas* or provide a single picture or map of these communities. Government departments responsible for heritage management fail to acknowledge their existence (IPHAN 2015). Brum (2009) argues that heritage may not take priority over the wellbeing of those who dwell near it, but there must be a way of balancing needs, after all in the Outeiro da Gloria presented above and many other cases in Rio de Janeiro, they are part of the heritage vista and streetscape.

In Paraty, the explosive growth of its low-income neighbourhoods has changed community behaviour. Self-built, low-income informal communities have rapidly spread into areas bordering the traditional settlement. More than just a matter of survival, this cost-effective method of development reflects the impoverished locals’ experience and background, and the low-income communities are entangled in a richly symbolic system
that was built over time. Here, historic urban settlements are the catalyst for urban growth, and this is also an important point that further challenges narrow assumptions of a divide between the heritage precinct and its ‘non-heritage’ surroundings.

Paraty is a prime example of a community experiencing an increase in tourism over the years and consequential urban growth, whereas Rio is an example of negligence in a modern city. Both heritage sites display clear borders between old and new and a tendency to isolate monuments from their surroundings, which can bring both negative and positive changes to sensitive areas. Both sites also profit from their traditional events, which support tourism in the region and enhance the sites’ vitality.

As previously mentioned, more than 14 per cent of Rio’s metropolitan population lives in favelas. These settlements present a number of intangible cultural manifestations, including Urban Samba parades, Funk, Carnival, Jongo, Capoeira, and others that inform Rio’s unique lifestyle, which the WHC has clearly identified as cultural expressions. IPHAN (Brazil 2007) described these manifestations as “not simply musical genres, but forms of expression, modes of socialization and community belonging benchmarks.” These and other cultural expressions that were listed as intangible heritage in 2007 have their roots in Rio’s favelas.

With the success of the UPP program in Rio, favelas are attracting considerable attention. They are also increasingly becoming safer places to visit. Rio’s favelas now have local museums, art galleries and tours that showcase the communities’ culture. Communities in the privileged areas of Rio are also being transformed into trendy places to live and attracting international tourism. However, as these areas are subject to rapid urbanisation, gentrification also raises the spectre of different but equally important threats to the ongoing vitality of favela culture (Vasconcelos et al. 2013). Those communities were neglected because, from inception, they are illegal.
The urban heritage centres studied in this chapter have common features such as their location along the sea and in being former colonial ports, but also by being vulnerable to environmental hazards and catastrophe. Their values and vulnerability status are similarly connected to a wider framework of city development. Those features, therefore, provide indications of areas of heritage sensitivity that require careful attention to planning, design and implementation of development projects.

In Rio, culturally valuable architectural heritage has been retained largely because of effective legislation that penalised demolition of heritage building with high taxes. Consequently, a high number of architectural remains are preserved within the city, but in a developing country’s list of priorities, conservation issues are often linked to economics, and so it is difficult to allocate scarce public resources to preserve historic monuments.

**Transient heritage management**

Tung (2001, 13) argues that “human-made environments gain value from being immovable, as succeeding generations erect beautiful buildings in the same place over centuries.” Brazil’s governments have long tried to remove favelas, seen as black spots in their cities. For more than a century, the government has disregarded and excluded low-income communities. However, it is vital for governments to attend to how informal communities affect heritage sites. Through their continued use of the land, way of life, traditions and community engagement, these communities develop new heritage for future generations. Heritage centres such as Rio and Paraty are not just time capsules; they are also living exchanges between old and new. As discussed, placemaking is an ongoing activity, and the meanings and importance attributed to sites are organic, mutable and somewhat unpredictable. Although beneficial to the maintenance of local identity,
such dynamic placemaking is difficult to accommodate in conventional heritage management and governance practices.

Cherry et al. (2010) argue that effective management of urban growth significantly influences the impact of neighbouring development on heritage cores. Accordingly, governmental acknowledgement and acceptance of informal communities such as favelas as contemporary and active forms of urban growth are urgent and crucial to effective heritage management. The successful amelioration programs enacted at Providência Hill provide a model that channels development for the benefit of all. This model accommodates the cultural values of informal communities and recognizes their contributions to the sense of place and heritage. Neighbouring communities are not heritage cores in historical and material terms and should not be treated as such. Nevertheless, these communities have emerged from years of exchange between the historic environment and the local culture and form an important layer in the urban heritage landscape.

Heritage managers need to recognize the value of these layers within historic urban settlements and their contribution to the heritage and sense of place. Managers also need to accept that heritage constantly evolves and changes, obliging them to develop and incorporate techniques to manage these changes. Cherry et al. (2010, 2) argue that accepting the “diversity of values and understanding each perspective in its distinctive context and its role in the wider scene” is imperative. Transient heritage management must be capable of protecting objects and heritage centres as well as the influences, customs and cultures of neighbouring communities.

**Conclusion**

The dynamics of change between old and new in urban heritage is inherent to heritage as a register of transience. In this chapter, I have demonstrated the contributions made by
informal communities in Rio de Janeiro and Paraty to urban heritage in those cities. I have also established that these communities should be considered bearers of current heritage, some because of outstanding contribution to the local identity and others because of their longevity and resilience. As Tung (2001, 388) concludes, “the conservation of historic cities entails two primary acts of social invention: the initial creation of beautiful old cityscapes and, later, the decision to preserve those environments as parts of the expanding contemporary metropolis.” Consequently, reconceiving heritage as a register of transience requires novel management techniques that support both tangible and intangible community values.

In this chapter, I have also sought to demonstrate the disastrous impact of uncontrolled development upon urban heritage, exposing the vulnerabilities of communities and imposing stress on the heritage listed core. I have identified that informal urban sprawl can cause deforestation, the occupation of green areas, pollution, biodiversity loss, siltation and landslides, among other threats, sometimes less catastrophic than a natural disaster, but often equally so. I have also shown that urban sprawl can increase urban threats such as violence, the formation of gated communities, socially deleterious drug trade and corollary unrest. Additionally, to the catastrophic character of uncontrolled development is the biological outbreak of mosquito-borne diseases, such as the cases of Zika virus and Yellow Fever diagnosed in favelas in 2017 and 2018 (Callaway, 2017; UCLA 2017; Exame, 2018).

Rapid urban growth and favela-like communities are apparent in many low and middle-income countries. Generally, as in the case of Rio and Paraty, new development features settlements with substandard and unplanned architecture. Overdevelopment of
buffer zones tends to overpower the heritage nucleus and overpopulation can directly affect the ability of local understaffed and unprepared councils to manage building pressures. Therefore, in the following chapter, I discuss the anthropogenic hazards to the integrity and authenticity of urban heritage properties in Western India. The WH listed Convents and Churches of Goa is compared with locally listed sites in Goa State and Daman and Diu Territory. Although the sites differ in many respects, they are all former Portuguese colonies and highly cherished by Indians. They are also threatened by new construction, seriously damaged by unregulated restoration, ineffective legislation and suffering from tourism and commodification. I consider strategies for protecting and respecting the integrity and authenticity of the intangible as well as tangible heritage in cultural landscapes threatened by tourism.
Heritage tourism is a growing global market and is a particularly important revenue source for low- and middle-income countries. Sawkar et al. (1998) observe that in Goa the resident population has changed with the influx of migrants from other Indian states seeking possible employment in the tourism industry. “Most of these people are engaged in selling artisanal pieces, handicrafts and garments” (7). Additionally, heritage tourism is a useful marketing tool for an assemblage of private and public interests (Bandyopadhyay, Morais and Chick. 2008; Mckercher and Du Cros 2012; Giraudo 2016; Gravari-Barbas, Robinson and Bourdeau 2016; Vaz et al. 2017). Consequently, tourism contributes to rapid urban growth and development of informal communities around heritage sites and heritage is commodified for the tourism market. Heritage tourism in India, unlike Brazil, has a complex, ancient and diverse architectural culture that was well established prior to European colonisation. This culture attracts enormous amounts of tourists, and the tourism industry is an important industry for the local economy in India (Sawkar et al. 1998; Bhatnagar 2016). The pressure to accommodate tourist-driven
developments pose various threats to the integrity and authenticity of tangible and intangible heritage, making sustainable management an urgent priority. Heritage in the former Portuguese colonies of Goa and Daman, the case studies examined in this chapter, is threatened by poorly managed tourism development and commodification (Sawkar et al. 1998; India 2002, Solomon 2009; Bhatnagar 2016; Vaz, 2016). Chouhan (2009, 1) suggests “that the pace of degradation [in Goa] has almost doubled due to short-term planning, public indifference, industrialization and rampant urbanization.” Bhatnagar (2016, 1) adds that "modern buildings have started to come up and overshadow the old heritage of Nani Daman."

Indian civilization can be traced back thousands of years; an ancient history of diverse cultures and traditions. India was already multicultural when the first Europeans arrived, and Portuguese architecture was just one more cultural layer:

Even before the sixteenth century, Vijayanagara, true to its Islamicate culture, was adopting Deccan Sultanate forms and systems in secular building, while the Sultanates themselves looked towards Persia and China for inspiration. Things became more heterogenous later, with the Ikkeri Nayakas probably the first to use Sultanate forms in temples. By this point, European influences had also arrived in South Asia, as can be seen in the later works of the Mughals, which included Persian, Central Asian, Gujarati, Bangla, Deccani, and also European elements of design. (Kanekar 2015,1)

Most cultural heritage sites in India are related to the nation’s religious diversity (UNESCO 2015a), the most common being Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Buddhism, and Jainism (India 2011b), but also Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and various traditional religions. This chapter discusses heritage derived from Portuguese colonisation, including sites whose heritage significance is due to Christian practices and their interactions with other faiths. Kowal (2000, 501) argues that the religious rivalry that existed in the 17th and 18th centuries between the Christian and Hindu authorities across that border did not forestall, but instead encouraged the interchange of architectural motives and ideas between the two. Both Jesuit and Maratha sponsors vied for the attention and affiliation of the same populace and thus relied on similar forms and employed many of the same artisans to craft them.
This cultural interchange is important to the authenticity of Indian heritage (Wilson 1997).

In this chapter, I explore theme (2) heritage integrity and authenticity and discuss the impacts on tangible and intangible heritage caused by anthropogenic threats arising in and near the urban heritage properties of Western India, including pressures accompanying rapid urbanization, tourism-driven developments and commodification of tourism. The effects of tourism commodification and different heritage preservation approaches at Reis Magos Fort and Aguada Fort in Goa are discussed, whereas Panaji, Goa, and the Moti and Nani Forts (Figure 40) in Daman provide cases studies for the examination of the effects of rapid urbanisation on heritage. The discussion focuses on the integrity and authenticity of heritage subject to these pressures, i.e., the history of heritage retention and maintained, how local communities perceive and contribute to the heritage, and strategies to protect and respect intangible, as well as tangible heritage, in cultural landscapes facing tourist commodification and unplanned infrastructure development (Wilson 1997; Sawkar et al. 1998; India 2002; Bandyopadhyay, Morais and Chick, 2008; Solomon 2009; Mckercher and Du Cros 2012; Bhatnagar 2016; Vaz et al. 2017).
This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the historical context of each case study, followed by an analysis and critique according to Foque’s (2010) methods of product, context and process analysis, outlined in Chapter One, with particular emphasis on the value of urban heritage in low and medium-income countries. I conclude by suggesting an alternative approach that encompasses respect for a site’s cultural layers, sustainable tourism development and the heritage agenda. The task of promoting heritage sites as repositories of meaning in low and medium-income countries is challenging under the current understanding of heritage. As discussed in Chapter Four, cultural heritage requires
protection through socially inclusive legislation that ensures that local material culture reflects all layers of history with integrity and authenticity. Well-managed tourism can, therefore, provide sustainable local economic development, which can be embraced by local communities.

**Case Study Area**

Goa and Daman are located in the western coastal region of India (Figure 41). Goa is a small south-western state. Daman is a district in the Union Territory of Daman and Diu surrounded by Gujarat and the Arabian Sea. The areas studied in Goa are characterised by forest, villages and protected heritage areas of Reis Magos, Nerul, and Candolim, and Panaji, which is listed as an area of historical significance by the Goa Land Development and Building Construction Regulation 2010 and by the Outline Development Plan of 2011 (Ahmed and Shankar 2012). The Churches and Convents of Goa in Goa Velha are both nationally listed, and World Heritage listed sites. The forts of Aguada and Reis Magos are both nationally listed by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and are situated along the northern bank of the Mandovi River, whereas Goa Velha and Panaji are located along the Southern banks (Figure 42).

The Daman district forts of Moti and Nani Daman are recognized by the ASI for their national importance under the Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Sites and Remains Acts of 1958 and 1959 (Figure 43). These sites have been selected as case studies because of their scenic coastal areas, colonial Portuguese built heritage, urban growth and unplanned tourism infrastructure.
Figure 41- Location of Goa and Daman states in India. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe. Accessed January 31, 2016.

Figure 42- Location of case study sites, Panaji, Reis Magos, Nerul and Candolim in Goa, India highlighted in purple. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe. Accessed January 31, 2016.
Figure 43- Location of case study sites, Moti and Nani Daman in Daman, India; highlighted purple. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe. Accessed January 31, 2016.

Daman has its average population density much higher than Goa, where the latter have much more forest preserved close to its heritage areas. Compared to the other Indian capitals such as Mumbai or Chennai, this area has a much lower population density; it mainly consists of villages of one-storey houses. In Goa, the same can be said of the region of the Reis Magos Fort, though a slightly higher density can be seen in the nearby city of Panaji.
Table 2. Statistics for Goa and Daman. Statistical information is for the period 2011 and 2012. Data from Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner (India 2011c; d), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Goa</th>
<th>Daman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inhabitants (2011)
 | 1,457,723         | 190,855      |
| Land area (km²)
 | 3,702.0 a         | 72.0 c       |
| Residential density (inhabitants per km²)
 | 394 d             | 2,651       |
| Medium disposable income (2011)
 | 37,796 Indian Rupees ($US 580.92) |             |
| Gini India (2012)
 | 0.495             |             |
| Residential density of surrounding communities (inhabitants per km²)
 | 1,200 d (Panaji, Reis Magos, Nerul and Candolim) | 6,630 c (Daman District) |
|                                                          | 638 (Goa Velha)  |

a. (Statistic Times 2015)
b. (OECD 2018)
c. (India 2011c)
d. (India 2011d)

Most of the case study sites have experienced threats to their physical urban heritage from intrusive new constructions, inappropriate and unregulated restorations, the impact of tourism-related infrastructure (for example, parking lots, shopping centres, roads), pollution of adjacent water bodies (Chouhan 2009), and a lack of emergency preparedness and risk assessments (such as fire protection, tourism management plans and land use regulations) (Wilson 1997; Sawkar et al. 1998). Solomon (2009, 3) stresses that in Goa “this fast growing tourist market caught the attention of foreign investors and tour companies, who built hotels, swimming pools and golf courses to meet the tourists’ growing expectations and demands”. When the focus is on tourism revenue, heritage conservation approaches differ resulting in tourism exploitation of the cultural assets (Bandyopadhyay, Morais and Chick 2008; Mckercher and Du Cros 2012). However, all
sites have an intense vibrancy and sense of place formed by intense use by local communities and tourists.

**Historical Context**

After leaving Brazil in 1500, Pedro Alvares Cabral sailed around the Cape of Good Hope to reach the Indian Ocean, but Vasco da Gama landed in Calicut in southwestern India in 1498. Pearson (1988, 20) notes that the tropical “Goa must have looked like a paradise to the sixteenth-century Portuguese peasant” coming from Portugal with its “rocky, infertile and barren appearance,” where the bulk of the population suffered from disease and high mortality rates. Portugal’s population at that time was about one per cent of India’s 140 or 150 million inhabitants (Pearson 1988).

The port city of Goa became strategically important in the transport of goods from the region back to Portugal (Rossa 2015a). As the first European maritime power to arrive in India, the Portuguese were interested in controlling part of the profitable Indian Ocean trade in cloth, precious stones, fine spices, wooden artefacts and horses (Rossa 2015d). Francisco d’Almeida was sent as Viceroy in 1505 to formally establish the *Estado da India*, or State of India, and built forts along the coast to demonstrate and enforce Portuguese power. Goa became the capital of Portuguese India in 1530 and “were heads of the civil and military government of the whole state from East Africa to the Moluccas and Macao, in theory responsible to one king, and to God” (Pearson 1988, 35). Almost anything was possible for the Portuguese authorities, who carried with them the power of the Pope:

> Being extremely absorbed with simmering questions in Europe, the popes delegated to Portugal the patronage of the Roman Catholic missions in the vast regions that Portugal had brought to the world. Irrespective of their nationality, priests that worked in these territories were sustained by the crown and owed obedience to the King of Portugal. (Rossa 2015a, 3)
Chapter 5

The Portuguese controlled the sea trade in Gujarat in northwest India and increased maritime patrols in the Gulf of Cambay (Rossa 2015d). The maritime presence forced “the local chiefs in the area of influence of Vasai [Baçaim] city placed themselves under Portuguese vassalage” in 1534 (Rossa 2015d, 2). In 1559, the Portuguese took Daman and created the Proíncia do Norte, or Northern Province, in the same way as the Captaincy Colonies in Brazil had been formed, and established the Padroado. “The Portuguese Padroado consisted of a series of exclusive privileges, rights and duties that had been little by little granted by popes to Portuguese monarchs through a series of bulls and papal letters” (Dean-Oswald 1985, 227). The Padroado enabled the Portuguese to control the sea trade along the western coast of India and build a number of forts and fortifications to provide military protection and to serve as trading posts.

Rossa (1997, 16) argues that “the Portuguese were interested in trade, not production, in ports and not the territory they supplied. This was directly reflected in the gradual process of constructing its own [Portuguese] urban network.” This process is still reflected in the urban heritage landscape, as this urban network was almost always built in areas where some kind of permanent urban structure already existed. Western India had a diverse religious character at that time (Rossa 1997). Many temples, mosques and forts existed, built by locals, Hindus, Moors, Mughals and other diverse groups. According to Rossa (1997, 24), “the urban implantation of these installations was based on the organic fusion in an adjoining space of a Portuguese fortification with a pre-existing agglomeration.” Consequently, Portuguese colonial features can be found in those colonies intermixed with the existing architecture. For example, Portuguese Goa began with the construction of the Pilar Seminary on top of the existing (Hindu) temple of Sri Goveshvar (Rossa 2015b). New buildings were also constructed in cleared areas,

---

1 Vasai is a case study discussed in Chapter Six.
almost detached from the Indian or Sri Lankan landscape. Hence, the contemporary urban landscape is multi-layered, raising issues for heritage conservation.

Unlike the predominantly mercantile objectives of Holland and England (Asher and Talbot 2006), the Portuguese were also motivated by the Padroado to spread Christianity. This influenced the built environment, resulting in numerous churches in Goa. Rossa (2015a, 9) states that, in Goa, the Padroado agents were “regular priests, mainly Franciscans and Jesuits, although Augustinians, Dominicans, Carmelites and Saint John of God (the order of Malta) also appeared in specific urban nuclei and geographic areas outside Goa, where most of the then active religious orders were established.” In many regions, ‘Portuguese’ became synonymous with ‘Catholic’” (Rossa 2015a, 6).

**Goa**

Prior to Portuguese occupation, Goa had been conquered in 1469 by the Vijayanagara Empire who ruled all southern India and Sri Lanka (Fonseca 2001 [1878], 83). The Portuguese, commanded by Alfonso de Albuquerque, took Goa from the Vijayanagara in 1510 with the intention of forming a vast network of maritime ports and military posts to support the armadas and cartazes. The Portuguese initially occupied Tiswadi Island (Figure 44), between the Mandovi River to the north and the Zuari River to the south, where the Muslim Vijayanagara and Hindus before them had previously built. Rossa (1997) explains that in the early years, many Franciscans either converted former mosques into Catholic churches or destroyed them and built anew. As the population grew, a new settlement was established at Panjim (or Panaji) (Rossa 2015b). The first sacred building, Nossa Senhora da Conceicao church, was built over a Hindu temple in Panjim in 1533 using private funds (Fonseca 2001 [1878]). Some private houses were also built, including one for the brother of the Muslim King of Cambay.
Figure 44 - Map of Ilha de Goa, 1620-40, or Goa Island. Image in the public domain; reproduced from E-corpus.

Reis Magos Fort (built in 1551) and Aguada Fort (built in 1606) are just two of many other forts in the area that were built to protect the Portuguese colony against invasion from other Europeans, particularly the Dutch. Aguada Fort was considered one of the biggest forts in India, along with those at Vasai and Diu (Mendiratta and Rodrigues 2015a). The fort is comprised of upper and lower forts, a lighthouse, munitions warehouse, a citadel and 14 bastions, similar to the layout of the fort in Daman (Mendiratta and Rodrigues 2015). Improvements were made to Reis Magos Fort in 1589 after the construction of Aguada Fort caused it to lose its strategic value (Mendiratta and Rodrigues 2015). New bastions and a platform at shore level were built, essentially comprising two quadrangular bastions joined by a wall between its parapets. The most affluent people in the colony lived within the protected areas of both forts and locals resided outside the fortifications, demonstrating that development outside the fort’s walls was a feature of colonial settlement.
In the 1600s in Goa was characterised by difficult times, resulting in the change of the town centre from Old Goa to Panaji. Rossa (1997) explains that the high mortality rates resulted from frequent epidemics was the main drive to shift the colony in the 1630s.

Besides the growing defence difficulties, the Mandovi River silted to the point that for much of the year long-haul ships, precisely the ones with the deepest draughts, could not travel the nearly 10 kilometres separating the bar in front of Panaji from Old Goa, because the bar was closed during the monsoon months. Added to this was the unhealthy air and water, for the site was one of the most humid, hot and least windswept in the territory. (Rossa 1997, 4)

A 1707 report by the Jesuit Ignacio de Andrade describes the chaos of the Goa settlement: infrastructure buildings, warehouses, hospitals, Governor’s house and many other houses were “arranged in no apparent rational order” Rossa (2015b, 4). Rossa (1997, 47) suggests that “one decade after the conquest, the walled city was completely full of buildings” and an organic and even hasty urban development outside the wall had formed radial to the existing lagoon. De Andrade proposed a “new Goa” be built in Panaji, then a small fishing village by the river. It had a small port, a customs house and a hilltop fort built by the Portuguese (Rossa 2015b). Following the demolition of a number of buildings in Old Goa, the materials were reused in Panaji. Church valuables were distributed amongst various churches in the new area (Fonseca 2001 (1878)). Few buildings remained from Old Goa after the move to Panaji.

The World Heritage listed Churches and Convents in Old Goa are seven major examples of 60 churches inventoried in the eighteenth century that “aimed to awe the local population into conversion and to impress upon [them] the superiority of the foreign religion” (WHC 2015a, 3). Axelrod and Fuerch (1998, 443) state that “during this early period of Portuguese rule, indigenous Goan villagers are variously conceived as targets for conversion, resisters of Portuguese rule, practitioners of devilish and barbaric religious activities, and sources of tax revenue.” However,

in 1755 some rights with respect to religious freedom had been established, namely the construction of temples by other faiths and, in 1761 (as a prelude to the 1774
Pombaline reform of the Estado da Índia) the natives were granted the same rights as citizens who were Portuguese or of Portuguese origin. The Portuguese action in this new Goan territorial area thus had a new context right from the start, a new paradigm in which even cultural proselytism was weakened. A local, Goan identity was then flourishing. (Rossa 2015b, 3)

In 1843, Panaji was made the official capital of the area and was developed on reclaimed marshland, between Mandovi River, Ourem and Saint Ines creeks and the Altinho hill (India 2010). This new Goa shared the same civic privileges as Lisbon until 1961 (WHC 2015a). Panaji is still the capital of Goa and is the most important cultural heritage, tourism and commerce centre in the state (India 2010). Goa’s landscape is unique in India (Rossa 2015a): “the way of distributing territory, clearing land, and setting up infrastructures for agriculture and circulations is specific” (5). Today, Goa has a vast urban heritage mostly spread over a great area, but only Old Goa, Panaji and the nearby forts are discussed in this thesis.

**Daman**

The Portuguese occupied Daman in 1557 (Rossa 2015c), consolidating the formation of the Northern Province, with Vasai, discussed in Chapter 6, as the northern capital. At that time, other European nations were arriving in India, with Dutch and British ships also trying their luck in the Indian and Pacific oceans (Asher and Talbot 2006; Rossa 2015e). “During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, Gujarat traded teak, bamboo, spices, pearls, gold, silver, carnelian, camels and woven cotton to Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe” (Asher and Talbot 2006, 90). Daman was in a strategic position to the control the Gulf of Cambay and the border of the Mughal Empire. The Book of Cities and Forts 1580 (Luz 1960, 26b; my translation) describes the early development of the town Nani Daman as “a flat area with no walls or fence with a nearby small fort that used to belong to the Muslims with four bastions wherein the captain lives. In a few

---

2 Marshland reclamation was also a common practice in the Portuguese colonization of Brazil.
years, a wall with lots of bastions was built around the entire city.” Rossa (2015c, 2) describes the pre-existing fort as “very similar to the quadrangular Manueline forts with cylindrical turrets at the corners (the southwest one is still visible) raised here and there throughout the Empire.”3 In the early days, diverse Catholic orders occupied the existing buildings:

The Jesuits established themselves above an Abyssinian mosque in the northwest corner of the fort; the Franciscans by the Sea Gate, the Augustinians at the far eastern end and, diametrically opposite (overlooking the sea), the Dominicans. Only the Augustinians’ building remains, though much changed; there are also substantial ruins of the Dominican convent. (2)

Daman has two forts, Moti (big) Daman and Nani (small) Daman, on each side of the Daman Ganga River, which originally protected the river mouth. Moti Daman has a distinguished urban design, where an orthogonal pattern of streets derives from a north-south axis linking the traditional Portuguese architectural feature – the two main gates, the Sea Gate (Porta do Mar) and the Land Gate (Porta da Terra), to the fort (Figure 45). Its urban core is comprised of a regular and orthogonal urban mesh, with square blocks measuring a quarter of the area of the fort (Rossa 2015d, 3). Rossa (2015b, 4) argues that Daman is… the only case in which an inherent aspect of the Portuguese occupation was the aim of building a city. In the other cases either the city already existed (Goa, Diu) or the occupation was gradual, i.e. following the (very frequent) sequence of factory, fort, equipment, entrenchment, etc, that often resulted in a city (Kochin, Chaul, Vasai).

It is populated with public and religious buildings and appears much the same it did in the past, in terms of traditional colonial construction. It comprises many chapels of the religious orders, colleges and churches, a town hall and jail, the Mercy hospital, a marketplace, the Governor’s house, and other houses. Rossa (1997, 78) states that “after the religious orders were abolished (1834), the governors dismantled the Franciscan and Jesuit institutions to reuse the stone blocks in other constructions”, as they did in Goa at

---

3 Cylindrical bastions can also be found today in the Reis Magos Fort and in the Vasai Fort and the Galle Fort in Sri Lanka, which are discussed in the next chapter.
the same time. Many contemporary public buildings today are spread around the fort walls; however, the interior of the fort is less dense than the vibrant villages nearby.

Figure 45 - Map of Damão (Daman), 1620-40. Image in the public domain; reproduced from E-corpus.

Daman today is a district of the Republic of India in the state of Gujarat. A plaque inside the fort says: “Daman was liberated by the first Bn [battalion of] the Maratha Light infantry on 19 December 1961 after a heroic fight. Thus ended the 450-year-old Portuguese regime”. This refers to the fact that after this battle all Portuguese territories in India were returned to India, including Goa and Diu.

The Portuguese introduced many elements of change in all Western India, including the rise of a Christian community, festivities, traditions, food and may other cultural characteristics present in all case studies of this thesis. Singh (1992,4) highlights the introduction of "crafts such as manufacture of bangles out of turtle shell" that are base of Daman’s arts and crafts, and therefore part of the traditional communities’ revenue today. Next, I will discuss how tourism planning and management could be effectively
brought under community stewardship, providing local development and fostering sustainability.

**Urban Heritage in Goa and Daman today**

**Goa**

Goa today is one of the tourism hubs of India. For Solomon (2009) and Vas and Fernandes (2009) tourism has long been a matter of concern for Goans. Since the 1980s, when the first international charter flights started to land in Goa, it was "reported to be very clean with dense vegetation and magnificent dunes" (Solomon 2009, 2). However, today, traditional communities are the ones affected by the tourism industry, and most still do not benefit from the infrastructure and profit derived from the tourism industry (Mckercher and Du Cros 2012; Giraudo 2016). Solomon (2009) affirms that in Goa most of the infrastructure works provided by the state are targeted at touristic areas. The author continues, “their cultures, beaches, sacred and religious sites, heritage, homes and livelihoods are wrecked in many instances by tourism” (10). Crowded streets, increased traffic, electricity failures, water shortages, growing crime, and in-migration leading to social tensions among others, are some of the threats suggested by the author. Vaz et al. (2017, 24) confirm that current planning policies implemented by the state suggest that proper attention is given to mitigation of anthropogenic activity, however the dynamics of the urban sprawl continue to be uncontrolled and sporadic. Thus, sustainable development is crucial to the continued welfare of the state, and particularly within the reach of economic drivers such as tourism in Goa.

In the next section, some of Goa’s cultural heritage tourist areas are studied in more detail; they are Aguada and Reis Magos Forts, Panaji and the World Heritage Site of the Churches and Convents of Goa. These are remnants from the Portuguese colonization that represent a similar heritage architectural and urban style discussed in all case studies. All Goan buildings listed above are material remains from a continuous process of living.
They still represent Stovel’s (2007) aspects of authenticity (refer to Chapter One) remaining intact, whole, and genuine, but also representing the continuity of the social and economic conditions including its evolution. Here, heritage material authenticity and integrity are enhanced by the process of continuity and change, confirming Zancheti and Jokilehto’s (1997) affirmation that values are in constant transformation.

**Aguada Fort**

Aguada Fort is located in Candolim by the mouth of the river, enveloping the Aguada peninsula, adjacent to the Arabian Sea. It is constructed from the local laterite (ASI 2011), the same stone used in many other churches and forts around Goa, and is divided into upper and lower sections, a common practice for Portuguese colonial settlements. The upper fort, or citadel, is quadrangular in plan, surrounded by a moat on three sides, with the fourth side facing the ocean. A lighthouse is positioned on top and chambers for storing water are located inside the fort (Figure 46). ‘Aguada’ means ‘watering’ in Portuguese and refers to the principle reason for the fort’s existence. The citadel was used to supply water for the ships anchored in the bay and has a storage capacity of 2,376,000 gallons (ASI 2011). The citadel is accessible from street level via a bridge over the moat and a flight of steps in one of the towers (Figure 47).
Figure 46 - Water chambers and lighthouse at Aguada Fort, Goa. Photo by author, 2014.

Figure 47 - Tourists on ramparts of Aguada Fort, Goa. Photo by author, 2014.
The lower part of the fort envelops the whole Aguada Fort peninsula. “The entire defence perimeter...totalled 14 bastions and extended over about four and a half kilometres, encompassing around 150 gun emplacements” (Mendiratta and Rodrigues 2015a, 2). A working prison occupies a section of the lower part of the fort from the original Portuguese construction. The northern entrance of the fort is surrounded by temporary and informal constructions, including souvenir and snack vendors. However, the fort is mostly surrounded by natural bushland. The Vivanta by Taj hotel is also located adjacent to the walls of the fort by the Sinquerin Beach.  

**Reis Magos Fort**

Reis Magos Fort is located a few kilometres inland from Aguada Fort along the northern bank of the Mandovi River, across from Panaji. The fort is accessible from the river, where one encounters three buildings at the entrance positioned at street level, comprising a reception, a souvenir shop and a mechanical room (Figure 48). Similarly, it has a lower and upper part and a quadrangular plan but is compressed in the middle, forming two quasi-triangular shapes, with bastions in each corner. The fort structure is made of laterite, and its pavilions have limewashed facades and clay roof tiles. A steep pedestrian road ascends along the fort’s eastern side towards Reis Magos Church, behind which lies the original church cemetery. The upper level of the fort contains two bastions facing north and west and walls that extend down a slope to bastions by the water (Mendiratta and Rodrigues 2015b). A steep staircase takes the visitor down to the ‘bastions by the water.’ The lower level of the fort contains a promenade level with two pavilions and a gun loop with vaulted ceiling rooms that were once used as jails.
The Fort restoration works started in 2008 and finished in 2012, where it prioritised the 1707 form of the fort (Reis Magos Fort Website 2013). The restoration was faithful to a single period of the site’s existence and added necessary present-day infrastructure. However, it emptied the site of its cultural integrity, giving it a Eurocentric interpretation. As a result of the massive, expensive intervention, the site is the only historical case study that entrance is ticketed, which presents a barrier to many local tourists. Consequently, this exclusion suggests that Winter (2009, 108) is correct in his observation that “tourism is not just an aggregate of merely commercial activities; it is also an ideological framing of history, nature and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.” The ‘restoration’ resulted in an ideological version of a fort rather than an authentic version that valued the integrity of centuries of cultural diversity.
Panaji

Panaji is an important example of a traditional Portuguese urban settlement. It has several distinct heritage areas, four of which are discussed in this chapter: Fontainhas, Altinho, Campal and central Panaji. Many colonial buildings are still found in the preserved neighbourhoods, and buildings listed by the ASI are protected. The Indian national monuments authority ASI reviews any application of new construction, repair, renewal or maintenance within the protected and regulated zones (Sharma 2012). Although some multi-storey buildings are located in Central Panaji, the “old Portuguese quarter of Fontainhas is a nostalgic kickback to the days of yore” (India 2010, 3). Nostalgia is a significant preservation strategy in the area: despite some new additions and ferocious urban growth, Fontainhas still resembles a colonial neighbourhood with mansions and churches from Portuguese colonial settlement (Figure 49).

Figure 49 - San Sebastian Chapel, Fontainhas, Panaji. Photo by author, 2014.
Open spaces, *largos* and gardens, which descend from colonial Portuguese origins, also constitute part of the unique sense of place of Fontainhas. There is also a *largo* in front of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, one of the most important heritage buildings in the neighbourhood:

In 1541 a hermitage was founded on the west slope of Monte da Conceição (Conception Hill) in Panaji. It faced the Mandovi River mouth and was raised to parish church [the Church of the Immaculate Conception] status in 1600. In 1619 the original building was demolished and the church rebuilt. The basic outline perimeter we see today dates from that time. (Faria and Gomes 2013, 1).

Faria and Gomes (2013, 1) further note that “the arrangement around the Church of the Immaculate Conception, with the redefined staircase that framed the setting, was part of the same plan for the whole, which also encompassed the main cross-town axis known as the Corte do Outeiro.” The nineteenth-century buildings of Portuguese influence are mostly one or two-storey in a quasi-grid urban plan adjusted to the topography. They occupy the entire front of the lot, with one house right next to the other, sometimes sharing the same thick wall, and form a cohesive urban ensemble (Figure 50) – also seen in the traditional areas of Daman, Rio de Janeiro, Paraty and Galle. They are built of colourfully lime washed masonry with clay-tiled roofs and sometimes have balconies projecting from the upper floor (Figure 50). Most of these houses are private, guest-houses or commercial establishments, giving a living dynamic character to the neighbourhood, with people occupying their verandahs and tourists walking to shops, guest-houses or restaurants. This lively neighbourhood character provides a unique cultural identity, which is also expressed through dance, music, arts, festivals and cultural performances (Solomon 2009; Ahmed and Shankar 2012; TOI 2015b). The integrity and authenticity of the urban heritage of Fontainhas promote community identity, reinforces social values, encourages tourism, and according to Solomon (2009), it can stimulate the local economy.
Panaji has around one thousand heritage structures (Kamat 2014). However, the Goa Land Development and Building Construction Regulation of 2010 only identifies forty as having historical and architectural significance (Ahmed and Shankar 2012, 546). The majority of the remaining buildings are from the nineteenth to early twentieth centuries.

A Development Plan for Panaji notes that economics dictates land usage in the city, which contends with development pressures as the state capital and a tourism hub (India 2010; Ahmed and Shankar 2012). The plan also noted that riverfront properties change from low ground-floor houses to multi-storey buildings in the 1980s, and “as a consequence, there is a high intensity land use which has generated traffic congestion, breakdown of civic infrastructure and marginalisation of the Panaji pedestrianisation [footpaths and sidewalks]” (India 2010, 4). Further, high-rise buildings overshadow heritage structures (Solomon 2009; India 2010). This is of particular concern at the Church of the Immaculate Conception stands out, where a number of high rises undermine the historical and aesthetic values of the precinct (Figure 51).
Figure 51 - Commercial development and high-rise construction affect the heritage values of the Immaculate Conception Church heritage site in Fontainhas, Panaji. Photo by author, 2014.

The Churches and Convents of Goa

The WH listed Churches and Convents of Goa are located 10km east of Panaji. The WHC (2015a, 1) listed the complex in 1986 because “these monuments were influential in spreading forms of Manueline, Mannerist and Baroque art in all the countries of Asia where missions were established.” These art styles were prevalent in Portugal and its colonies during the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries and are elegantly expressed at this site. The site is important for its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and its high level of authenticity and integrity remain important to the local community.

The site is composed of the archaeological remains of the old city (Arch of the Viceroy), a large palm tree forest, and seven buildings – Se Cathedral (Figure 52), Church and Convent of St Francis Assisi, Chapel of St. Catherine, Basilica of Bom Jesus (Figure 53), Chapel of St. Cajetan, Church of Lady of Rosary, and Church of St.
Augustine. The cathedral complex is entirely whitewashed, although the Basilica’s laterite composition is exposed. The elaborately carved Bassein (Vasai) granite front façade of the complex is striking. The ruins of the convent and church of St Augustine are located on a low hill called Monte Santo, or holy hill, and are strongly silhouetted against the skyline. Portuguese decorated tiled panels within the church are still intact, as are some laterite walls and ornaments. However, the complex was demolished following the religious expulsion of 1835 and its valuables distributed throughout the other Goan churches (Plaque inside the ruins of St Augustine complex, 2014).

Figure 52 - The WHS Se Cathedral, Goa. Photo by author, 2014.
The old city was accessible via the Mandovi River and the Arch of Viceroy: “the main thoroughfare, Rua [road] Direita, also known as the Rua dos Leilões (Road of Auctions), ran from the Arch of Viceroy to the church of the Misericórdia, and was the hub of social and mercantile life” (Sharma 2012, 17). The site is now accessible by car, via National Highway 4A which runs perpendicular to Rua Direita and bisects the site, dividing the Basilica of Bom Jesus from the Cathedral complex. The entire complex is accessible and easily navigated. Permanent present-day constructions exist in the major roundabouts within the complex, including restaurants, crafts and religious shops, and two permanent toilets that serve the whole complex. Rua Direita remains a social and mercantile hub, packed with the informal tents of street vendors’ crafts, snacks and other cheap goods. A massive carpark is situated within walking distance from the Se Cathedral, where the mortal remains of St. Francis Xavier are kept and exhibited once every 10 years, attracting millions of tourists.
The houses of Old Goa are also important colonial structures. Residences were typically built with mortar and tiled roofs frequently had two storeys and a yard, and were “often painted with water-based paints in tones of red and white. The fronts had windows protected by railings and jalousies, and upper-storey balconies were in the Muxarabi style. Polished oyster shells (carepas) fulfilled the role of glass” (Rossa 1997, 46). The carepas is unique to Goan architecture.

However, heritage buildings in Goa, particularly those that are whitewashed, require frequent maintenance, especially after the monsoon period. The original stone, a local and very porous laterite, needs to be whitewashed every two years, thereby increasing the fragility of the old buildings. Rossa (2015b, 5) explains that “only in projects with higher budgets was it possible to use imported stone, namely from Vasai… [and that] even in those cases, fitted or carved ashlar was only used as a finish (cornerstones, cornices, vaults ribs or keystones) and in bays.” Consequently, “the most recent Goa architecture of Portuguese origin has been and continues to be a poorly appreciated heritage” (Rossa 2015b, 5) and in Panaji, much of the Portuguese architecture has been demolished.

**Daman**

Moti (large) Daman Fort is located on the southern bank of the Daman Ganga River, across from which sits Nani (small) Daman Fort. Both Daman forts are listed nationally by ASI in the list of Monuments of National Importance in India and locally by the State Protected Monuments list in Daman and Diu. A bridge joins the forts over the sea that flanks both sites to the west. A *porta da terra*, or land gate, and a *porta do mar*, or sea gate (Figure 54), provide access to Moti Daman. A jetty outside the sea gate offers views of Nani Daman on the opposite shore. Monumental buildings from mid-to-late twentieth century appear alongside the main road, mostly occupied by governmental agencies.
However, “nothing remains of its [the forts] original constructions, for even the chapel...has undergone major changes” (Rossa 2015b, 2). Rossa (1997, 79) notes that “only one strip two blocks wide which links the two gates has any urbanistic consistency.” Other blocks were taken up with mini-farms, and today the site resembles an abandoned, overgrown lot. Inside Moti Daman (Figure 55), streets are quiet and “wistful” (Rossa 1997, 77).

The city inside the walls never achieved much density or even urban dynamics, namely driven by businesses or artisans; indeed the process of abandonment was early and accentuated: in 1745 there were about 2,524 residents; in 1900 only 385. Nowadays most of the area is empty or even, paradoxically, used for agriculture. Many of the buildings, including associated equipment, have disappeared, so it is hard to ascertain previous locations and forms. (Rossa 2015b, 2)

The site’s low activity and near-abandonment have impacted its sense of place and decreased its heritage value.

Figure 54 - The sea gate at Moti Daman, Daman, India. Photo by author, 2014.
Figure 55 - Quiet streets inside Moti Daman Fort. Photo by author, 2014.

Urbanisation is intense on the other side of Daman Ganga River, particularly on the northern side of the Nani Daman Fort, where the local community is located (Figure 56). The local industries are fishing and agriculture, and Daman is known for being an active port (India 2002). A Daman and Diu Government plaque next to the Nani Daman Fort claims that industrialisation and tourism are “upcoming” local economies. Cricket is played in the fort, the church is used regularly, and many tourists visit the complex. The fort is characterised by an open area, with few constructions adjacent to the inner walls. Apart from the walls and the entrance portal, the only original remains include a cemetery, a school and the Church of Our Lady of the Sea, built in 1774 (Figure 58). The walls of Nani Daman Fort are enveloped with thick plaster, protecting the structure under it. Mendiratta (2015, 1) notes that

the structure was conceived as a sort of autonomous hornwork [extended bulwark] of the Daman stronghold, with its three bastions facing north, northeast and east, i.e., towards the land and not the city – flanks where the wall is weak and narrow. This did not only prevent it from being used against the city, it was also easy to make it unusable if taken by the enemy. The three bastions have a pronounced
triangular profile and features enabling them to function autonomously as the very last bastions of resistance.

Urbanisation in the neighbouring villages overpower the remains of both forts and present day construction encroaches on the walls (Figure 57). Reconstructions have been poorly managed, showing a high level of intrusive interventions throughout the fort surroundings. However, it still holds the traditional Portuguese character of occupying the entire front of the lot, with house sometimes sharing the same thick wall, and forming a cohesive urban ensemble. Bhatnagar (2016, 1) notes

"there are also ugly remnants of unsustainable development, rapid industrialization leading to water and air pollution and slow deterioration of the glorious past and heritage of Daman. Due to government subsidy on industrialization and unsustainable development, heritage and environment of Daman have taken an unprecedented beating in last few decades."
Figure 57 - Urbanisation and high rises overpower Nani Daman fort and carvings on heritage walls damages the fort’s integrity. Photo by author, 2014.

Figure 58 - Inside Nani Daman Fort, Daman. Photo by author, 2014.
Reconsidering Authenticity and Integrity in Heritage Management

As discussed in Chapter Four, communities create buildings that are rooted in a place and time; a building created by one culture in one period carries a completely different meaning and cultural value for another culture in another period. Therefore, human interactions create a sense of place. Winter (2009, 110) describes this process as the creation of a cultural sensibility, explaining that “such features, then, as distinguishing physical identity and coherence, together with the consciousness of significance, can contribute to the sense of a distinctive presence that we associate with the special character of the place.” This “special character of place” is part of the OUV of heritage-listed sites – the unique cultural sensibility that makes an urban heritage landscape so fascinating.

However, Zukin (2009, 6) argues that authenticity is “a continuous process of living and working, a gradual build-up of everyday experience, the expectation that neighbours and buildings that are here today will be here tomorrow.” She notes that “a city loses its soul when this continuity is broken,” beginning with subtle changes that are barely noticeable in the surroundings. Menin (2003, 170) further argues that heritage management expressed “fears about the rapid social and environmental changes of modernity, post-war reconstruction, urbanization and globalization. There was also a fear of how the degenerative forces of capitalism would incur a loss of that authenticity.” Several heritage charters and policies have reinforced the value of heritage sites, stressing the importance of their morphological identities and posing questions about the identification of heritage sites’ frontiers or boundaries, whether or not they include those neighbouring communities.

The importance of establishing those limits is to avoid activities that increase misuse of the heritage site and most importantly, to guarantee the heritage site’s cultural significance and its traditional communities are respected. Solomon (2009) argues that
the tourism industry has caused many coastal communities and indigenous groups in Goa to be forcibly displaced from their traditional lands. The author continues "mass tourism can seriously disrupt thriving local communities; small businesses are forced to compete with well-established multinational companies, and local people are made to endure higher prices (from food to property) due to the presence of tourists" (Solomon 2009, 11).

Of course, heritage authenticity and integrity can be threatened by tangible or intangible historic inaccuracies or inappropriate procedures - such as the one aforementioned by Solomon. Another example can be seen in Daman, where official tourism bodies acknowledge that “the tourism potential of the region is being exploited in an unorganized and unplanned manner” (India 2002, 22), and do not act accordingly (Bhatnagar 2016). Other threats include demolishing or redeveloping sites without heritage expert involvement, allowing gentrification, or encroachment of new, illegal or uncontrolled development (Solomon 2009; Tung 2011; Rodwell 2007). However, international contemporary heritage management approaches recognize that authenticity is two-way, where the heritage site attracts benefits to local communities and the locals enhance and adapt traditions, by performing traditional celebrations, selling arts and crafts and maintaining local folklore (Bandarin, Hosagrahar, and Albernaz 2011). The UNESCO Heritage Urban Landscape (HUL) (2005) recognizes the value of the gradual and evolutionary development of an urban area, specifically acknowledging the importance of all emotional connections between heritage and human beings and the various layers of an urban area.

Some of the interventions into heritage structures in India challenge the Western understandings of authenticity. Winter (2009, 110) notes that “for many Western observers, the addition of neon signage or glass and concrete shopping malls or visitor centres might be regarded as ‘tacky’ or ‘kitsch’.” Although most of the interventions are to satisfy contemporary safety requirements such as the addition of paving or ramps for
accessibility, air conditioning, or fire protection, others seem arbitrary or to impinge on
the material authenticity of the site. However, they satisfy local ideas of heritage integrity.
For example, the whole Aguada Fort complex is generally well maintained. It is clean
and historical, social, symbolic and aesthetic values have been retained. However, few
exhibitions reinforce the cultural significance of the site, and only limited explanations
of local history are provided. The site’s material authenticity is problematic, as the top of
the water chambers is a recent concrete structure, and concrete interventions can be seen
in the original walls, however, overall, it still holds a high level of integrity.

The re-use of historical building material has been common throughout the
development of all the case studies discussed in this chapter (and others). Rossa (1997,
48) notes that in Old Goa, “the ditch was filled in and some of its sections used as walls
for other buildings.” In 1835, the churches of Old Goa were demolished to build others
in Panaji and to fill in moats for peripheral urban growth, and the re-use of original
heritage building material to ‘make-good’ parts of Vasai was common (see Chapter Six).
In this understanding of integrity, the materiality of heritage objects is supplementary to
the “quality of experience” they potentially offer (Zukin 2009, 3). Authenticity is no
longer sought, or needed, in the object but reproduced in its experience. Interventions
augment rather than undermine the site’s integrity in terms of cultural relativism and the
‘quality of experience.’

Winter (2009, 110) argues that Western heritage “critiques along with suggestions
for more ‘tasteful’ or ‘sympathetic’ alternatives are value judgements that stem from
particular cultural and historical contexts.” For example, the restoration of Reis Magos
Fort stands out from those at the other forts, owing to invasive contemporary interventions
that have resulted in a clean, sanitised and empty site. The ‘blank slate’ afforded by Reis
Magos conforms to a more Western heritage style and generates ‘meaning’ adequate to a
universal (Western) audience. All exhibitions and plaques are only in English and clearly
intended for tourists. Goa’s official language is Konkani, Maharashtra is Marathi, and Gujarat is Gujarati – none of these intra-regional tourists would be able to understand the interpretative plaques.

Zukin (2009, 18) argues that heritage management that respects integrity should recognize and provide “‘origins’ to speak for the politics of the underprivileged, to offer an objective standard of authenticity that defends their right to the city.” These ‘origins’ should also include the right of a local community to use and understand its own heritage. The Reis Magos restoration is not as sympathetic to the local inhabitants and informal communities as the heritage landscapes of Aguada Fort and both Daman forts. The latter three exhibit greater cultural integrity and as a consequence, are more frequented by their local communities as well as domestic tourists (India 2002). As Winter (2013, 184) suggests, “the field of [heritage] interpretation needs to pursue a path that straddles the polarised positions of universalism and cultural relativism. Adopting such an approach will help us find solutions to the difficult questions about what is ‘tasteful’, appropriate and successful.”

Heritage Authenticity and Urbanisation

Architecture that previously served to identify cultures and specific peoples is now subject to the standardising forces of globalisation. This is especially true in low and medium-income communities throughout the world where features such as stainless-steel window frames on unplastered brick, or concrete walls with metal roofs or reinforced steel-bars waiting for another floor to be added are common. Although new constructions increase the pressure on heritage sites, they can also offer opportunities for local heritage. Architecture as part of cultural identity has contributed to the development of cities through a “fluid process of forming, expressing, and enforcing identities of individuals, social groups, or spatially constructed communities” (Zukin 1995, 229). The idiosyncratic
features of contemporary urbanisation, found throughout the world and part of the everyday flow of life, could be taken as today’s cultural contribution.

Goa is one of these idiosyncratic places. The intriguing mixture of cultures and their transference as architecture, traditions and identity form the special sense of place that Goans are so proud of (Rossa 2015b, 3; Ahmed and Shankar 2012, 546; TOI 2015b). Goa is also subject to ferocious development, created by both real estate and tourism demands (Figure 59) (Bandyopadhyay, Morais and Chick 2008; Solomon 2009). The city’s most important assets – its historical buildings and character – are threatened by unmanaged demolition and development. The WH listed sites are somewhat protected by legislation and their media popularity (Ahmed and Shankar 2011). Central Panaji and the broader Goan heritage, where most of the historical architecture is unprotected, are most at risk. Accordingly, a new understanding of heritage conservation should incorporate the transient character of urban heritage today, so as to protect cultural properties as repositories of meaning for the local and broader communities.

Figure 59 - Urbanisation and high-rise development on the river front in Fontainhas, Goa. Photo by author, 2014.
Chapter 5

Heritage Tourism and Authenticity

Global tourism is increasing dramatically and WH listing enhances the tourism potential of a region. Domestic and international tourism to Goa has increased by 500% in the thirty years since the WH nomination of the Churches and Convents of Goa in 1986 (India 2015). Rossa (2015a, 5) argues that Goa’s landscape is “different from what was there about a century ago, when there was much less forest coverage, namely around the defence works which meanwhile became obsolete and have been renovated and ruined by the use of tourist attractions.” Kamat (2014, 1) is concerned that part of the problem is “the absence of legal protection and failure of the government machineries to maintain this age-old unique structure, the heritage buildings are giving way to multi-storey plazas [buildings] in Goa”. Solomon (2009, 20) affirms that "the big hotels more often than not operate with detrimental effects to local communities”. The author affirms that traditional people from Goa have been displaced to make way for hotels developments, especially those that perform traditional occupations in coastal areas.

In addition, the exploitation of cultural heritage in the developing world for tourism contributes to social exclusion in many places (Gunay 2008; Solomon 2009). Vivanta by Taj, a high-end resort-style hotel, was built at Fort Aguada to accommodate the dramatic increase in tourist numbers in Goa. The hotel is part of an international chain of hotels and resorts affiliated to the Indian Hotels Company Limited (IHCL), branded as Taj Hotels Palaces Resorts Safaris. It occupies part of the lower Aguada Fort, making the circular rampart and external walls of the fort available for public visitation, but also privatizing part of the inner fort area. This encroachment occurred despite the fact that Indian national legislation “mandates the creation of a 100m protected area immediately around the monument, and [a] further 200m buffer zone, the use of which is regulated” (Sharma 2012, 20). Moreover, although the hotel uses the Fort’s image, setting and name for marketing purposes (IHCL 2013), the website neglects to mention the surrounding
community. Further, IHCL does not contribute to the heritage site, for example, by maintaining fort walls, providing interpretation panels or promoting India’s heritage in any way. In addition, Solomon (2009) gives another example of the Heritage Village Club, affiliated to the national chain of hotels from the Select Group. It encroaches and affects traditional fishing operations by “discharging untreated solid wastes and effluents directly into the sea” (Solomon 2009, 23), and also by being located on a coastal safety set back. This characterises a violation of local legislation, and where policies are not made effective by local councils.

The Churches and Convents of Goa WH site is the main tourist destination in Goa and is reasonably well protected in comparison with nationally listed sites. However, the site does not have counteractive plans (such as emergency, periodical inspections, fire), risk assessments (earthquake) and, most importantly, management plans (WHC 2015a). In addition, the lack of a tourism management plan represents a major threat to the site. The site lacks an interpretation centre and adequate public amenities.

Ahmed and Shankar (2012,53) affirm that there is a great pressure by private developers to construct high rise buildings that “height will cause invisibility to the monuments.” The authors continue that “haphazard developments that are coming up in vicinity of heritage areas and precincts are greatly affecting the aesthetics and disharmony with the existing monuments” and “the area beyond 300 metres has no control over the new development that has caused greater threats to the monuments and its surrounding environs” among other development threats.

The consequences of the absence of a management plan, also mentioned by Ahmed and Shankar (2012,53), were clearly seen during the ten-yearly St Xavier festival in 2014. In November 2014, over millions pilgrims and tourists visiting for the exhibition of St Francis Xavier’s mortal remains. Christian pilgrims from India and the Indian-subcontinent converged on the site, camping in precarious installations (woven-straw
frame dwellings and tents) that exerted massive pressure on the heritage structure. With no on-site ablution facilities, chemical toilets were placed near the temporary pilgrim camp. Markets and food stalls, some with fire burners, were located along the main arteries of the heritage-listed complex, generating a wide range of other threats (Figure 60). Additionally, many pilgrims lit candles within and around the heritage churches, and as seen in Figure 53, the fire brigade was inadequately resourced to ameliorate fire hazards or other emergencies.

Figure 60 - Market stalls located close to the Se Cathedral WH site during the 2014 St Xavier festival, Goa. Photo by author, 2014.
A glut of temporary tents for religious services overwhelmed the Churches and Convents, and there were extensive queues to access most sites, particularly the Basilica which held all ceremonies, and the Se Cathedral, which housed the exhibition of the Saint’s remains. A temporary tent behind the Se Cathedral was mounted with religious displays of the different Christian orders in India (Figure 62). The site was bursting with life and character, showing the direct contribution of the local community to social, symbolic and spiritual values.
Figure 62 - Temporary tents for public mass during the 2014 Saint Francis Xavier mortal remains exhibition, The Convents and Churches of Goa WHS. Photo by author, 2014.

In cities like Mumbai, “religion plays a central role in the politics of heritage that is emerging from the debris of modernist city planning, but these heritages are not only located within the city but can also encompass the hometowns of urban migrants or the imagined cosmos of a transnational community” (Veer 2015, 11). During the 10-yearly public exhibition of St Francis Xavier’s remains and other more frequent festivities, a great number of pilgrims regularly camp at the heritage sites (Figure 63), contributing to the spiritual, social and symbolic value of the sites. Consequently, in this case, pilgrims are important stakeholders in heritage and other tourist attractions, along with local traditional communities not only the international tourism market (Solomon 2009). It is imperative that this community be accommodated thoughtfully to protect the site from damage, but also that they are considered as contributing to the authenticity and integrity of the site.
Sustainable Heritage Management

The challenge of nurturing a sense of place and history in regions experiencing accelerated urban growth and socioeconomic changes highlights crucial difficulties facing cultural preservation in the contemporary world (Arantes 2011). These difficulties are especially relevant for regions experiencing growth along with unequal concentrations of wealth, where investments are often targeted towards infrastructure that satisfies the demands of international tourism. If not well managed, such tourism pressures increasingly push the management of historical urban landscapes under the influence of global powers and away from local control (Bandyopadhyay, Morais and Chick 2008; Solomon 2009; Giraudo 2016). This shift could also lead to the loss of traditional lifestyles and threaten the authenticity and integrity of tangible and intangible heritage. Furthermore, newly restored heritage sites managed as tourist destinations do not tolerate poverty and encourage social exclusion and gentrification (Sawkar et al. 1998; Solomon 2009; Mckercher and Du Cros 2012). Heritage management oriented towards authenticity and integrity must aim at sustainable cultural development. This should be done by guaranteeing the right of land for traditional communities while
enabling and empowering them to preserve their cultural assets and perform their cultural expressions (both tangible and intangible); ideally, under community stewardship and management.

However, the management of urban heritage sites in conjunction with sustainable cultural development presents a global challenge. Rodwell (2007) argues that sustainability in historic cities can be categorised under three main types: functionality within communities, natural resources used in construction, and financial investments over generations. Winter (2013) argues that although heritage requires a democratic approach that includes all stakeholders, in the end, it is local communities that effectively use and contribute to the vitality of the place. Therefore, they should have a greater voice in the decision-making process:

there has been a widespread shift away from earlier “top down” models of heritage management in favour of more democratic approaches that valorise concepts like “stakeholders” or “values”. These terms reflect a concern for incorporating multiple perspectives, and [a?] plurality of voices. Heritage planners are now required to incorporate - and balance - the views of local residents, academics, local businesses, government offices and non-governmental organisations, with the needs of those consuming the heritage: tourists. (173)

As Logan (2002, 17) points out, “we must allow for change and let people decide their future for themselves. We should not seek to lock communities into patterns of life they no longer value, no matter how exotic they might seem to the outsider.” Most importantly, heritage managers need to experience, feel, listen to, and observe the community, its ways of life, how traditions are passed on, and how they are socialised, with an aim for inclusive and sustainable development of social, economic, environmental, and cultural domains (Harrington 2009; Rodwell 2011).

Tourism can be a tool for sustainable development in all domains listed by Harrington. According to Bandarin, Hosagrahar, and Albernaz (2011), culture contributes directly to economic development. Heritage sites in low and middle-income countries play an important role in local economic development, attracting tourists and revenue for its
communities. Heritage tourism creates employment and revenues for local communities, along with profits from sales of crafts, music performances and traditional festivities. In addition, heritage sites serve as an incentive for local people to preserve history and pass traditional knowledge on to younger generations. Ideally, government policies should foster both economic growth and human development and to that end, the Charter for the Conservation of Unprotected Architectural Heritage and Sites in India (INTACH 2004) recognises the unique resource of heritage and the symbiotic relationship binding the tangible and intangible architectural heritage of India as one of the traditional philosophies underpinning conservation practice.

Solomon (2009) presents a successful case in Goa where a village, assisted by the non-governmental group Centre for Responsible Tourism (CRT), empowered the local communities in the decision-making process enabling them to protect their livelihood rights. The women of this traditional village initiated a savings cooperative to assist other women in the same village, protecting their local livelihoods and guaranteeing that they were the first beneficiaries of the tourism opportunities in their area. As an example of their success, "the community group organized the local vendors to oppose licensing of outsiders seeing that the latter practice was depriving the original settlers of the coasts’ livelihoods" (20). Empowering the local communities to foresee threats, adapt to change and most importantly identify future opportunities.

In places such as Daman, which has historic and symbolic value because of its cultural originality, tourist-driven development has not been properly implemented (India 2002, Bhatnagar 2016). Moti and Nani Daman still have their heritage sites at such a level of integrity that tourism could prove an economic lifeline to those cities. However, success depends on good governance and sustainable management. In Daman, if growth is not properly planned will lead to unsustainable development. In 2002, the Indian Culture Department of Tourism suggested that “a proper tourism development and
marketing strategy would warrant consolidation of strengths, capitalization of opportunities, alleviation of weaknesses and counter measures for threats” (India 2002, 22). The report concludes that there is “no proper marketing strategy [that] has been implemented in the region. Hence there is no distribution network in place; none of the tour operators sell Daman tourism. There is a lack of a brand identity” (India 2002, 21). The marketing strategy was not effective in 2014 when I visited the site and, Bhatnagar affirms that issues of poor tourism development and policy enforcement were still current in 2016.

A process of values-based planning, taking into account both stakeholders and decision makers’ policies, has the potential to deliver better outcomes and contribute to sustainable development. In areas such as the ones studied in this chapter, they call for a small scale and community-based tourism, encouraging, training and empowering local entrepreneurs to host visitors, providing an alternative income and most importantly, authentic tourism for those interested in the local culture. For these processes to be established, government agencies need to pursue economic development by empowering local communities focusing on entrepreneurial training and the educational aspects carried by heritage, rather than concentrating efforts on tourists and tourism-related developments.

**Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the unique qualities of heritage in India and the effects of urbanization and tourism on understandings of heritage authenticity and integrity. Heritage sites of Portuguese influence in Western India attract a wide range of visitors interested in their uniquely European influences, spiritual and religious value. They give the Portuguese community around the world and those of the former Portuguese colonies, such as myself, a sense of identity and connection with others and the past. They also
reflect the diversity of Indian culture and the outcomes of shared heritage and challenge the universal understanding of an authentic material heritage. Tourism at Indo-Portuguese heritage sites is largely educational, as the physical layers of past cultures can be clearly seen, and tourists can learn about and reflect on actions taken by past generations. Watson (2014, 35) argues that tourism has many virtues,

it displays the achievements of humanity and the splendours of art and architecture, and it provides reference points for national identity and local customs. Its objects accrue value not only in having survived the many tests of time but in showing it and in representing an authenticity that is virtuously contrapuntal to the artifice of modernity.

However, heritage in Goa and Daman, as in many parts of the world, is subject to power struggles. In Goa, heritage is largely in the hands of tourists, whereas heritage in Daman still belongs to the local communities but reportedly lacking management and investment. Consequently, effective heritage legislation needs to consider an Indian understanding of integrity and authenticity and find a balance between economic development and tourism and the management of historic and cultural assets.

In this chapter, I sought to demonstrate the dynamics derived from ineffective legislation and not implemented policies. I also highlighted that there must have a shift in the management framework of highly significant heritage sites, where agencies governing larger areas should enable and empower local community bodies to have a duty of care of their cultural assets. Concentrating to enhance the potential for economic development, especially within communities is central to the heritage site’s identity. Community based producers of cultural goods and services, especially in low and middle-income countries, need entrepreneurial training and empowerment to enable this market to develop and also policies that aim at more holistic management supported by governing agencies. In the next chapter, I will focus on theme (3) heritage vulnerability and discuss the threatening combination of heritage sites, the ineffective character of some of the established policies and impoverished communities in the event of a natural disaster.
Built heritage sites and their informal communities are highly sensitive to natural disasters. Such events also increase the effects of existing environmental pressures, including “those arising from meteorological, oceanic and geologic phenomena and long term climate change” (Hettiarachchi et al. 2015, 11). Bandarin (UNESCO 2010, 2) stresses that disasters in or near heritage sites are a “combined product of hazards and vulnerabilities resulting from the complex interaction of numerous interlocking factors, many of which are very much within human control.” These anthropogenic factors include rapid urbanisation in low and medium-income countries, the continuous development of unsafe areas, poor governance and the daily destruction of the built and natural environment. Natural disasters combined with anthropogenic hazards increase the overall vulnerability of informal communities, threatening lives, livelihoods and cultures (Cohen et al. 2008; Yuen and Kong 2009; UNESCO 2010; Wilby and Keenan 2012; Hettiarachchi et al. 2015).

In addition to natural disasters such as the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, the WHC (UNESCO 2007a; UNESCO 2010) contends that global climate change poses a major threat to heritage properties. These sensitive areas are subject to physical and social impacts associated with climate change, such as changing weather patterns, rising sea
levels, population displacement, flooding, coastal erosion, and marine inundation. Wilby and Keenan (2012, 348) argue that “flooding is the most common natural hazard and third most damaging globally after storms and earthquakes” and note that “anthropogenic climate change is expected to increase flood risk through more frequent heavy precipitation, increased catchment wetness and sea level rise.” Earthquake and tsunami are the principal ‘natural’ risks impacting on this chapter’s case studies, Vasai in Maharashtra, Western India and Galle in Southern Province, Sri Lanka. The case studies are also subject to threats associated with climate change such as flooding, the rise of sea-level, coastal erosion, and increasing frequency and intensity of coastal cyclones and hurricanes.

The heritage sites at Vasai and Galle are discussed as comparable case studies in this chapter because of their shared colonial Portuguese history, the pattern of urban sprawl around their heritage centres and buffer zones, and their locations in coastal areas which are already disaster prone and likely to be even more gravely affected by global climate change. For example, a number of World Heritage Properties are located in areas hit by the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami in South and Southeast Asia. Cultural and spiritual centres in The Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka were damaged (Giudice 2005). However, the devastation was severe within the Old Town’s buffer zone, outside the boundaries of the World Heritage site, the walls of which provided only a minor measure of protection against the destruction of the waves. As Breece (2014, 1) notes, “houses that were easily demolished or severely damaged by the tsunami in the Galle district alone are estimated at about 12,000.” The communities were rebuilt despite safety setbacks and measures specifically designed by the government to safeguard against future loss of life, housing and livelihood (Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012; Mannakkara and Wilkinson 2013). This coincides with the ineffective character of some of the established policies in all of this thesis case studies.
This chapter focuses on theme (3) heritage vulnerability and the effects of ‘natural’ disasters on urban heritage areas and the neighbouring communities located within the buffer zones. This chapter discusses factors that pose additional threats or magnify the risks of climate change including rapid urbanization, the unsustainable use of resources, and biodiversity loss. Informal communities near heritage sites are exposed to and exacerbate anthropogenic risks, including climate change, but also enrich and contribute to the social and symbolic values of heritage sites. With proper forethought, legislation and management of heritage sites and their buffer zones, these communities can also mitigate risks to tangible and intangible heritage. The chapter concludes by recommending sustainable heritage management and the importance of well-designed monitoring systems, inclusive and up-to-date management plans allied with holistic legal systems able to reinforce land-use planning.

**Study Area**

Vasai and Galle are former Portuguese colonial ports located on the west coast of India and the south-west coast of Sri Lanka respectively (Figure 65). The national heritage listed Vasai Fort in Vasai, Maharashtra, India (ASI 2013) is an outstanding example of Indo-Portuguese colonial architecture (Figure 68), which is surrounded by an informal community called the Koliwada (Figure 67). Koliwada refers to a Koli village, a group of culturally distinct people where “the term ‘koli’ generally refers to fisherfolk, but this group comprises other subcastes engaged in agriculture, labour, salt-pan work and other activities and are typically named after their occupation” (Peke 2013, 7). Probably, the Kolis were the local residents who were already occupying the outskirts of the fortified area.
Although, the neighbouring communities of Vasai Fort have developed since the sixteenth century (Cunha 1993; Rossa 1997; Rossa 2015e), Mahimkar (2015) argues that the Koliwadas’ cultural vibrancy, or character still exists today (Figure 7 – Chapter 1). The World Heritage Site of Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka is located in an administrative area called Galle Four Gravets (Figure 69). The port area adjacent to the heritage site consists of several neighbourhoods, including Megalle, Kaluwell, Walawatta and Pettigalawatta, collectively referred here as the Galle Harbour Area (Figure 70).
Figure 65 - Location of Vasai, Maharashtra, India and Galle, Sri Lanka. Adapted from an image in the public domain; reproduced from Bruce Jones Design Inc. 2010.
Figure 66 - Map of Vasai, indicating location of the ASI listed Vasai Fort, highlighted purple. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe (accessed January 31, 2016).

Figure 67 - Map of Vasai, indicating boundaries of Pachur Bunder and Bassein Koliwada; highlighted orange. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe (accessed January 31, 2016).
Figure 68 - Part of the Koliwada in the buffer zone outside the Sea Gate of Vasai Fort, Photo by author, 2014.

Figure 69 - Map of Galle, indicating the area of Galle Four Gravets, Sri Lanka; highlighted in green. Adapted from Google, DigitalGlobe (accessed January 31, 2016).
Sri Lanka’s rise into middle income has been accompanied by a rapid transformation in how global markets view the country. Between 1975 and 2005, manufactures shot up from 6 percent of national exports to 60 percent. This reshaped the country’s economic geography – firms not farms now lead Sri Lanka’s connectivity with the rest of the world. (Lall and Astrup 2009, E1)

Galle is one of the areas undergoing a rapid transformation in Sri Lanka, through economic drivers such as increased fishing and tourism industries, in addition to manufacturing however is still manly rural (Sri Lanka, 2011). Today, there, the beaches are packed with informal construction to accommodate those industries. Fishing has drawn people to live close to the coast, both in Vasai and the Old Town of Galle. The wealth distribution of Galle is lower than that of Vasai (Table 3), both cities show better equality than Brazilian case studies. Vasai Koliwada is much denser than the Galle Harbor area. However, the Koliwada area is much smaller as they are bounded by the Ocean and the fort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case studies</th>
<th>Vassai, India</th>
<th>Galle Four Gravets, Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inhabitants</td>
<td>1,221,233 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land area (km²)</td>
<td>380 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential density (inhabitants per km²)</td>
<td>3,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gini</td>
<td>0.495 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential density of surrounding communities (inhabitant per km²)</td>
<td>1,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land area of surrounding communities (km²)</td>
<td>Pachur Bunder and Vasai Koliwada 2.8 c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. (India 2011c)  
b. (Sri Lanka 2012b)  
c. (Sri Lanka 2011)  
d. (Statistic Times 2015)  
e. (India 2011d)  
f. (Sri Lanka 2012a)

**Historical Context**

Throughout the previous chapter, I have discussed the early Portuguese colonial period of dominance in Western Asia, presenting an introduction to the historical context in India and Sri Lanka. It was the Dutch in Asia and the French in Brazil who started challenging Portuguese naval supremacy. Asher and Talbot (2006, 181) explain that the Dutch were better equipped and better financed than the Portuguese. They state that the Dutch colonial strategy was to control spices at the places where they were produced, whereas the Portuguese tried to control the ships carrying goods for sale. This strategy slowly deprived the Portuguese of their possessions and resulted in the Dutch taking control of the ports.

It is worth noting how the Portuguese did not face the same battles in Brazil that they faced in Western India; at least, the waters were more peaceful in Brazil. Additionally, colonisation in Asia was not focused on big monocultures, as it was in
Brazil. The existing settlements in Western India and the cultural diversity influenced the Portuguese when choosing where to start their occupation. But in all case studies, initial settlement evolved from the construction of a fortified area, the establishment of religious orders’ colleges and churches, and pathways between them populated with houses, all adjusted to the existing topography. In Brazil, the case study sites started on hilly areas, whereas in Asia the case study sites began on peninsulas, promontories or islands. Streets were then laid out in a quasi-orthogonal pattern in accordance with the ocean-inland axis, or sea and land gates in the case of walled settlements. This is the case in the Asian case studies of this thesis. Within the normal geographical area chosen by Portuguese settlers to place and start a colony, can be potentially establishing the historical conditions of the vulnerability of the sites. Additionally, the walls of the fort constructed by the Portuguese in both sites acted as dividers, historically excluding locals from settlers.

Vasai

The Fort of St. Sebastian of Vasai (Forte de São Sebastião de Baçaim) is located 48 kilometres north of Mumbai. The southerly walls of the fort face the river mouths of the Vasai Creek and the Ulhas River, and the southwesterly walls face the Arabian Sea. Sixteenth-century Portuguese mariners valued this strategic position from which to command the Arabian Sea. After several years of naval assault, the sultan of Gujarat ceded the “Mahomedan fort of Bassein” (now Vasai) and the surrounding territories to the Portuguese in 1534, due to increasing Portuguese military power on the coast (Cunha 1993; Miranda 2014). The treaty between the sultan and the Portuguese gave the Portuguese Empire control over the city of Bassein and surrounding territories. Importantly, they were given control over navigation in the area. Thus, Vasai became the most important settlement after Goa and the capital of the Northern Province until the Portuguese gained control of Daman (Luz 1960).
During this early period of Portuguese colonization, Vasai was a typical feudal settlement where the church had major influence, and the Portuguese profited from locals through taxes and trade (Rossa 2015e). Rossa (2015a, 1) argues that “Portugal’s possession of the territories of Vasai was accomplished by replacing the lords of the previous feudal system. Almost everything remained unchanged, with the Portuguese neither living nor interfering with locals beyond the fortifications, except for missionary activity.” This is worth noting because it proves the century-old existence of neighbouring communities living in the areas close to what is considered heritage today.

Muslim defensive structures were destroyed by the Portuguese in 1533 and Rossa (2015e) notes that there is little evidence to suggest that those structures were used by the Portuguese. In the 1550s, fort walls were constructed around an existing village (Figure 71), including a swamp area that allowed fishing and the cultivation of rice (the rossio). Rossa argues that the polygonal shape of the fort walls indicates that parts of the Muslim fort were refurbished. As discussed in Chapter 4, the rossio is a planned expansion area included in all Portuguese colonial settlements. The urban morphology was similar to Portuguese settlements elsewhere, with a clear distinction between public and civil sectors, a structured grid of alleys and paved streets going from the shore to the main square and “three water tanks that still supply local residents” (Rossa 2015e, 3):

In perfect alignment with the streets from the shore to the square, more or less straight streets to the northwest structured a grid of streets and alleys respectively measuring 36 and 20 palms wide. This indicates a process of rational urban layout similar to the creations and enlargements done during the same period throughout the Portuguese world.
Figure 71 - Map of Baçaim, 1620-40. Image in the public domain; provided by E-corpus.

Vasai rapidly became a thriving colony, with exports of wood coming from the interior and Arabian horses were sent via Vasai to the kingdoms in the interior of the Hindustani peninsula (Rossa 2015e). “The market was to the north; it is very probable that the fish market located by the northern reserve once had a built structure. The mint [Casa da Moeda] was built at an undetermined location in 1611” (3). The population grew, attracted to economic opportunities. A local described the residential and mercantile expansion of the town thus:

In that place a large house was built with a large porch. It had a large open ground in front enclosed by a stockade and filled with material to make it a high platform. Next to the house were other equally large ones for storing merchandise. And houses were built for the officers and for a hundred men who would have to stay there with the factor, for which there was stone and mortar and much effort to that end. Everything was surrounded by the thick stockade with ditches inside. Here the people came in from the countryside with things to eat and sell, setting up a bazaar, with Canarese vendors. And the population began to grow because the country people found more things among our people than among the Moors and began to pay their rent to the factor, wherein the money was much more than expected. (Rossa 1997, 65)
In addition, Vasai locals had religious freedom, however, “the coexistence of Christian churches with Hindu and Muslim temples in the first decade was followed by systematic destruction of the latter two” after the launch of the Inquisition in Goa in 1560 (2). Rossa (1997, 62) states that “non-Catholics were forbidden to be inside the city walls after the gates were closed at the end of the day, which in practice led them not to own property within the urban nucleus.” Consequently, Christian churches and religious colleges of the Augustinians, Benedictines, Jesuits and Franciscans were established inside the fort.

In the early eighteenth century, Vasai and the Northern Province were subject to constant military pressure from the Marâthâs, particularly in 1723–1724 and 1730–1732, impacting the region’s economy (Miranda 2014). “This protracted state of war would lead to the invasion of 1737–1739, the sieges of Bassein and Daman and, ultimately, the surrender of the province in 1739” (178). Cunha (1993, 209) adds that “on the capture of Bassein by the Marâthâs all these [Portuguese] warlike stores were taken possession of by them, but it does not appear that they made any effort to improve the fortifications.” Although Bassein remained important during the Marâthâ period, it was neglected after being taken by the British in 1780 (Cunha 1993). Rossa (1997) argues that the town’s neglect was the result of the combined effects of population decline due to the plague, the constant change of control of the fort, and the development of the rival Bombay, by the British East Indies Company. In 1825, travelling bishop observed that the ruined churches and houses were uninhabited and locked up; they are monuments “of departed greatness” (211).

The Portuguese colonial buildings are now in ruins, overgrown with vegetation. The Fort was nationally listed by the ASI and hence, the walls of the fort and the citadel, along with its bastions, are better preserved. Most of the ruins are stabilized with concrete structures or new refurbishments undertaken after the last earthquake. The site is clean
and well supervised by ASI rangers who oversee local visitors who speak fondly of the site as a familiar landscape of their childhoods.

Vasai, however, has been challenged by environmental and anthropogenic pressures since settlement. In 1618, the town was struck by an enormous earthquake. Local Manuel Faria e Sousa wrote there were “two thousand dead in the settlement and in the surrounding countryside…[and] nearly all temples were knocked down” (quoted in Rossa 1997, 27). Earthquakes have recurred in the area, most recently in 1993. Dr Gemalla Carer, visiting in 1695, noted the risk that floods and disease pose to the town:

on the south side, towards the channel, there is only a single wall, that place being less exposed to the danger of enemies, and sufficiently defended by ebb and flood. One third of the city, towards north, is unpeopled, by reasons of the plague which for some years raged in it. (Carer quoted in Cunha 1993, 141)

Galle

The Portuguese first arrived in Ceylon (present day Sri Lanka) 1506 and established a fort at Colombo in 1518. They were attracted to the island because of its strategic position and valuable resources, namely precious stones and cinnamon. The Portuguese “entered the trade of cinnamon and other products from the island, tried to disseminate the Catholic faith and became increasingly involved in domestic politics” during the following century (Serrao 2014, 185). The strong Portuguese hostility towards Muslim ships and traders resulted in a violent campaign to further commercial objectives and “the artillery mounted on Portuguese ships, which were heavier than indigenous vessels, gave them decisive advantage and enabled them to rapidly seize a series of coastal sites,” including Ceylon (Asher and Talbot 2006). Portugal gained control of part of the western side of the island after an intense and violent campaign in the 1590s (Pearson 1988). Portuguese settlers to whom land was granted were obliged to take up residence in Sri Lanka, and the local Sinhalese were expected to live in the various fortresses along with the Portuguese (Pieris
Sinhalese were encouraged to convert to Christianity and intermarry with the Portuguese. Unlike in Vasai, locals were not excluded from the fort area.

Constant Dutch harassment during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries resulted in Portugal losing several colonies throughout South-East Asia, including the Sri Lankan settlements of Galle in 1640 and Jaffna in 1658. In 1638, Coster (quoted in Pieris 1920, 269) observed that “the Portuguese fort of Santa Cruz de Galle occupied the rising ground which formed a promontory on the western side of the extensive bay, the natural beauties of the surrounding of which did not compensate for the dangers of its hidden rocks.” The fort “consisted of a wall with three bastions facing the land and a palisade facing the sea” (Wijeratne 2005, 1). The Dutch built the fortified town of Galle laying out the streets in a grid (Figure 72). This town had “an area of 52 ha inside the walls defended by 14 bastions” (WHC 2015d, 3).
In 1796, the British took over the fort from the Dutch, following the surrender of Colombo (WHC 2015d). A number of modifications were made by the British, including “ditches filled in, new blockhouses added, a gate put in between the Moon bastion and the Sun bastion, a lighthouse installed on the Utrecht bastion, and a tower erected for the jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1883” (3). Rapid development in the early twentieth century when the country was still under British control resulted in the housing growth along the Galle Harbour, altered the built heritage and threatened the authenticity of the township (Manawadu 2011).

The Old Town of Galle has diverse Dutch, Portuguese, British and local architectural features and wide streets with houses on each side containing their own private gardens and front verandas supported by columns and timber screens and was listed by the WHC in 1988. The Fort was listed by the WHC in 2008 because it is “an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history” (WHC 2015d, no page) and due to its well-preserved fortifications and few modifications to the original context (Abeywardana, Court and Thompson 2016). Various temples and a mosque coexist alongside a culturally diverse population and a large number of tourists that visit the fort. Sri Lanka is an ethnically diverse society that includes Sinhalese Buddhists, Sinhalese Christians, Sri Lankan Tamils, Indian Tamils, Christian Tamils, Muslims, and Burghers (Dean-Oswald 1985). It is remarkable to experience such diversity in a place that for centuries has been so disputed by inhabitants of diverse religious backgrounds. Sites of violent battles today attract tourists from all over the world.
Tangible and intangible heritage in contemporary Vasai and Old Town of Galle

Vasai

After a 62km drive from central Mumbai, one reaches Vasai Fort almost inadvertently, as there is no signage, wayfinding or interpretation and the means of access – a very wide opening cut into the wall next to the “Land Gate” – gives the visitor no sense of entering a heritage-listed fortress. The fort is divided into two sections by a recently built west-east road, Killa or Old Fort Road. None of these openings is original to the fort’s initial construction. The northern part of the fort is separated from the rest by the road and formed the rossio in colonial times. Today, it is a cleared area containing a statue of the Maratha general Chimaji Appa, who recaptured Vasai from the Portuguese in 1739 (Miranda 2014, 178).

A group of present-day contemporary buildings, called Customs Quarters, are located in front of the land gate, adjacent to the ASI building. In the middle of the fort are the remains of the Portuguese senate house, town hall and prison, or Casa de Câmara e Cadeia, also seen in many villages in Brazil, and the Dominican Church and convent, separated from the other orders. The citadel, or the older fort of Saint Sebastian, is also located in the centre of Vasai Fort. A monumental entrance still stands with the Portuguese coat of arms, the Malta cross on the left and armillary sphere on the right (Figure 73). Richly adorned with Bassein granite, it stands out in the landscape. Its walls and three cylindrical bastions are easily distinguished, as are a factory with its still standing chimney, a cistern and the Misericordia Church, all in ruins.
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Figure 73 - Monumental entrance of Saint Sebastian Fort inside Vasai Fort. Photo by author, 2014.

The citadel’s walls have been reconstructed, and the differences between the original wall and the reconstructions are easily distinguished. Reconstruction work is continual, with agents of the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) breaking rocks to add to the missing parts of the wall using cement rather than the traditional ‘surkhi’ – ground burnt bricks or clay in lieu of sand with lime mortar (Figure 74). Jaisinghani (2009) argues that some of these interventions are purely aesthetic and devalue local authenticity, however, as discussed in Chapter 5, they now form part of the local character.
The southern part of the fort is mostly covered in dense vegetation with many buildings in ruins, including Hindu temples. These ruins are linked by gravel pathways, but site interpretation is non-existent, and there is very little present-day construction. Eight ruined churches, built by Christian religious orders, are spread throughout the fort, including Saint Gonçalo Garcia Church (Jesuit), Saint Annunciation Church (Augustinian), Saint Anthony’s Church (Franciscan), and the Dominican Church. Saint Joseph’s Church was built in 1547 over a pre-existing temple (Rossa 2015e). The church tower is higher than the fort’s defensive walls and is an imposing presence in the urban landscape (Figure 75). Concrete and cement structural reinforcements completed after the Latur Earthquake in 1993 are evident, and the floor is natural gravel, rather than the concrete or tile of other ruins within fortress walls. One can leave the fort via the original southern Sea Gate, beside which there is a little temple adorned with Hindu symbols and
religious trappings (including a swastika, Aum, the figure of Ganesha, incense and yellow flower garlands).

Figure 75 - Remains of Saint Joseph’s Church inside Vasai Fort. Photo by author, 2014.

A flight of steps next to Saint Joseph’s Church provides access to the top of the fort wall and ramparts, and it is possible to walk around the top of the southern part of the walls. The southeastern fort walls and ramparts overlook Vasai Creek, and the southwest walls overlook the Arabian Sea and the fishing village of Vasai Koliwada, where there are a small shipyard, old containers and some present-day constructions, mostly government buildings.

**Vasai Koliwada**

The village of Vasai Koliwada can be accessed through an opening in the southwestern wall of the fort, possibly an original passageway (Figure 76), or by boat from the Arabian
Sea or Vasai Creek. Most of the inhabitants of this village are fishermen from the Koli caste, the traditional indigenous people or fisherfolk of Maharashtra (Karmarkar 2010; India 2013; Peke 2013). The Ministry of Tribal Affairs recognizes 45 tribes living just within Vasai (India 2013). The population of Vasai Koliwada was 15,000 in 2010, of whom “62% were Christians Kolis and 38% Hindus” (Karmarkar 2010, 15). Village roads are paved, and houses are constructed of concrete with tiled floors and walls. Shrines to Christian saints with offerings of Hindu garlands and incense are spread throughout the village. The village is clean and organized, and the houses are tidy, although the village creek is completely polluted and silted with rubbish (Figure 77).

Figure 76 - The Koliwada entrance through the walls of the Vasai Fort. Photo by author, 2014.
The Kolis in Vasai are an essential part of the Vasai heritage. “Koli music and dance are unique and popular in the cultural programmes in the State” (Peke 2013, 9). Women tie a longer sari in a distinctive manner, use flowers in their hair and also many bangles (traditional Indian jewellery) on their arms, signifying a local identity. It is common to see women washing clothes near the well located inside the fort and carrying pots of water on their heads from the well. Sun-dried and salted fish that are the main part of the fishermen’s diet while at sea are dried on tables and racks throughout the village (Figure 77) and while men are out fishing, women do the rest of the work, for example, selling the fish, milling wheat and cleaning.

Koli culture is under threat, however, by government neglect, urbanization and climate change. Peke (2013, 11) notes that “in recent times, the Kolis have struggled to keep their culture intact in the face of the pressures of modern development. Their settlements have been subsumed by the urban sprawl of Mumbai, and it is an uphill battle to secure their space and livelihood.” Warhaft (2001, 216) further argues that “although
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each Koliwada is unique, they share common characteristics and problems. Pollution, lack of basic amenities, declining catch, increasing costs and inadequate housing are issues affecting most Koli families,” and these issues are evident in Vasai Koliwada. In addition, the Kolis’ livelihood suffered after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and an oil spill caused by two cargo ships colliding in 2010 (TOI 2010) damaged marine life and local mangroves (Peke 2013).

As discussed, the area is susceptible to natural disasters. One of the reasons that the Vasai fort is in ruins is “a terrible storm followed by an earthquake and a tsunami [that] razed most of its buildings” in 1618 (Rossa 2015e, 3). The Latur Earthquake in 1993 also severely impacted Vasai, though “the ruins are still impressive” (4). Maharashtra is still considered to be at ‘moderate risk’ of earthquakes (Desai and Choudhury 2014) and, hence, the prospect of further disasters in the region cannot be disregarded.

The Old Town of Galle

The Old Town of Galle in Sri Lanka is also an elegant fortress, and in much better shape than Vasai. The Galle Fort is still impressive and prominent in Galle’s skyline. It is well preserved, and once you are in the fort, streets shaded by trees and lined with single-storey houses on both sides take the visitor back in time (Figure 78). “Besides the military structures is the plausibly Portuguese origin of one or two of the main north-south streets…houses [in those streets] may indicate the local existence of a columned veranda house type of possible Portuguese origins” (Biedermann 2012, 1). This feature of a columned veranda is also seen in colonial houses in Western India and in Brazil.
Figure 78 - Inside the walls of The Old Town of Galle. Photo by author, 2014.

Traditional Sri Lankan building techniques were incorporated into the structure of the fort, especially in the “ramparts, [where] coral is frequently used along with granite. In the ground layout all the measures of length, width and height conform with regional metrology” (Mandawala 2015, 6). The fort was listed by the World Heritage Committee in 1988 for its social, historical and architectural significance – being a result of a combination of European and Sri Lankan building styles – and for its continued inhabitation by local people. Although little Portuguese architecture remains, the fort still accommodates a multicultural population of Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Christians and others. As in Vasai, it has always been home to many different nationalities and local groups, reinforcing its historical and social value. The fort is also heritage listed for its scientific and technological significance, specifically for its sewer system flushed by tidal sea-water, built by the Dutch in the 17th century (WHC 2015d). The system used to be “controlled by a pumping station formerly activated by a windmill on the Triton Bastion” Wijeratne (2005, 1). The fort area is the part of the heritage ensemble with the highest
authenticity and integrity, but there are a number of locally listed buildings of note outside the fort, such as the original harbour, home to 25 historical shipwrecks, houses, temples and a vegetables and fish market.

As discussed in Chapter Three, a clear buffer zone was not compulsory for heritage sites when Galle fort was World Heritage listed in 1988. Nonetheless, the local Department of Archaeology introduced in the middle of the 20th century a policy that required the construction of a buffer restricting adjacent construction, 400 yards wide from the boundary of the listed property (Wijeratne 2005). The buffer around the fort remains (Figure 79), but there is a proposal to include the area of Galle Harbour within the cultural landscape (WHC 2015d). This would act as a buffer zone to the Fort and protect its port remains, shipwrecks, maritime archaeology, and most importantly the fishermen communities in the area.

Figure 79 - The exterior of the World Heritage site of Old Town of Galle. Photo by author, 2014.
The Galle Heritage Foundation was created in 2002, and a development plan was made to implement heritage policies within the fort, such as removing 26 government buildings from inside the fort and regulating use (Wijeratne 2005). Towards this end, an abattoir and a garment industry were banned from the heritage-listed boundaries, and incentives were given for raising public awareness of heritage. However, the focus of the plan remains on the World Heritage listed areas, rather than on the broader cultural landscape that contributes to the vitality of the heritage centre. Moreover, the failure to acknowledge the significance of this surrounding area could threaten the tangible and intangible heritage landscape, as demonstrated by the areas destroyed by the 2004 tsunami (discussed below).

Gentrification is a recurrent issue in the fort and threatens its living culture, which is one of the WH listed OUV. Locals are leaving the fort and giving way to foreigners, impacting on local culture (Samarawickrema 2012; Abeywardana, Court and Thompson 2016). The “most predominant problem facing the urban fabric is the pressure due to developments activated as a result of the change of use of the buildings to accommodate the rapid development in the tourism sector coupled with social uplift” (Mandawala 2015, 13). Manawadu (2011, 1160) notes that


tourist attraction to the township boosted after [the] Fort being declared as a World Heritage [site] had a dual form of impacts, both negative and positive for preservation. On [the] one hand tourism helped to preserve historic landscape and architectural character of the Fort mainly due to reverting of those introvert facades back into their original forms. On the other hand, it encouraged degradation of fort characteristics as a result of attempts for increasing more and more guest accommodations and amenities by means of unlawful constructions, both by encroaching into open spaces and by extending vertically upward.

Such development has negatively impacted the Galle World Heritage site. A greater percentage of residential units are erected inside the Galle fort walls since it becomes a World Heritage Site (Wijeratne 2005), a trend that continues. Restoration of the fort in 2006 inadvertently promoted the fort as a tool for regional development. Although the
restoration project aimed to refurbish and preserve original buildings and historic infrastructure in the fort (including the underground sewer system and the ramparts which were consolidated and documented, to create the Maritime Archaeology Museum), it also performed maintenance services in 60 private homes within the heritage site, 10 per cent of the fort’s housing stock (Manawadu 2011).

Furthermore, World Heritage reports to Sri Lankan state governments have noted that the International Cricket Stadium’s facilities, located immediately within the existing buffer zone, are intrusive to the fort’s authenticity (Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall 2012; WHC 2015d). It used to be a public space and a most “suitable forecourt for the majestic ramparts” (Wijeratne 2005, 6), but today it is privately administered, fenced and with constructions almost as tall as the ramparts. The intention to build a new port in the Galle Harbour (Figure 80) is also considered problematic by most of the heritage experts involved in its heritage impact assessment (Hettiarachchi et al. 2015; Thompson 2015).

Figure 80 - Galle Harbor. Photo by author, 2014.

As mentioned, Galle was affected by the 2004 tsunami, which killed thousands of Sri Lankans and visitors, injured and displaced thousands more, destroyed homes and
workplaces and disrupted the lives of countless people. Sri Lankan priest Father Damian Arsakularatne argues that the Galle Fort was hugely important during the disaster: “if the fort would not have been there [protected by its high walls], oh my God, I can’t even imagine the damage that would have been, it saved us” (quoted in Breece 2014, 2). The WHC (2002, 1) further noted that “thanks to the ramparts…the Old Town suffered only relatively minor damages from the Tsunami, especially compared to the massive extent of destruction caused by the disaster along the coast around the World Heritage property, where thousands lost their lives.” Galle fort itself suffered minor damage, with some of the buildings flooded, ramparts walls damaged in several places and the underground sewer destroyed in two parts (Giudice 2005; Wijeratne 2005). However, “most of the old buildings in Galle town but outside the fort have been reduced to debris…[and] many unauthorized buildings in the buffer zone were destroyed” (Wijeratne 2005, 5), including the many fishermen’s buildings by the beach and by Galle Harbour, and local heritage sites in Galle town (Hettiarachchi et al. 2015). Giudice (2005, 2) confirms that “the ancient harbour and underwater heritage also ran into difficulty.” The International Cricket Stadium, just outside the fort, was also severely damaged.

Fishing is one of the most important forms of income for the local people, and they are the owners of most of the unauthorised or unplanned buildings in the buffer zone. Those who survived the tsunami lost not only their relatives and their houses but also their livelihoods. After the disaster, the remains of this community had to shift inland due to new safety regulations on setbacks issued by the Sri Lankan government, but in 2015 many returned to the beach. Jayawardane (2006, 6) affirms that “most victims tend to return to their original homes or lands after the disaster, but more often they become victims once again due to such recurring events.” Hettiarachchi et al. (2015) confirm the presence of constructions by the shore and affirm that “Galle is one of the many coastal cities around the world, which remains heavily exposed to the tsunami hazard. Presence
of poorly constructed buildings and inadequate drainage would have contributed towards increased vulnerability” (14).

The practices of stilt fishermen from the Galle region have recently become a tourist attraction near the fort. The fishermen plant stilts in the reef, tall enough so they can sit and catch fish manually with a rod. Nagodawithana (2007) and Deepananda et al. (2016) agree that the practice is relatively recent, beginning around the 1950s. Nagodawithana notes that “stilt fishing is not only a fishing method – it has become a tourist attraction. There are some ‘fishermen’ who earn a living by posing for photographs” (2007, 3). While this is not an old tradition, the craft of making the rod, the hooks and stilts, and fishing with such devices is today of intangible value, and it “is an example of a community-based management system, and an alternative to the bureaucratic, centrally managed coastal fisheries in Sri Lanka.” (Deepananda et al. 2016, 289). This added a new layer of culture to the cultural landscape produced by the traditional neighbouring communities of a heritage site that represents the transient character of local cultural values, where fishermen found alternative means of subsistence during times of hardship and also creatively engaging with a more recent industry, the tourism. This practice indicates community resilience in the face of the pressures of tourism, environmental degradation, and climate change. Deepananda et al. (2016) argue that fisher knowledge is not normally included in the development of management plans and “opportunities exist to set up a proper baseline for the management of artisanal coastal fisheries with the ultimate aim of incorporating traditional fisher knowledge into management decision making” (288). That would align with decision making under the community stewardship and management mentioned in Chapter Five.
Overview of environmental threats

Urbanisation, informal communities and anthropogenic risk

In many low and middle-income countries, urban poverty manifests in slums and informal settlements (Revi and Rosenzweig 2013, 13). The UN-Habitat (2003) states that those informal settlements “are not a stand-alone phenomenon; they are linked to urban planning and development practices. Most cities, across the low, middle- or high-income countries, face challenges in providing affordable housing and universal service coverage, especially during periods of rapid growth or decline.”

As discussed, informal communities are springing up in the thriving economies of heritage sites due to the ineffective character of some of the established policies and citizens’ pressing needs. This growth is even more problematic in countries where rapid urbanisation is not matched by the government’s capacity to provide infrastructure, housing and urban services. The anthropogenic hazards associated with neighbouring and informal communities expose fragile urban heritage sites. Such hazards include visual, environmental and cultural impacts on urban heritage sites, such as the occupation of safety setback zones set by the government agencies to protect residents in disaster-prone areas, and buffer zones set by heritage agencies to protect heritage sites’ integrity, authenticity and also from environmental threats, lack of infrastructure, pollution, and environmental degradation. Threats to heritage sites can also “come from several sources, for example on-shore and upland land uses that degrade water quality or cause silting at a coastal or marine site” (Perry and Falzon 2014, 48). Rapid urbanisation results in pressures such as intensity and rate of change, unsustainable use of resources and biodiversity loss. Revi and Rosenzweig (2013, 32) note that “managing a continuous influx of people and infrastructure in cities creates pressures on supporting ecosystems both within cities and in their surrounding regions.” Hettiarachchi et al. 2015 (11) further
argue that these “potentially damaging physical events, phenomena or human activities that may cause the loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation.” They also note that “human induced hazards such as oil spills in the vicinity of coastlines have serious impacts on the coastal zones” (11), particularly important for the case studies discussed here.

Jayawardane (2006, 6) argues that in Sri Lanka’s south-west “unplanned development and land use, ad-hoc human settlement and lack of implementation of even the existing regulations have caused severe encroachments into floodplains and unstable slopes making inhabiting people constantly vulnerable.” Perera (2005, 1) further notes that “well before the post-tsunami zoning regulations, the 1981 Coast Conservation Law banned construction along the coast. The law had been blatantly violated.” In 2014, new informal constructions made of unprotected clay bricks, concrete and flat roofs, arose along the stretch of land by the historical harbour between the reconstructed Sea Street and the ocean, occupied mostly by fishermen (Figure 81). Khazai et al. (2006) affirm that “it was the housing of the very poor that was most affected [in the 2004 tsunami], both because of inferior quality and also because it was located virtually on the coast where land is not regulated” (in Hettiarachchi et al. 2015, 33). The practice of building where land is not regulated, also represents that there is a differential between laws that don't 'work' and others that are ignored (that may have worked, either as they stood or with amendment) owing to corruption or other socio-political factors. In Galle, Vasai and the other case studies of this thesis, the ineffective character of some of the established policies ultimately contribute to the increased number of vulnerable people, in the event of a disaster.
Inside the Galle Fort, change of use and intrusive development has been an ongoing threat. “From the beginning of the 20th century, while still, the fort was under British dominance, it began to display consequences of rapid developments, haphazardly altering built heritage, thus threatening the authentic historic characteristics of the township” (Manawadu 2011, 159). Vacant lots and verandahs encroached on open spaces. “Road widening to enable vehicular movement, encroaching narrow front spaces into roads, seemed to have aggravated the situation, encouraging more and more occupants to convert their houses to introvert residential units” (159). Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall (2012, 98) affirm that “repairs to a number of buildings in the old town have been completed while other significant buildings continue to decay and inappropriate illegal alterations and constructions are taking place.” Moreover, Abeywardana, Court and Thompson (2016, 14) conclude
many abandoned buildings within the Fort; [and] buildings in the Fort that have undergone inappropriate modifications by residents. Both are a result of the local community not finding institutional representatives for heritage management able to accompany measured change to facilitate modern ways of life without eroding cultural values.

The authors argue that "site management still often takes a more material based rather than a values-based approach and community perspectives are rarely integrated into management planning” (13). This brings back the issue raised in Chapter Five of community stewardship and management, and also investment should be focused in training of local people on local heritage values.

**Buffer zones & informal communities**

Heritage buffer zones are generally characterised by green areas such as parks, forests, and are formed as safety setbacks – to protect sites and users from environmental disasters. These green spaces are intended to preserve ambience and protect areas unsafe for construction. However, the combination of green areas, an urban housing deficit, and ineffective government supervision can make buffer zones the perfect locations for the uncontrolled sprawl of the urban poor (Yuen and Kong 2009). The formation of informal communities in the vacant areas surrounding heritage sites, expose the sites to anthropogenic risks associated with those communities and increase their vulnerability to natural disasters. In Rio for example, landslides are common, partly owing to the disruption of soil and removal of native vegetation when unplanned development occurs (see Chapter Four). Likewise, Vasai Koliwada occupies the stretch of land between the fort walls and the ocean and fills in the fort’s moat and local creeks with rubbish and raw sewage (Figure 82), is vulnerable to flooding, diminishes local natural resources from which the community members extract their livelihood (fish and mussels) (Mehta and Amin 2008), and impacts directly on the health of the community.
Unsustainable use of resources, biodiversity loss and government neglect have been major threats to Vasai. Peke (2013, 13) explains that “pollution of creeks and rivers has deprived the women of their supplementary income of fishing for crabs and shell fish.” Karmarkar (2010, 4) notes that “environmental degradation of creek, coastal and seawater ecosystems as well as various international and domestic policies endangered traditional fishing activity. Consequently, various issues of livelihood and survival of the indigenous fishermen [and women] community have surfaced in Vasai.” Further, “the upstream flow of Ulhas [river, leading up to Vasai creek] runs through the industrial zones…where huge amount of chemical and hazardous water is dumped in the creek water. Similarly, illegal dumping of solid domestic (municipal) waste is also observed” (18). Water pollution near Vasai fort is “alarmingly high” with pollution of heavy metals coming from upriver industries resulting in depletion of marine life and habitat destruction (Mehta and Amin 2008, 32). Consequently, the pollution of Vasai Creek and other creeks inside Vasai
Koliwada is part of a much bigger picture, out of the control of the local community. Koli tangible and intangible culture is also threatened by government neglect:

At a time when fishermen still lose their lives at sea for want of a simple lighthouse, state governments authorise and support gigantic port projects for international trawlers, whose mass fishing techniques plunder the oceans leaving one environmental catastrophe after another in their wake. And at the local level, development projects and urbanisation threaten seaside settlements in almost every Koliwada (Koli hamlet) in the city. (Warhaft 2001, 215)

However, “the Kolis highlight their indigenous status to claim or protect hereditary rights to fish from the Bay, and they do this in formal and informal ways. A section of the Indian Easement Act provides legal assurance to the Koli community that the water of the Bay be preserved without preventable disturbance” (220).

**Urbanisation, informal communities and natural disaster risk**

The effects of natural disasters near heritage precincts, in areas such as the polluted Vasai Creek or the fragile coast of Galle, are magnified by the overdevelopment of informal communities. The United Nations Inter-Agency Secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR 2005, 5) states that

rapid urbanization shapes disaster risks through a complex association of concentrated populations, social exclusion and poverty compounded by physical vulnerability. This can be seen in the consequences of unsuited land use, inadequate protection of urban infrastructure, ineffective building code enforcement, poor construction practices and limited opportunities to transfer or spread risk.

Yuen and Kong (2009) provide examples of climate-related hazards in Myanmar, Indonesia and the Philippines, including heavy rainfall, typhoons and floods, which also pose threats to the case study sites discussed here. They argue that in Southeast Asia, informal communities located in disaster-prone areas or sites unsafe for construction generate further risks to life, health and property and leave them vulnerable to climate change.
A heritage site may be more at risk from the secondary effects of a disaster, than from the disaster itself (Jha 2010). Such effects include infrastructure repairs, looting or rescue or relief measures that disregard heritage value and local cultures, sometimes diminishing livelihoods and social connections associated with heritage precincts and its local communities. Holgersson (2013, 3) described the secondary destruction effects that followed the 2004 tsunami in Sri Lanka as “the second wave.”

Wijeratne et al. (2005) stress the importance of the reconstruction of the physical environment at the time of a disaster, noting that “in catastrophes of this nature, there is an important socio-psychological and a socio-cultural need for local communities and individuals to see and feel that the familiar environment with which they identify are not totally wiped out” (236). They argue that “maintaining the familiar’ is one of the most valuable components of the entire restorative process, helping to ‘keep one's moorings’, to retain identity, to engender and strengthen a psychology of survival and recovery in the face of great destruction.” Reconstructing the surroundings of a heritage site after a disaster helps to gather local communities back into their homes and livelihood, and enhances the community’s essential vitality, which is imperative for the recovery process.

Threats to intangible traditions resulting from a disaster or less-than-sensitive post-disaster recovery projects must also be considered. For example, cosmology guides Sri Lankan daily life. Holgersson (2013, 70) explains that “in local traditions, homemaking involves reciprocal relations with the earth and the spirit world. These relations are essential for creating an ordered, bounded space around the household and a safe and ‘proper’ home for its dwellers.” Such beliefs were ignored when new houses were built by aid agencies for returning local fisherman. Holgersson (2013, 79) argues that “important local social and cosmological relations and webs of reciprocity that have
bearing upon ‘a good/safe home’. If successful relocation (from a beneficiary perspective) is to be achieved this should be taken into account by policy makers and implementers.”

Urbanisation, informal communities and climate change
According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2013, 20), climate change over the 21st century “is projected to increase displacement of people. Displacement risk increases when populations that lack the resources for planned migration experience higher exposure to extreme weather events, in both rural and urban areas, particularly in developing countries with low income.” In other words, climate change exacerbates poverty and increases inequality, directly impacting informal communities and, by extension, heritage sites. Although climate change is not the sole or most immediate threat to cultural heritage and its local communities, “it imposes increased or alternative disasters and trends of stress” (Welling et al. 2015, 9). UN-Habitat (2007, 1) observes that the “urbanization process can modify the hazard profile of the city directly through the urbanisation of hill slopes and floodplains, but also indirectly as the impacts of climate change hit cities.” Hill slopes and floodplains are the typical locations of informal communities, particularly those in the cases studies discussed here.

Consequently, climate change will exacerbate the hazard profiles of cities and the threats faced by heritage sites and their informal communities. Bigio (2015, 113) notes that although cities contribute disproportionately to climate change, “they are also being increasingly impacted by the consequences of climate change.” He argues that

the impacts on cities directly related to climate change, include sea-level rise, coastal erosion and marine inundation; increase in the frequency and intensity of coastal cyclones and hurricanes; intensification of the urban heat-island effect and of periodic heat-waves; more frequent and intense episodes of precipitation and related flooding and mudslides; changes to the water cycle with consequences on fresh water availability; the deterioration of urban eco-systems; and the increase in vector-borne diseases with impacts on urban public health (114).
Asia is already considered to be the region most prone to natural disasters (Cohen et al. 2008). Jigyasu (2014, 1) argues that “India is vulnerable, in varying degrees, to a larger number of natural disasters, and this has been exacerbated by dramatic changes to the landscape”:

Out of [India’s] total landmass, 58.6 per cent is prone to earthquakes of moderate to very high intensity; over 40 million hectares (12 per cent of land) is prone to floods and river erosion; of the 7,516-km-long coastline, close to 5,700km is prone to cyclones and tsunamis;… An expanding population, intensified urbanization and industrialization, development within high-risk zones, environmental degradation, and climate change, have only heightened India’s vulnerability to the risks from natural disasters. (2)

Further, climate change significantly affects coastal areas, such as those examined in this thesis. Welling et al. (2015, 6) note that “some of the most visible consequences of climate change are occurring along coastal and fluvial systems with increased rates of erosion events that threaten the preservation of archaeological and other cultural heritage resources.” Combined with rapid urban expansion, coastal heritage sites are particularly vulnerable. For example, Peke (2013, 13) observes that “coastal areas near Mumbai are rapidly developing due to a growing urban population.” Extreme weather, floods and sea level rise already effect Galle and Vasai and the sea level in Galle is expected to rise 0.60m in the next 100 years (Sri Lanka 2009). Hettiarachchi et al. (2015, 14) further argue that climate change increases “episodic hazards include severe storms, earthquakes, tsunamis and oil spills all of which have limited predictability and may result in major disasters.” The 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami that hit Galle demonstrated the catastrophic effects of climate change on the city, opening an opportunity for government agencies to prepare for the future.

As discussed, “climate change exacerbates existing inequalities. Indigenous peoples and marginalized populations are particularly exposed and vulnerable to climate change impacts due to their resource-based livelihoods and the location of their
homelands in marginal environments” (Perry and Falzon 2014, 14). This is particularly true in Galle and in Vassai.

Yet it is not “climate change” alone that is the villain, for the effects that endanger communities are practically always the amplification by a changing climate of existing environmental degradation, over-exploitation of a natural resources base, urban and industrial encroachment into ecological commons that have long survived because of the caution thriftiness of its humans stewards. (Goswani 2015, 32)

Climate change has a ripple effect that impacts the historic core of the urban ecosystem even as it generates hidden costs compromising the broader city’s sustainability. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2010, 75), “in general, these costs will hit cities and their competitiveness. Because of the difficulty of estimating the value of non-market entities and services, costs of lost ecosystems and cultural heritage, as well as health-related impacts, are often ignored in economic studies.” Bartlett (2011) adds that one of the biggest impacts of climate change on low-income countries is health. These health effects result from physical hazards generated by floods, landslides, and so on, as well as “from extreme temperatures, increased risk of some diseases and constraints on food availability” (672). Health risks impact socio-economic activities such as agriculture, fishery and tourism and affect communities’ social, physical and economic lives near heritage environments.

The importance of effective heritage disaster management

Current policy inconsistencies

The need for a comprehensive management plan, including the Heritage Urban Landscape (Bandarin and Oers, 2015) is crucial for effective management of heritage at risk of disastrous events. A disaster risk management plan needs to be in place to safeguard people and conserve tangible and intangible cultural heritage. It should include the people responsible for the maintenance of local identity and enhance social and historical value. Jigyasu (2014b, 2) notes that “disaster risk management has emerged as
a formal sector in India, public policies and institutional systems have been set up at national, state, and district levels, with tools and procedures for risk assessments, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery.” However, he cautions that they are predominantly top-down, an issue encountered in most case studies of this thesis.

In 1997, a Coastal Zone Management Plan revised the Galle Coast Conservation Law and defined a buffer area lying within the limit of 300m landwards of the mean high-water line and a limit of 2 km seaward of the mean low-water line, prohibiting any development activity within the coastal zone without a permit from the Coast Conservation officers. However, as Jayawardane (2005, 3) stresses, “law enforcement was not very effective for several reasons resulting in ad-hoc construction within the coastal zone.” Oversight by local authorities combined with urban poverty, growth of informal settlements, spatial expansion, inadequate infrastructure and development priorities contributed to the magnitude of the 2004 tsunami. The failure of urban authorities to enforce building codes and land-use planning renders cities particularly vulnerable (Cohen et al. 2008). Cohen et al. argue that land-use planning is an effective instrument that city authorities can employ to reduce disaster risk by controlling the expansion of settlements into hazardous locations. However, “in large cities of middle-income countries, the high proportion of citizens are forced to reside in informal settlements where activities operate outside the formal planning and regulatory systems are particularly challenging for building control” (22).

After the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, a safety setback rule was established along much of the Sri Lankan coast (Wijeratne 2005; Holgersson 2013; Breece 2014). The rule was intended to safeguard against future loss of life, housing and livelihoods. However, it introduced patterns of inequality and hardship created by the displacement of communities from their original locations, separating people from familiar social groups.
and relocating families distant from their livelihoods (Holgersson 2013:74). Breece (2014) notes that

the government proclaimed that there was to be a buffer zone of 100 metres from the ocean where there would be ban on any new buildings. The buffer zones turned out to be problematic in many ways and according to Arsakularatne, they actually prolonged the reconstruction plans. There was no clear idea about where to resettle those who had previously been living on or near the beach. Most of them were fishermen, and for them to resettle further inland was hardly an option. Slowly people made their way back, closer to the shoreline, and the government simply changed the buffer zone regulation, first to 50 metres and then 30. In some cases settlement is now basically back on the beach, particularly so if tourism is involved. (1)

A policy is only as good as its enforcement. Even one year after the disaster, “only the tourism industry [was] allowed to rebuild (on the Sri Lankan coast)” (Prasad quoted in AAP 2005, 1). As seen in Chapter Five, some governments countries often allow the tourism industry to overshadow the needs of local communities. In Galle, tourism-related new constructions were rebuilt on waterfront sites, and fishing communities relocated to government lands far away from the ocean (Figure 83).

![Figure 83 - New constructions by the beach in Galle. Photo by author, 2014.](image)

Although perceptions and significance of the importance of buffer zones and safety setbacks changed in Sri Lanka following the tsunami, buffer zones recommendations in
Galle have been repeatedly ignored. An area covering a 1.5-kilometre radius from the harbour, including the original harbour, the fort and two ancient monastery buildings, was recommended as a buffer (Somadeva 2007). Neither this extended buffer zone, a buffer that included the historical harbour and its shipwrecks, proposed by the Galle Heritage Foundation (Mandawala 2015), or the safety setback proposed by the government after the 2004 tsunami disaster was enacted (Holgersson 2013, 74). They are demonstrating an oversight again from authorities to expert’s advice and future planning.

**Informal communities and disaster management**

Preserved historic urban sites listed by the World Heritage Committee are normally well protected physically – their parameters are usually well-defined and their buildings and infrastructure maintained. They are recognised as valuable assets and so are well-looked after. Additionally, heritage sites are normally more resistant to physical damage owing to their long existence. However, this is not always true for the informal communities located near heritage sites, which are usually unregulated and poorly constructed. As discussed, informal communities are usually inhabited by people struggling to survive. Yuen and Kong (2009, 4) argue that “without effective management, rapid urban growth is expected to exacerbate existing problems of poverty, slums, pollution, water, sanitation, etc. With few exceptions, most municipalities cannot cope with challenges of rapid urbanization.” The combination of rapid urban growth, inadequate infrastructure, and climate-related threats (such as extreme weather events, floods, and rising sea levels) increases the overall risks for those living in informal communities and hence the heritage sites they surround.

Consequently, any management plans related to an Urban Heritage Landscape should engage with informal communities and other minorities, such as fisherfolks noted earlier in this chapter. Hettiarachchi et al. (2015, 11) suggest that “communities should
be made aware of the types of hazards their characteristics and should be educated on the importance of preparedness in responding to potential disasters in particular when faced with the rapid onset of extreme events.” Not only the potentially disastrous effects should be made aware to stakeholders, but also the cultural values of the place and its potential hazardous effect if not maintained. Kawakami, Weise and Dingwall (2012) note that "communities are better positioned to be directly involved in addressing critical issues because they know the site conditions best" (99). This is confirmed by neighbouring and informal communities that are highly engaged in the cultural dynamics of sites, are usually the ones responsible for the recovery of the heritage places after a catastrophic event (Bandarin and Oers 2015).

Local communities also provide knowledge and expertise when dealing with natural threats. Fisherfolk like the Kolis in Vasai and the stilt fisherman in Galle have long-term relationships with the ocean, accumulated through the years and knowledge transmitted throughout generations about surviving through change. “Traditional knowledge, developed over centuries, enables certain communities to recognize subtle changes in the atmosphere, or the behaviour of flora and fauna, and prepare themselves accordingly” (Jigyasu et al. 2013, 21). However, Goswani (2015, 32) cautions that “the rate of change is reaching at times beyond the capacities of communities, the strength of their intangible cultural heritage and the depth of their local knowledge.” Hence the call of this thesis for community empowerment.

Further, cultural places provide support to those in need, especially to those communities located in their environments. After the 2004 tsunami, Giudice (2005, 2) affirmed that “religious monuments along the coast, damaged by the tsunami, are surrounded by tents of survivors”, reflecting attempts at, as Wijeratne et al. (2005, 236) calls it, “maintaining the familiar.” Consequently,
the rich expression of heritage is also a powerful means to help victims recover from the psychological impact of the disaster. In such situations, people search desperately for identity and self esteem. Traditional social networks that provide mutual support and access to collective assets are extremely effective coping mechanism for community members. (Bandarin and Oers 2015, 142)

Well-managed recoveries include the community, bring revenue and jobs after a disaster, and enhance the community’s pride and identity. For example, restoration of Galle Fort by local craftsmen has built the professional capacity of the community:

Technology transfer to the community, which indirectly sustained the regional development, was an outcome of the project. Few skilled craftsmen and artisans from the community were taught the way of handling of old and historic buildings, and were given hands-on experience at various conservation projects sites in the country, before deploying in preservation of old houses in the Fort of Galle. (Manawadu 2011, 1161)

Affected communities use cultural properties as places to relocate after a disaster and as an incentive to strengthen community pride and social connection, providing a sense of continuity and identity.

Policy and disaster management

Despite constant warnings and reports from heritage experts and the World Heritage Committee of threats regarding climate change and natural disasters (Cohen et al. 2008; UNESCO 2010; Jha, 2010; Jigyasu 2013; Perry and Falzon 2014; Welling et al. 2015), heritage management rarely thinks beyond the buffer zone. The ability to manage and preserve heritage sites in the face of pollution, environmental degradation, natural disasters, and climate change depends on legal support by government departments, including the implementation of land-use planning and integrated management plans including assessment of urban risks that may affect the site.

Perry and Falzon (2014) and Welling et al. (2015) have demonstrated that a well-designed monitoring system, evaluation and an up-to-date management plan provide the best strategies to deal with a heritage property facing such threats. While serving as an
early warning system, such plans also allow managers to be proactive in reducing negative impacts when possible. Bigio (2015) suggests an “entire agglomeration” approach that is consistent with the Heritage Urban Landscape (UNESCO 2005):

The assessment of urban risk and the response in terms of adaptation to climate change and resilience to natural hazards will have therefore to be developed for the entire agglomeration with a special lens and attention to the valuable historic parts of the city. (Bigio 2015, 115)

Mitigation programs should include local responses, preventive maintenance, emergency preparedness, realistic expectations, adaptations and urban resilience. UNISDR (2005, 15) confirms that “land-use planning has proven [to be] an essential tool for disaster reduction by involving risk assessment, environmental management, productive livelihoods and development activities.” Considering the integrity and authenticity of communities and places, local vibrancy and identity can be recovered, only when “combined interests of risk management, environment, professional and technical abilities, investment and development working for a common purpose, with success closely linked to perceptions about the immediate territorial or community conditions they share” (UNISDR 2005,16). Every potential disaster zone should anticipate and address vulnerabilities, keeping risk assessments and impact statements up to date. Governments will have to invest in strategies to increase the resilience of sites and communities.

According to the IPCC (2013, 5), “resilience is the capacity of social, economic, and environmental systems to cope with a hazardous event or trend or disturbance, responding and reorganising in ways that maintain their essential function, identity, and structure, while also maintaining the capacity for adaptation, learning, and transformation.” Heritage sites, with their long histories and strong community engagement, are brilliant examples of resilience. Heritage urban areas, plans and policies must ensure low ecological impact, respect zoning regulations and avoid new
encroachments on heritage properties. Cohen et al. (2008, 37) suggest that “stronger governance systems, legal instruments and capacity for oversight and enforcement are necessary to support implementation of land-use planning.” Protecting the environment around heritage sites also empowers the communities that depend upon the natural resources, preserve traditional knowledge and guarantee that tourism continues to generate revenue.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed the impact of disasters on communities and the environment near two heritage sites in Vasai and Galle. In addition to economic growth, heritage communities such as these must prepare for the effects of climate change. Community empowerment is key for sustainable and resilient heritage management. Rather than concentrating opportunities in specific areas, “policies should amplify the interaction between leading and lagging areas” (Lall and Astrup 2009, 2) and most importantly, act locally. They should be followed by the increase in education, health and improvement of infrastructure. Jigyasu et al. (2013, 15) conclude that cultural heritage is “closely connected to the fundamental components of an inclusive social development”, and therefore enhancing the importance of those communities to the maintenance of local identity and increasing their resilience in case of a disastrous event.

In this chapter, like chapters Four and Five, I sought to demonstrate the dynamics derived from ineffective legislation and not implemented policies, where in Galle clearly resulted in a more disastrous effect after the 2004 Tsunami and highlighted the vulnerability of the Vasai Koliwada. In the next chapter I will focus on the findings of this study and conclude with strategic recommendations to inform policies aiming at integrating neighbouring communities into a wider framework of development.
7. Diverse Layers of Heritage

Cities, like dreams, are made of desires and fears, even if the thread of their discourse is secret, their rules are absurd, their perspectives deceitful, and everything conceals something else.

(Calvino 1978, 44)

This study has discussed the aesthetic, socioeconomic, and environmental dynamics that connect heritage centres to their surrounding communities. These dynamics are as much a part of the urban heritage landscape as the historical sites, buildings, architecture and intangible culture. Several case studies were used to illustrate the challenges for architectural and cultural heritage management in medium-income countries where accelerated informal and unauthorised urban growth occurs. The challenges discussed include rapid urban growth in the buffer zones of heritage sites, threats to heritage authenticity and integrity by tourism, inadequate and ineffective land-planning; anthropogenic threats such as deforestation, social unrest, occupation of green areas, pollution, biodiversity loss, and siltation; natural disasters derived from inadequate land use such as flooding, coastal erosion, and landslides; disasters derived from climate change such as the rise of sea levels, increase in the frequency and intensity of coastal cyclones and hurricanes, and natural disasters such as earthquakes and tsunamis.

The necessity of this study lies in understanding the challenges faced for managing heritage sites in such rapidly changing contexts. Heritage properties are neither completely static nor ever truly authentic, and generations of inhabitants contribute to the formation, consolidation and changefulness of heritage. Heritage centres form through cultural evolution and reflect the contributions, enterprise and values of many people who
have lived in or near them. It thus becomes unreasonable and impractical to expect them to remain ‘true’ to or be representative of a particular period or style. Transience is an inherent character of heritage sites, and their neighbouring informal communities contribute to their identity and vitality. This research shows that heritage always arises from interactions between people and their environment – whether ‘natural’ or urban. Urban sites and architecture enjoyed by successive generations leave identifiable physical remains of cultural identities easily comprehended by the broader population. Urban growth adjacent to heritage centres can, therefore, have a range of positive effects for the community, tourism, economic development, and local traditions.

This research has provided a comparative analysis of heritage sites at former Portuguese colonies in Brazil, India and Sri Lanka. The built environments of heritage sites and their surroundings were investigated, framed by an architectural and urban planning approach. This approach adopted a holistic perspective on the heritage of urban environments, considering the relationships between built form, public spaces and the many layers of historical artefacts and meanings that contribute to local cultural identity. Hence, it discussed the aesthetic, socioeconomic, and environmental concerns impacting on the urban heritage that require balanced management based on policies-based assessment, including ethics, social justice, and urban vulnerability.

The research explored the contributions that neighbouring communities make to heritage sites, with specific attention to those located in places experiencing accelerated urban growth. It examined the effects of the emergence of unauthorized and informal communities on the material and cultural values of heritage sites, their relationships to heritage integrity and authenticity, and the threats faced by heritage sites and their neighbouring communities when they are located in disaster-prone areas. The history of existing international legal and institutional heritage frameworks was established, facilitating analysis and recommendations for change at policy and planning levels, aimed
at more holistic management within a larger development context. Throughout this thesis, heritage was addressed through three interlinked themes, (1) heritage as a register of transience, (2) heritage integrity and authenticity, and (3) heritage vulnerability.

This final chapter summarises the observational findings of the thesis and provides answers to the research questions set out in the introduction, specifically:

1. How does the informal unauthorised built form of today contribute to or detract from the heritage value of sites?

2. What is the impact upon local cultural and material wholeness, integrity and authenticity from heavy tourism and neighbouring overdevelopment in heritage sites? and

3. How are heritage sites made vulnerable by the neglect of low socio-economic level communities, combined with the impact of environmental stresses?

In this final chapter, additional case study comparisons are made that enrich the conclusions made in each Chapter. The significance and timeliness of the research are reinforced, and policy recommendations are made. The chapter concludes with a statement of a holistic and inclusive ‘best practice’ approach for managing heritage sites. Finally, directions for future research are recommended, and final reflections on the challenges posed by this complex and multilayered cultural heritage study are discussed. The thesis’ research reinforces the importance of informal communities inhabiting adjacent to cultural landscape, previously considered unexceptional, as a vital part of the modern heritage.
Targeting an evolutionary process in urban heritage centres

As outlined in the thesis introduction, three primary research questions drove this study. They are explicitly answered in the following section.

1. How does the informal unauthorised built form contribute to or detract from the heritage value of sites?

The challenge of managing heritage sites in rapidly growing urban centres is so great that the whole local community must be responsible, through the incorporation of comprehensive and inclusive procedures for managing local heritage values. These procedures must also be reinforced by positive and effective governmental leadership. Informal communities have both tangible and intangible effects on heritage sites. In Paraty, Brazil, the heritage centre is isolated by physical boundaries, including rivers to the north and south and the ocean in the east, therefore safeguarding the historical centre from the encroachment of new constructions. A chained gate circumscribes the historic centre at the western boundary, but the chaos of the informal part of the city is manifest beyond this physical boundary within its buffer zone. These physical boundaries also operate as social boundaries, dividing the local community between those who live in the centre and those who do not.

In Goa, the World Heritage Site complex is located within a palm forest, and the heritage buildings can be seen rising above the surrounding palm trees, which form a green frame to the white church towers. The impacts or the lack of government control results in tall, high-density buildings constructed around the heritage site, which cannot compete for visual pre-eminence. Additionally, although the forest canopy appears whole and aesthetically pleasing, a wide range of intrusive additions such as parking lots, pilgrim camps, solid waste, and market stalls, are present within the World Heritage Site complex and in the buffer zone in Goa. Here the informal unauthorised built form is detracting from the heritage value of the site.
Accelerated urban growth can also drive poorer communities to reside in disaster-prone areas, which creates complex threats to the built and cultural heritage. As seen in Chapter Four, urban growth in central Rio occurs mostly in the hills where fear of landslides is a daily reality during the heavy summer rains and worsened by the poor construction methods and rubbish accumulation. The Vasai Koliwadas occupy the floodplain between the ocean and the fort and are therefore subject to flooding worsened by the devastation of the surrounding natural mangroves. Information sessions and training with the communities should inform the locals on the types of hazards they are exposed to, to educate them on the importance of risk preparedness for potentially disastrous events, how to mitigate further stress, such as deforestation, rubbish accumulation, pollution, and others, and most importantly, to educate them on the effects of visual pollution on the heritage landscape. In both cases, the areas occupied by those communities are buffer zones of heritage sites and disaster-prone areas, where growth resulted from an ineffective character of the policies establishing those safety areas. For those reasons, both case studies, the Providencia Hill favela and the Vasai Koliwada, are cases where the informal unauthorised built form is detracting from the heritage value of sites. However, the impact is ameliorated by the cultural contribution added by the vibrancy of those communities. This is then a case where heritage is both an outcome and a register of transience.

The dynamism between informal growth and heritage management in Rio de Janeiro and Paraty, Brazil, is discussed in Chapter Four. The informal communities, the favelas, in those centres occupy the vacant zones and build virtually free from government control or construction safety procedures. In a hilly centre such as Rio, informal urban growth happens in national park forests or steep green areas where construction is restricted, mostly for safety reasons. In Paraty, most building happens in the heritage
centre’s buffer zones. However, in both cases, informal communities are important producers of heritage assets. Such communities have existed in Rio for more than a century and characterised the city’s heritage. Rio City Centre is no longer the colonial town of the 1700s, the capital of the Portuguese empire of the 1800s, or the modernist town of the 1950s – it is an assemblage of all these periods, including the favelas. The cultural contribution of such local communities to heritage sites must be recognised and acknowledged in a heritage site’s management plans. Informal communities must be partners in decision making processes about their local heritage.

In Rio, as in Paraty, many policies and legal instruments exist along with professional planning, architecture and engineering agencies to regulate and restrict constructions in dangerous zones, on private property, and in natural green areas (PCRJ 2009). Nonetheless, communities continue to grow in those areas. Reasons for this include a lack of private and public cooperation, poorly integrated management plans that fail to include informal communities, inadequate and weak public governance who may not act in the interests of impoverished communities, and funding provision to ineffective housing estates (Abreu and Brakel 1998, Valladares 2008). The enormous housing deficit in these areas often outweighs government efforts. Some governmental administrations in Rio have intervened through re-urbanisation and resettlement schemes directed at favelas, some of which were inclusive of those communities. Inclusive schemes (e.g. Favela Bairro, Morar Carioca) accepted the informal character of the constructions and provided services and infrastructure to the communities such as paving (Figure 84), rainwater collection, power, sewage and garbage collection, among others (Magalhaes 2010; Lara 2013).
Figure 84 - Concrete paving and rainwater collection installed at Providencia Hill, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Image in the public domain; Photograph provided by Museu da Favela RJ/divulgação, 2015.

Earlier policies and practices (see Chapter Four) assisted the existing *favelas*, but cultural heritage was not included in the programs. Heritage-listed buildings in Rio, or Paraty, are normally well looked after and protected from urban threats such as graffiti, arson or looting, reflecting the pronounced social value attached to them. However, Rio’s and Paraty’s heritage buildings are not protected from natural threats exacerbated from rapid informal growth, such as flooding, landslides, extreme weather events and pollution. Weak public governance struggles to cater for all and low economic investment in poorer communities perpetuates the vicious circle of informal growth.

Informal occupation challenges the heritage centres’ historical and symbolic value, with chaotic communities adding pressure to the heritage material. In contrast, they have social value, facilitating connections between people and heritage and strengthening community identity. In Rio, *favelas* have contributed to the accretions of culture amassed by the heritage centre over its history. The aesthetic value of *favelas* has been recently
recognised with national and local heritage listing its material and intangible culture such as carnival, samba, and local arts and crafts (Figure 85), corroborating their social, historical and symbolic significance.

Figure 85 - *Favela* museum, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Image in the public domain; Photograph provided by Museu da Favela RJ/divulgação, 2015.
2. **What is the impact upon local cultural and material wholeness, integrity and authenticity from heavy tourism and neighbouring overdevelopment in heritage sites?**

As discussed in Chapter Five, the unique Indo-Portuguese architecture of Western India generates tourism, which ultimately results in economic returns for local communities. Cultural tourism can bring economic development of neighbouring communities to heritage sites around the world as proven in Goa. However, the authenticity and integrity of heritage sites are constantly challenged by heavy tourism, contributing to a vicious circle of rising tourism opportunities, migration to areas close to economic opportunities, increasing housing demand, generating neighbouring overdevelopment, and environmental stress. Tourism branding also challenges the authenticity and integrity of a heritage site by changing the built environment to cater for a tourism audience, affecting the local real estate market, and promoting gentrification. As seen in the case studies, tourism also increases unauthorised informal urban development.

Figure 86 - View of Nani Daman from Moti Daman across the Daman Ganga river, India. It shows the prominent building developments on the background of the fort. Photo by author, 2014.
Alternatively, inclusive cultural heritage tourism, managed by or with the guidance of the traditional communities increases equity and prosperity. It encourages historically relevant educational interpretation and creates an additional source of much-needed income to local communities, threatened by the loss of their traditional subsistence lifestyles as a result of aggressive tourism and market forces. Cultural heritage tourism led by local communities already exists in the quilombos in Paraty, the favelas in Rio, coastal communities in Goa and the fishing communities in Galle.

Tourism that is well executed, with comprehensive, research-based management plans, empowers local stakeholders and contributes to sustainable development. Public-private partnerships and capacity building training empowers communities to deal with change and more effectively manage their tangible and intangible heritage. As Jigyasu (2014a, 171) explains, “capacity building includes interpretation and communication techniques, heritage impact assessment and preventive conservation techniques.” Such
capacity building assists locals to take ownership of their sites, maintain heritage, and reinforce the connection of the younger generation with their traditions and identity (Figure 88).

Figure 88 - Traditional performance at Campinho quilombo in Paraty, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Reproduced by permission from Paraty tours (paraty tours.com.br).

Heritage sites in Goa are already affected by tourism commodification and social exclusion. As described in Chapter Five, Reis Magos Fort and part of the Aguada Fort have inequitable access to and use of heritage areas. Moreover, the ineffective oversight by local authorities affects the integrity of the Churches and Convents of Goa World Heritage Site. Recurrent pilgrimage adds considerable numbers to regular tourist visitation and causes environmental pressures and hazards. Effective integrity management is, therefore, urgent for this and many sites in low and medium-income countries. A holistic management plan must include all stakeholders and be supported by the local community, heritage organisations and government agencies.
3. How are heritage sites made vulnerable by the neglect of low socio-economic level communities, combined with the impact of environmental stresses?

The management of any World Heritage site, and indeed, any heritage site, requires adaptation to climate change impacts, which “depend on the legal and policy support given by government, especially in relation to legal and policy issues that may potentially impact on a site’s integrity, as well as the documentation that establishes its legal status” (Perry and Falzon 2014, 42). Perry and Falzon warn that “this can be a challenging process, but needs to be honestly considered so that a realistic assessment can be made.” The process tends to be complex and onerous because of lack of government cooperation, strategic planning and genuine involvement of stakeholders. Socio-economic differences are particularly significant here. Inadequate government oversight and the overuse of environment and heritage centres by private industries and tourism-related developments depletes resources and displace the urban poor and informal communities that depend on heritage sites. The poor are disadvantaged by the system despite being the target of the government for socio-economic development. Nevertheless, holistic management by heritage managers and local government bodies that consider the Heritage Urban Landscape approach and long-term records includes and raises awareness of the communities that depend on the heritage centre’s ecosystems and resources.

As previously discussed, the urban poor is partly responsible for overdevelopment in disaster-prone areas. The density of population, lack of safety engineering, use of unsafe materials, or insufficient government regulation pose risks to the community and heritage. For example, in Rio, the poorest favela inhabitants occupy more dangerous areas of the hills, areas avoided by those with greater wealth or social opportunity. One of central Rio’s 100-year-old favelas is located near an old quarry, and the removal of shacks made from recycled materials (cardboard, timber panels or tin roof sheets) is constant,
increasing the risk residents face from landslides. Although it is not permitted to build on the site, the government is unable to control growth in the area.

Vasai, India and Galle, Sri Lanka have both been affected by natural disasters that had a greater impact on the neighbouring communities than the more resilient heritage centres (Chapter Six). Vasai Fort was already in ruins prior to the last earthquake due to British colonial interventions: “besides transforming the city into an inaccessible military post (1818-1830), the British speeded the destruction of existing buildings and even blew some of them up” (Rossa 2015e, 3). Therefore, damage to the heritage property from the earthquake and prior extreme weather events did not affect its integrity as much as anthropogenic factors such as government neglect, unsustainable use of resources and biodiversity loss have done and continue to do (Figure 89). The 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami caused minor damage inside the fort area of the Old Town of Galle compared to the devastation right outside the fort, where thousands lost their lives (Figure 90). Both of these heritage centres have proven resilient in the face of natural disasters, but not to anthropogenic hazards, which in themselves exacerbate and can even cause natural disasters, such as in the case of landslides experienced in Rio. The informal communities surrounding these sites are well established in their buffer zones, and as discussed in Chapter Six, comprehensive management plans for the heritage sites that include those communities are paramount in the face of future natural disasters and anthropogenic threats.
Although the Old Town of Galle WHS was relatively unaffected by the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the surroundings were devastated. The massive waves destroyed most of the fishermen’s houses near the harbour, the seventeenth-century fish market, the bus station and the cricket stadium, among other constructions and infrastructures in the
Galle Harbour area (Giudice 2005; Breece 2014; Hettiarachchi et al. 2015). Inhabitants of this zone were vulnerable because of the dense pattern of urbanisation and consequent environmental degradation, and their community was destroyed. They were “left to debris” (Wijeratne 2005, 5; see Chapter Six). In 2015, a series of studies were performed in Galle to identify vulnerability and risk and instruct communities on risk preparedness and resilience (Hettiarachchi et al. 2015). The report argues that “a community which is well informed of the hazards and prepared are less vulnerable because they are able to move away from prior to the hazard sets in or in a better position to respond intelligently to emergency situations” (33). A “comprehensive” management plan for Galle fort was submitted in 2015 as part of a proposal to redevelop Galle Harbour (Thompson 2015), which focuses on the Heritage Site and neglects the fisher community located by the historical harbour, despite their long lasting connection to the place and importance to the heritage character of the area. Hence, they were back in the same area shortly after the 2004 disastrous event (Breece 2014; Hettiarachchi et al. 2015).

Coastal hazard risk management and adaptation planning are essential for managing properties in hazard-prone coastal areas (WAPC 2013), including those with cultural character. Such management establishes context, identifies risks and assesses vulnerability, determines the likelihood and consequences, evaluates risks and adaptations, and finally implements management strategies for monitoring and reviewing performance indicators. It must also be prepared in collaboration with the community: “It is important that once the assets have been identified, their function/service and values reflect the community and stakeholder viewpoint.” (WAPC 2013, 13). Successful implementation of risk management and protection of cultural assets and values requires holistic and sound public administration and governance.
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Vulnerabilities and strategies for protecting the cultural built environment

A sense of place is created from more than an idealised environment or urban and architectural forms alone. Even when similar forms are constructed, each location embodies unique local characteristics and diverse styles, and, therefore, different typologies. That is evident in the architecture derived from Portuguese colonisation, where the Indo-Portuguese style differs from the Brazilian, as well as from the (European) Portuguese architecture. As Mason (2002, 2) explains, “values are produced out of the interaction of an artefact and its contexts; they don’t emanate from the artefact itself.” Heritage is formed by people inhabiting places, making the physical structures unique.

The case studies in this thesis challenge conventional understandings of heritage authenticity and integrity. Each heritage property studied in this thesis has a unique character and identity, linked by a common thread of Portuguese colonial history and culture. However, the Portuguese influence is only one layer of heritage relevant to these properties. The favelas, Koliwadas, and fishing communities in Goa and Sri Lanka contribute with contemporary influences to these properties. Heritage cannot be represented solely in a sequential timeline or a tourist-focused theme park; it must be considered as an ensemble of aggregate influences that have constructed a sense of place, including people’s lives, expectations and memories.

The case studies are also vulnerable to anthropogenic and environmental hazards, indicating areas of heritage sensitivity that require careful planning, design and implementation of development and infrastructure projects. Anthropogenic risks include impacts on heritage vistas and streetscapes, poor services, pollution, and inadequate governance. Heritage persists in multiple areas after rapid development, which requires a nuanced understanding of values and, therefore, interpretation and implementation of legislation accordingly. To illustrate, Galle Fort managers delivered construction and
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heritage training sessions to locals, transforming and empowering the local community to maintain the fort’s material remains. Similarly, the Paraty Quilombolas have been transformed into an arts and crafts centre, which maintains residents’ culture, through traditional farming, regular dance performances and cooking classes, and provides tourist income through shop sales. The Vasai Koliwada fishing community also contributes to the vibrancy of the area; its members engage in the activities of daily life, girls weave baskets by their porches, women carry water pots on their heads from the Fort's well, and fish dry in the sun – enhancing the image of this colourful and lively community and guaranteeing the maintenance of the Koli culture (Warhaft 2001; Karmarkar 2010; Peke 2013). The inclusion of the community in heritage centre maintenance, and decision-making processes and approvals would empower them to take ownership, enhance their quality of life and culture, and reduce risk to their community and the heritage site. If empowered, local communities are able to adapt and profit from the tourism industry by developing their own cultural packages offered to those heritage places they inhabit, train local tour guides, prepare their own tourism guidelines, and encourage entrepreneurship.

Communities surrounding heritage sites rather than the heritage buildings are often hardest hit by natural disasters and effects of climate change and, therefore, it is negligent not to include these communities in risk management plans. The collective sense of identity and social value provided by heritage sites assists in community recovery (and therefore heritage recovery) after a disaster. As seen in Chapter Six, heritage sites are used to relocate communities after a disaster event, for emergency relief, or as a common place where groups can gather to re-establish their connection with others and contribute to survivor solidarity. Thus, heritage sites are important cultural spaces in post-disaster scenarios, and the physical reconstruction of familiar place after a disaster restore socio-psychological and socio-cultural needs of local communities (Wijeratne et al. 2005).
A wide range of effective risk assessment models and risk management reports targeting heritage sites are available for public download, for example at the UNESCO World Heritage Council website. The implementation and accessibility of such models to all stakeholders are crucial for successful natural disaster response at heritage properties located in disaster-prone areas (Jigyasu et al. 2013). However, implementation is challenged by insufficient mapping of community inhabitants or inadequate and ineffective governments who may not act in the interests of a wide range of stakeholders. I reinforce here that by empowering traditional communities and giving them, a voice would protect them from corrupted social-political interests. This should be done by guaranteeing the right of land for traditional communities, enabling and empowering them to preserve their cultural assets and perform their cultural expressions (both tangible and intangible); and ideally, the management of their surrounding assets being under community stewardship. The benefits to these communities of managing their own tourism are to promote sustainable use of resources, educating guests and hosts about the importance of traditional practices, guaranteeing the authenticity of cultural practices and its continuity to future generations and providing funds to the community. Ultimately, cultivating some measure of resilience and contributing to sustainable development.

Validity, outcomes and holistic policy implications for heritage and urban development

The most recent ICOMOS charters – the Paris Declaration (2011) and the Florence Declaration (2015b) – articulate the theoretical underpinnings of inclusive policies that aim for community-driven solutions and local empowerment. They have also been extensively and repeatedly discussed by Jigyasu (2013, 2014a, 2014b). Nonetheless, the kind of ‘bottom-up’ approach recommended by Jigyasu and the charters have not been systematically implemented in many of the case studies, indicating that policy alone does not have the desired impact. This thesis’ observations demonstrate that low-income and
informal communities continue to be excluded from a community-driven approach. However, on a more positive note, the cultural contributions of local groups at some sites have been recognised such as the Divine Holy Spirit’s Party and the *Quilombolas* performances in Paraty, and Rio’s Carnival parades.

Buffer zones are still not required for World Heritage listings, thereby leaving policy open for interpretation and site contingencies: “wherever necessary for the proper protection of the property, an adequate buffer zone *should* be provided” (UNESCO 2013, 26; my italics). The boundary of Rio's World Heritage Site recorded in the listing overlooks all existent *favelas*. However, they are not included in photographs, and the rapid urban development in Rio is not listed as a threat to its heritage. The buffer zone described in Galle's World Heritage listing ignores the presence of fishermen by the harbour and some archaeological shipwrecks in the bay. A wider buffer zone proposed in 2015 also failed to include the fishermen and pushed for the construction of a new port in the historical harbour. Although Goa’s World Heritage listed limits are adequate, local policies that regulate use inside the buffer zones are quite loose, resulting in the presence of pilgrims, arts and crafts and food stalls that are not included in the existing management plan.

From a policy perspective, this thesis’ research concludes that attention must be drawn to the existence and contributions of informal communities that interact with heritage properties. Effective heritage management must create urban planning policies specific to those communities, considering their informal character. They should be included in all processes of planning, design and delivery, and work in collaboration with government agencies, heritage organisations and other stakeholders. They should also be included in decision-making processes and empowered to have a say on their own cultural matters, ultimately being well informed, prepared and protected from risks identified in this research.
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Conclusion

Contemporary heritage site management depends on stronger government systems, stakeholders involvement, strategic planning, and an inclusive and sustainable development approach. Low-income communities should be contemplated as targets for local growth, especially those that depend on the ecosystem they share with the heritage property. Continuous monitoring and periodic reporting are essential, considering threats derived from anthropogenic factors, natural disasters, and the effects of climate change. Increasing the resilience and preparedness of low-income communities for a natural disaster, as the communities most affected by a hazardous event, is necessary. Local community empowerment has proven to be an effective approach towards local development and heritage preservation. The active role that heritage plays through respectful, mutually beneficial interchanges between local communities and the heritage sites should be considered as a tool for resilience and for preserving local cultural heritage. It is possible to grow the economy sustainably, preserving cultural heritage sites and their urban landscape, and benefiting local communities and governments. As local communities develop, economic growth and sustainable development spread more broadly.
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