

Outline Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan

2022+

EDINBURGH WORLD HERITAGE

JULY 2021



Credits

Title: Outline Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan 2022+

Coordination: Edinburgh World Heritage

Authors: Kay Marwick, Edinburgh World Heritage

Date: July 2021

City: Edinburgh

Copyright notice:

© 2021 ATLAS-WH Consortium Partners. All rights reserved. ATLAS-WH has received funding from the European Union's Atlantic Area for "4.2. Enhancing natural and cultural assets to stimulate economic development" under grant agreement no. EAPA_631/2016. For more information on the project, its partners, and contributors please see <http://www.atlaswh.eu>. You are permitted to copy and distribute verbatim copies of this document, containing this copyright notice, but modifying this document is not allowed. All contents are reserved by default and may not be disclosed to third parties without the written consent of the ATLAS-WH partners, except as mandated by the European Commission contract, for reviewing and dissemination purposes. All trademarks and other rights on third party products mentioned in this document are acknowledged and owned by the respective holders.

The information contained in this document represents the views of ATLAS-WH members as of the date they are published. The ATLAS-WH consortium does not guarantee that any information contained herein is error-free, or up to date, nor makes warranties, express, implied, or statutory, by publishing this document. The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	4
2	The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site	5
2.1	Statement of Outstanding Universal Value	5
2.2	Edinburgh's attributes	6
2.3	Management Partners	7
2.4	Current management plan 2017-2022	8
2.5	Future management plan 2022+	9
3	AtlaS.WH methodology	10
4	Mainstreaming heritage report.....	12
5	Evaluation of current management plan 2017-22	14
5.1	How the current management plan was produced.....	14
5.2	Evaluation of the current management plan.....	15
6	World Heritage Site Climate Action Plan	17
7	Next steps.....	19
	Appendix A – AtlaS.WH methodology workshop report	20
	Appendix B – Mainstreaming Heritage Report	21

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the AtlaS.WH – Heritage in the Atlantic Area: Sustainability of the Urban World Heritage Sites project is to create a network of urban World Heritage Sites by addressing common challenges related to the protection of their identity, while enhancing their cultural assets, in order to stimulate heritage-led economic and cultural development.

The main output of the project is a management and sustainability plan for each World Heritage Site which builds on the exchange of knowledge and best practice across the AtlaS.WH network and which implements an integrated and participative management and monitoring model. The plan will be used to effectively manage the Site, taking into account current challenges and to protect, sustain and enhance the Site's Outstanding Universal Value.

This report is Edinburgh World Heritage's outline management and sustainability plan for the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site. We are not able to produce a final plan for the AtlaS.WH project. This is because Edinburgh World Heritage is only one of three management partners responsible for the management of the World Heritage Site, alongside the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland. The current management plan for the Site covers the period 2017-2022 and the next iteration of the management plan will be produced in 2022.

Nevertheless, the AtlaS.WH project has been invaluable for providing opportunities to carry out research and analysis, examples of best practice and a methodology. This report provides a summary of the work carried out to date as part of the AtlaS.WH project and the lessons learned which will be taken forward by the partners as we work together to produce the management plan for 2022+.

This report takes into account the following studies produced by the AtlaS.WH project:

- [Diagnosis study](#) of urban WH sites in the AA, August 2018
- [Thematic study](#) of urban WH sites in the AA, June 2019
- [Methodology](#) for the development of Management Plans for Urban World Heritage Sites, January 2020

As well as the [Operational Guidelines](#) for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

2 THE OLD AND NEW TOWNS OF EDINBURGH WORLD HERITAGE SITE

Edinburgh has long been celebrated as a great city: an ancient capital, the medieval Old Town alongside the world renowned eighteenth century classical New Town, all situated in a spectacular landscape of hills and valleys beside the wide estuary of the Firth of Forth. It is the recognition of these qualities that led to the city’s inscription by UNESCO as a World Heritage Site in December 1995.

The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site is located in Edinburgh on the southern shore of the Firth of Forth. Edinburgh is Scotland’s second most populous city and its capital. At its greatest extent, the Site is approximately 2 kilometres long from east to west and 1.5 kilometres wide, north to south, giving a total area of some 4.5 km².

The Site contains nearly 4,500 individual buildings, of which over 75% are listed for their special architectural or historic interest. The Site also contains Scheduled Monuments, the best-known being Edinburgh Castle.

The resident population is 23,300 or 4.6% of the total of Edinburgh’s population, although the working population is five times that number at 105,800. Visitor numbers in 2019 were 5.3 million.



Map showing the boundary of the World Heritage Site

2.1 Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value underlines a Site's importance as worthy of World Heritage status. UNESCO's Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention state:

Outstanding Universal Value means 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. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

To be included on the World Heritage list, Sites must meet at least one out of ten selection criteria. The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site meets two:

Criterion II: to 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

The successive planned extensions of the New Town, and the high quality of its architecture, set standards for Scotland and beyond, and exerted a major influence on the development of urban architecture and town planning throughout Europe, in the 18th and 19th centuries.

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

The Old and New Towns together form a dramatic reflection of significant changes in European urban planning, from the inward looking, defensive walled medieval city of royal palaces, abbeys and organically developed burgh plots in the Old Town, through the expansive formal Enlightenment planning of the 18th and 19th centuries in the New Town, to the 19th century rediscovery and revival of the Old Town with its adaptation of a distinctive Baronial style of architecture in an urban setting.

2.2 Edinburgh's attributes

Alongside the Outstanding Universal Value criteria, the Statement of Significance expands on the criteria and outlines exactly what makes Edinburgh exceptional in an international context. These "attributes" are the elements that contribute to Outstanding Universal Value. Edinburgh's numerous attributes fall under the broader descriptive five key qualities:

City of Contracts

The survival of two contrasting styles of urban development: the organic multiple layers of the medieval Old Town and the enlightened, spacious, ordered elegance of the New Town.

Monumental City

The city's fine collection of neo-classical monuments that reflect its status as Scotland's capital. These monuments contribute to the richness and diversity of the townscape and their subjects represent a variety of personalities who were significant in their time.

Iconic Skyline

The dramatic hills and green spaces of the landscape, plus key buildings of the Old and New Towns give Edinburgh its iconic skyline that has inspired generations of artists, writers, visitors and residents.

Authentic City

The survival and condition of Edinburgh's historic buildings, many being authentic examples of their time – a noteworthy and rare quality.

A Model City

The Old and New Towns embody the changes in European urban planning from inward looking, defensive walled medieval cities, through 18th and 19th centuries formal Enlightenment planning, to the 19th century revival of the Old Town with its adaptation of a Baronial style of architecture in an urban setting.



The skyline of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site

2.3 Management Partners

The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site is managed by a partnership of:

Edinburgh World Heritage

Edinburgh World Heritage is an independent charity formally charged by the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland with facilitating the work of the World Heritage Steering Group and overseeing the implementation of the management plan since 1999.

The City of Edinburgh Council

The City of Edinburgh Council is the Planning Authority. It implements the planning system in the city. The Council is responsible for providing political leadership and governance for a comprehensive range of services across the city.

Historic Environment Scotland

Historic Environment Scotland is a non-departmental public body. It is the lead public body established to investigate, care for and promote Scotland's historic environment. Its board is appointed by Scottish Ministers.

The day-to-day management of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site is overseen by a Steering Group that is made up of members from Edinburgh World Heritage, the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland.

2.4 Current management plan 2017-2022

Edinburgh World Heritage, the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland have worked in partnership to produce three management plans for the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site since it was inscribed.

The current plan covers the period 2017-2022. The production of this plan was led by the City of Edinburgh Council and involved collaboration and consultation with a wide range of stakeholder groups and communities. This consultation used a modified version of the Place Standard Tool which focused on six themes or challenges:

Care & maintenance

To ensure ongoing investment in the conservation of the Site.

Control & guidance

To improve the tools to sustain Outstanding Universal Value.

Contribution of new developments to the city centre

To ensure that development embraces the context of the World Heritage Site and is of the highest quality in terms of architecture, design and materials.

Awareness of the World Heritage Site status

To coordinate the actions to ensure a broad level of understanding of the World Heritage Site.

Visitor management

To advocate for sustainable tourism within the World Heritage Site and the city.

Influence & sense of control

To sustain effective partnerships that support the management of the World Heritage Site

An action plan was produced which sought to address each of these six themes. A total of 39 actions are being progressed during the lifetime of the management plan.

Implementation of the management plan and associated 39 actions is being monitored by the Steering Group. An evaluation of the plan can be found in section 5 of this report.

2.5 Future management plan 2022+

The diagram below provides a summary of the work carried out to date as part of the AtlaS.WH project and the lessons learned which will be taken forward by all the Edinburgh partners as we work together over 2021-2022 to produce the management plan for 2022+.



The next sections of the report explore this work in more detail.

3 ATLAS.WH METHODOLOGY

The aim of the AtlaS.WH [Methodology](#) for the development of Management Plans for Urban World Heritage Sites is for each of the AtlaS.WH partner cities to share this common philosophy on how to manage their World Heritage Sites, and for this to be reflected in each partner's management plan.

In 2020, a capacity building workshop was held by Edinburgh World Heritage and the City of Edinburgh Council to explore how the methodology could be used as a tool for Edinburgh and what lessons can be taken into the management plan for 2022+.

A report on this workshop can be found in appendix A. The workshop summarised the key findings from the methodology as follows:

Tangible cultural heritage

Decision making relating to heritage matters should be clear, transparent and evidence based. Local communities should be involved in the conservation and management of the Site, to promote well-being and contribute to social cohesion. Conservation methods should integrate ethical values and follow best practice (and UK regulation) and knowledge should be disseminated to facilitate cooperation between stakeholders and build capacity.

Planning and legislative instruments

Local context should be at the heart of policymaking. Policy hierarchy should be defined from supranational to local, from legislation through to non-statutory guidance, plans and projects. The World Heritage agenda must be integrated with these different policies and tools and policy / legislative framework should have space to include World Heritage at a strategic level, to engage in emerging challenges such as climate change.

Population and housing

The World Heritage Site must be seen as a place where people live. Policies, specific to local conditions, should encourage people to live in the Site, such as the availability of different types of housing including social / affordable housing. The provision of community facilities and improved public realm can enhance the liveability of the Site and strengthen community identity.

Tourism, culture and economy

Defining capacity, acceptable levels of tourism impacts, linked to dispersal strategies is central. Local communities must benefit from tourism through quality jobs and area development and the tourism 'product' should be improved and developed in partnership with local people. Effective regulation is key, for example to place limits on unregulated growth of tourist retail, and the negative impacts of tourism must be called out and planned for (housing, environmental, traffic, health and safety, energy and water use). More needs to be done to encourage, protect, regulate, and if needed, certify local and regional products from the effects of over-commercialisation, including investment

in SMEs / art incubators / local artist co-ops etc. Public / private partnerships and better collaboration with universities is recommended.

Community engagement and capacity building

The voice of local communities is essential in the governance of the World Heritage Site. Transformative engagement, with active local governance, rather than passive participation is recommended although this kind of engagement requires investment and structure to produce tangible outputs. Power imbalances – between institutions and citizens as well as between different citizen groups – can prevent meaningful engagement. Building the capacity of local communities can make them more resilient.

Management systems

Institutions must collaborate at multiple levels, be accountable and have roles clearly assigned, with conflict management mechanisms to be embedded in the management plan. The involvement of communities in the management of the World Heritage Site should be increased. The implementation and impact of a management plan should be monitored and evaluated. Impact assessments should be carried out for all proposed interventions in the Site.

This AtlaS.WH methodology has laid the foundation for the philosophy under which Edinburgh's next management plan will be written. The recurring themes are that the management of our World Heritage Site should:

- Recognise that the value of such a site is both tangible and intangible. The community's sense of place should be preserved.
- Move away from care of physical heritage alone towards the pursuit of well-being of both heritage and people. Good management of the site should support the needs and requirements of those living, working and using the Site.
- Enable the local population to benefit from the economic benefits of World Heritage Site status. Tourism should be sustainable, protect local communities and contribute to quality job creation and area development. Cultural activities should be supported and protected from over-commercialisation.
- Take account of, and be integrated with, local and national planning and legislative instruments, strategies and plans as well as city governance structures.
- Involve partners and stakeholders and promote accountability, cooperation and knowledge-sharing between the various responsible agencies. Potential conflicts should be addressed and resolutions implemented.
- Seek to include all levels of society in decision-making processes. Participatory governance which is people-centred and engages communities and the public makes for good governance and better care of the Site.
- Build capacity of communities in order to strengthen resilience, increase knowledge and adapt to change.
- Include a robust and ongoing management system which is accountable, transparent and takes into account a Site's individual governance context. Constant feedback should be provided through regular monitoring and evaluation and acted upon.

These themes will be taken forward into the new management plan for 2022+.

4 MAINSTREAMING HERITAGE REPORT

In 2020, Edinburgh World Heritage commissioned a historic city management study to assist with the development of our management plan. This study aimed to support and strengthen the management of Edinburgh as a historic city, by mainstreaming heritage in decision making.

Edinburgh's heritage makes a major contribution to the life of the city – in economic terms, as a driver of tourism and inward investment, but also as key factor in the high quality of life residents enjoy, as a contributor to the cultural life of the city, and as a driver of our international reputation. However, Edinburgh World Heritage's research demonstrates that the potential of the sector to play a more dynamic role that benefits everyone is being held back. The recommendations from the AtlaS.WH [Diagnosis Study](#) also noted that stakeholders need to be more active and coordinated in delivering the management plan.

The resulting “Mainstreaming Heritage in the City of Edinburgh” report is included as appendix B. It identified several barriers which are preventing the heritage sector delivering more for Edinburgh and recommended a series of practical actions to address a range of opportunities.

The report revealed four main barriers preventing the mainstreaming of heritage in Edinburgh:

1. Heritage is not viewed consistently as a key driver of urban renewal
2. There is an inconsistent interface between the World Heritage Site management plan and other city management systems, plans and processes
3. Heritage is often seen as an issue to be managed within the planning department, which can prevent it playing a broader role across diverse areas of city life
4. Resources dedicated to the management of the city's heritage, both financial and organisational, are constrained

The report concluded that these barriers are not unsurmountable. International comparisons taken from the AtlaS.WH project suggested that with effective and determined leadership, the potential of the heritage sector in Edinburgh could be unleashed to make a far greater contribution to the life of the city. The report recommended 10 interventions designed to realise this potential. Highlights from these new measures include:

- Comprehensive training, provided by Edinburgh World Heritage, across departments within City of Edinburgh Council and other institutions
- Integrated planning and governance for the World Heritage Site Management Plan, in line with recommendations from the AtlaS.WH partnership
- Providing additional expert resource to City of Edinburgh Council, via secondments, to address skills gaps
- Giving heritage a ‘seat at the table’ when key decisions are taken

Edinburgh World Heritage believes that mainstreaming heritage will result in a wide range of benefits to the city in areas as diverse as health and wellbeing, the provision of affordable housing,

and the response to the climate emergency. More specifically, implementing these recommendations will lead to:

- More informed decision making across all areas of city life, including the crucial response to the climate emergency.
- Heritage will play a greater role in supporting people's well-being and mental health
- Staff working in city institutions will have a greater sense of ownership and understanding of the city's cultural heritage
- Money will be saved because heritage is considered at a project's outset, and therefore re-work is avoided.
- And the site becomes better protected for both current and future generations

The recommendations will be taken forward into the new management plan for 2022+.

5 EVALUATION OF CURRENT MANAGEMENT PLAN 2017-22

The current management plan for the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site covers the period 2017-2022.

In 2020, two capacity building workshops were held by Edinburgh World Heritage and the City of Edinburgh Council to understand:

1. How the current management plan was produced and what lessons could be learned for the production of the management plan for 2022+
2. Evaluate how the current management plan is operating and how the associated action plan is being implemented

5.1 How the current management plan was produced

Stakeholder engagement

The process was opened up to different stakeholders to capture a wider range of operational management issues. An analysis of other World Heritage Site management plans was undertaken, along with an evaluation of the two previous management plans. Various stakeholder groups were consulted, including World Heritage UK members, other World Heritage Sites in the UK and ICOMOS UK.

This process of collaboration and consultation was incredibly valuable in obtaining expert opinion and sharing best practice.

Community consultation

Community consultation was undertaken in variety of ways over the course of two months, including:

- Online consultation with the community which generated 600 responses
- More than 500 “on the street” responses at community events such as the Meadows Festival and World Heritage Day
- Social media feedback

These consultation surveys used a modified version of the Place Standard Tool which focused on six themes or challenges.

A wider reach was achieved for this consultation that had been the case for the previous two management plans and therefore the results were more meaningful. However, respondents were largely self-selected and as such not necessarily representative of Edinburgh as a whole. Future consultation should aim for a broader representation of the community.

Governance and partnership working

The City of Edinburgh Council led the production of the management plan, in partnership with Edinburgh World Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland. The plan required to be approved by the leadership of all three organisations, including the political leadership which changed midway through the writing of the plan. For the next management plan, it is important to factor sufficient time for this approvals process and to ensure buy-in from senior representatives from each partner organisation. An advocacy programme should be implemented to ensure cross-political party endorsement.

The production of the management plan was overseen by the World Heritage Site Steering Group and sitting above that, the Oversight Group which included community councils, the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce and ICOMOS UK. This was important so that key stakeholders were involved in the process. Having in place the right governance structure for the next management plan will be critical to its success.

5.2 Evaluation of the current management plan

The current management plan focuses on six themes or challenges and 39 associated actions. The three management partners – Edinburgh World Heritage, City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland – are responsible for carrying out the actions. Implementation of this is being monitored by the World Heritage Site Steering Group. Evaluation is ongoing during the period of the management plan 2017-2022. Nonetheless, interim findings are as follows:

Care & maintenance

There are 13 actions to ensure ongoing investment in the conservation of the Site. The conservation grants programme and maintenance programme are running well. A programme to facilitate research and best practice is progress, in part due to the AtlaS.WH project. Consultation has taken place on the public space management plan and resourcing has been added to support the management of the public realm. The Buildings at Risk Register is being maintained. A conservation and energy efficiency project has been piloted. The City Mobility Plan has been developed.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against most actions under this theme.

Control & guidance

There are seven actions to improve the tools to sustain Outstanding Universal Value. The partners planning protocol is in operation. Public awareness of planning matters is high. A study on the attributes of the World Heritage Site is complete. The Mainstreaming Heritage report has been completed. A Traditional Building Festival takes place in the city on an annual basis. More work is required on Conservation Area Character Appraisals and to make guidance to owners more visible.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against some actions under this theme, but more work is required on others.

Contribution of new developments to the city centre

There are six actions to ensure that development embraces the context of the World Heritage Site and is of the highest quality in terms of architecture, design and materials. Through the AtlaS.WH project, an online training platform “[managing heritage in a changing world](#)” aimed at heritage professionals and the wider community has been developed. Place briefs are yet to be produced for the World Heritage Site.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against some actions under this theme, but more work is required on others.

Awareness of the World Heritage Site status

There are four actions to coordinate the actions to ensure a broad level of understanding of the World Heritage Site. The events programme to promote understanding of the World Heritage Site is running well. Over 600,000 people visited “Our World Heritage” exhibition at the Tron Kirk. A visual ID guide for interpreting the World Heritage Site has been developed.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against most actions under this theme.

Visitor management

There are four actions to advocate for sustainable tourism within the World Heritage Site and the city. Edinburgh’s 2030 Tourism Strategy has been published, with a focus on sustainable tourism. Research on perceived authenticity of the Royal Mile has been published. The Waste and Cleansing Improvement Plan is being implemented.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against most actions under this theme.

Influence & sense of control

There are five actions to sustain effective partnerships that support the management of the World Heritage Site. Stakeholders and partners are involved in the management of the World Heritage Site. The Steering Group continues to monitor implementation of the management plan. City of Edinburgh Council consultation hub includes “We Asked, You Said, We Did”. Communities and local stakeholders to be engaged with and inform the new management plan.

Conclusion: good progress has been made against most actions under this theme.

The overall conclusion is that actions are most likely to be progressed when they are:

- Well-defined
- Achievable
- Owned by a particular organisation or individual with adequate resources
- Measurable to evaluate progress

These learnings will be taken forward into the new management plan.

6 WORLD HERITAGE SITE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

...climate change has become one of the most significant and fastest growing threats to people and their heritage worldwide...

ICOMOS, Resolution 19th General Assembly of ICOMOS, 2017

One of the greatest threats to the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site is climate change. It is critical that the next management plan for 2022+ seeks to address this threat. To help inform our approach, a Climate Change Risk Assessment has been undertaken as part of the AtlaS.WH project.

Building off a bespoke methodology based on previous academic research carried out in Edinburgh and a tool tested and implemented in Australia and Orkney, the Climate Change Risk Assessment has sought to identify the impacts of climate change on the World Heritage Site. The overall approach has a people-centred focus, as underlined in the AtlaS.WH methodology, by embracing a bottom-up process that relies on inputs from various stakeholders from the community. Data collected is based on local knowledge and is mostly qualitative. This is opposed to top-down approaches that rely on modelling tools and result in quantitative data.

The project has focused on the two main typologies of stakeholders as follows: local / city wide (Edinburgh residents, groups or entities) and national / international (visitors / heritage experts). The project has identified and engaged with under-represented stakeholders: those not engaged with World Heritage Site and the historic built environment in general and those not engaged with climate change.

The approach has focused on whole risk management process: definition of what is at stake (values), assess potential risks and their impacts and define how to adapt to the impacts without losing the shared values of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site and its community.

The two risk assessments frameworks have focused on the following values:

- The way climate change will affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site (i.e. tangible effects such as stone erosion or the effects of inappropriate climate change adaptation actions on the OUV)
- The emotional, economic, social, cultural and practical relationships between the World Heritage Site and its community of residents, business owners and visitors (i.e. intangible, emotional effects such as the loss of one's childhood home)

It is the first time an urban World Heritage Site has been used to test the [Climate Vulnerability Index](#) process, a rapid assessment tool that evaluates Outstanding Universal Value vulnerability and community vulnerability for all types of World Heritage properties. A range of heritage partners were invited to participate in the Climate Vulnerability Index workshops and the results will be

disseminated to encourage other urban World Heritage Sites, including the AtlaS.WH partnership, to undertake similar exercises.

Three primary climate stressors are predicted to impact the World Heritage Site:

- Increased temperature
- Increased rainfall
- Increased frequency and intensity of storm events including extreme rainfall events

The Outstanding Universal Value Vulnerability has been assessed at “Moderate”, meaning some loss or alteration of key World Heritage values will incur, but not causing a significant reduction of Outstanding Universal Value. The Community Vulnerability has also been assessed at “Moderate”, acknowledging the relatively high level of adaptive capacity within the community of the World Heritage Site.

The results of the Climate Change Risk Assessment are being collated into a World Heritage Site action plan and its robust dataset will be used to inform climate change policy in the city. The climate action plan will also inform the next management plan.

It has also informed the methodology for extensive community engagement which will be incorporated into the engagement plan for the next management plan.

Another output of the Climate Change Risk Assessment is that it has built the capacity of Edinburgh World Heritage, the other management partners the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland, as well as other heritage experts and members of Edinburgh’s local communities. Learnings will also be disseminated amongst partners, including the AtlaS.WH. This will help to better manage the threat of climate change to the World Heritage Site.

7 NEXT STEPS

The timetable for producing the next management plan for 2022+ is as follows:

- Summer 2021 – finalise governance arrangements
- Autumn 2021 – community consultation and engagement, stakeholder engagement, advocacy programme
- Winter 2021/2022 – produce first draft of the management plan
- Spring 2022 – consultation on the draft management plan including community and stakeholder engagement
- Summer 2022 – produce final draft of the management plan
- Autumn 2022 – partner endorsement and launch

The engagement plan for the management plan is as follows:

Tools	Participants	Output	Approx. Timing
1. Professionally recruited Focus Group Discussions (new)	Representative panels of residents across the city	Qualitative information on key threats and opportunities	July – August
2. Self-selecting on-line consultation	Random, but with efforts to limit to Edinburgh businesses and residents. May include placemaking ‘wheel’ to foster comparison to 2017/22 plan	Semi-quantitative information on threats and opportunities	July
3. Community workshops (new)	Targeted across Edinburgh’s communities from both within and outwith the World Heritage Site	Qualitative evaluation of specific community concerns	August – September
4. Expert workshops	Targeted across key stakeholder groups engaged in different areas of City management (e.g. housing, tourism, transport, climate response etc.)	Expert views from a range of different perspectives on threats and opportunities	September – October
5. Social Media listening exercise (new)	Targeted users of Social Media	Real-time digital expressions of opinion on threats and opportunities	July
6. Face-to-face discussions at high-footfall Edinburgh events	Targeted communities who participate in these events (e.g. Meadows Festival)	Semi-quantitative information on threats and opportunities	Autumn

APPENDIX A – ATLAS.WH METHODOLOGY WORKSHOP REPORT

Workshop report

Methodology for the Management and Sustainability Plans summary for Edinburgh

GABRIELLA LAING

AUGUST 2020



CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Workshop aim	3
1.2. Workshop agenda	3
2. Methodology	4
2.1. Introduction to the methodology	4
2.2. Strategic fields	4
2.3. Strategic field summaries and discussion	5
2.3.1. Tangible cultural heritage	5
2.3.2. Planning and legislative instruments	6
2.3.3. Population and housing	7
2.3.4. Tourism, culture and economy	9
2.3.5. Community engagement and capacity building	11
2.3.6. Management systems	13
2.4. Questions to consider for Edinburgh	14
3. Next steps	15

1. INTRODUCTION

The AtlaS.WH project, led by the Municipality of Porto, is funded by the Interreg Atlantic Area Programme through the European Regional Development Fund and intends to create a network of urban World Heritage Sites (WHS) by addressing common challenges in order to stimulate heritage-led economic and cultural development.

The overall objective of the AtlaS.WH project is the preservation, enhancement and sustainability of World Heritage Sites in the Atlantic Area. One of the project's key outputs is for each partner city to produce a management and sustainability plan for its World Heritage Site. On Thursday 30 July 2020, Edinburgh World Heritage hosted an internal workshop to analyse the work of WP06 Methodology for the Management and Sustainability Plans, to better understand its recommendations and implementation for Edinburgh's own circumstances. The workshop was attended by Kay Marwick (KM), Nick Hotham (NH), Yann Grandgirard (YG), Jenny Bruce (JB) and Gabriella Laing (GL).

1.1 WORKSHOP AIM

Using the team's collective effort and individual expertise, we will:

1. Understand the content of the methodology
2. Identify broader themes which cut across the strategic fields
3. Start to consider how these broader themes will be developed into the next management plan for Edinburgh

1.2 WORKSHOP AGENDA

1. Introduction to the Methodology (5 mins)
 - What Porto did
 - How this methodology fits within the AtlaS.WH project and a reminder of what EWH has to produce under this Work Package for AtlaS.WH
2. Workshop the Methodology's Strategic Fields (90 mins)
 - Kay 4.1 – Tangible cultural heritage (KM) (pp. 23-36)
 - Jenny 4.2 – Planning and legislative instruments (JB) (pp. 37-46)
 - Gaby 4.3 – Population and housing (GL) (pp. 47-55)
 - Nick 4.4 – Tourism, culture and economy (NH) (pp. 56-72)
 - Yann 4.5 – Community engagement and capacity building – YG (pp. 73-94)
 - Kay 5 – Management systems (KM) (pp. 95-116)
3. Partnership working (15 mins)
 - How can we bring in HES and CEC into the conversation?
4. Next steps (10 mins)
 - How can we evaluate the current MP against this methodology?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE METHODOLOGY

This work package was a collaboration between the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Porto and the Research Centre for Territory, Transports and Environment, Municipality of Porto.

It builds on the previous work packages completed by Santiago de Compostela which produced the Diagnosis Study – essentially, what is the state of each partner WHS now? And the Thematic Study on Common Challenges produced by Florence which took the emerging themes of the Diagnosis Study (namely: governance, population and tourism) and explored best practices from within the partnership and further afield.

The methodology document takes its lead from the findings of both of these reports, as well as wider academic guidance on the running of World Heritage Sites. Therefore, as detailed as some of the recommendations are in this document, it is perhaps more helpful to think of it as not a methodology for writing a Management Plan, but more a methodology for managing the site; it's a whole philosophy of how the site is managed.

Therefore, the aim of the methodology is for each of the partner cities to share this common philosophy on how to manage their WHS, and this will be reflected in each partner's Management Plan. So looking at Edinburgh, we need to produce our next MP very much with this Atlas-branded philosophy in mind. Nothing much else changes for us in terms of producing the next MP, and the time extension has been really favourable to us here, except that we will be presenting our progress on it at the next partnership meeting in October. The main thing to keep in mind is that even though we of course would have produced the next Management Plan anyway, this one is being done as the main output of the AtlaS.WH project.

2.2 STRATEGIC FIELDS

Prior to the workshop, each participant reviewed a different strategic field to identify key findings and broader themes and conclusions. Each strategic field one-pager is presented below, with notes of the workshop discussion following.

- 4.1 – Tangible cultural heritage (KM) (pp. 23-36)
- 4.2 – Planning and legislative instruments (JB) (pp. 37-46)
- 4.3 – Population and housing (GL) (pp. 47-55)
- 4.4 – Tourism, culture and economy (NH) (pp. 56-72)

- 4.5 – Community engagement and capacity building – YG (pp. 73-94)
- 5 – Management systems (KM) (pp. 95-116)

2.3 STRATEGIC FIELD SUMMARIES AND DISCUSSION

Field	1. Tangible cultural heritage
Description	<p>Tangible cultural heritage “(...) refers to a place, locality, natural landscape, settlement area, architectural complex, archaeological site, or standing structure that is recognized and often legally protected as a place of historical and cultural significance” (ICOMOS 2008, p. 2).</p> <p>Intangible cultural heritage “(...) means 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” which are transmitted from generation to generation and recreated by communities and groups providing them “(...) with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity” (Jokilehto 2005, p. 43).</p> <p>Cultural heritage provides connections to both past and future generations and is fundamental for community identity. Conservation of culture heritage must go beyond the physical as this alone will not help preserve a community’s sense of place.</p> <p>Therefore, this strategic field is about the importance of “heritage values”. The management of World Heritage Sites should shift away from care of physical heritage alone towards the pursuit of well-being of both heritage and people, taking account of social, cultural, environmental and economic factors. The approach should be values-based and integrated.</p>
Key findings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decision making relating to heritage matters to be clear, transparent and evidence based 2. Local communities and resources to be involved in the conservation and management of the Site 3. Knowledge to be disseminated to facilitate cooperation between stakeholders and build capacity 4. Conservation to be people-centred, promote well-being and contribute to social cohesion 5. Conservation methods to integrate ethical values and follow best practice (and UK regulation)

Broader themes / conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation and engagement activities which raise awareness and enhance understanding will lead to public support for the Site and its management • Participatory conservation can bring together heritage professionals, institutions (decision makers) and communities in a way that encourages understanding and collaboration and builds capacity • Ethical values should be integrated into heritage management, individual behaviour and decision-making processes • Heritage is inherently sustainable as a concept and also through conservation best practice, including maintenance
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an inherent tension between subjective and objective approaches to defining heritage values, with the current WHS system being very traditional, yet there is a move towards emphasising values which come from the local community – ‘The People’s OUVs’ • We are used to traditional markers of values: OUVs and attributes, but qualitative research needs to be undertaken to understand the values given by the local community to the site • HES’s ‘What’s Your Heritage’ started to unpack these ideas • This approach is key to the CCRA project which will attempt to ask what people’s values of the WHS are, as this emotive connection will couch the impact of climate change in a more immediate way – collaboration / pilot opportunity here for methodology • Concepts of people-centred and participatory conservation need to be defined

Field	2. Planning and legislative instruments
Description	<p>According to UNESCO (2011B, p.5), regulatory “(...) systems should reflect local conditions and may include legislative and regulatory measures aimed at the conservation and management on the tangible and intangible attributes of the urban heritage, including their social, environmental and cultural values.” This highlights the need for specific legislative instruments that enhance the unique value of WHS and protects OUV, while also stating the need to reinforce and recognise the legislative instruments already in place.</p> <p>A broad spectrum of policy and planning tools exist (plans, programmes, projects), each with different goals and each operating at different spatial and institutional levels. That some of these tools are statutory and some are guidance should be noted. Attention should be paid to how they overlap and what local conditions they are responding to. It must be understood that these exist within the context of continual change – particularly in an urban context - that may have an impact on the WHS.</p>
Key findings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the policy hierarchy from supranational to local, looking at legislation through to non-statutory guidance, plans and projects

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The WH agenda must be connected to different policies and tools to ensure integration with overlapping agendas (eg mobility plan, tourism strategy, local development plan) 3. National policy/ legislative framework should have space to include WH at a strategic level, to engage in emerging challenges such as climate change 4. The WH message should be articulated in a way that it relates to the broader themes of heritage management (environmental, social, economic) 5. Local context should be at the heart of policy-making
Broader themes / conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have good systems in place that notionally support WH in Edinburgh: we have a political agenda that is aware of the context, we have support from SG and HES, and we have policies within the planning system (the UK’s mechanism for ‘managing’ WHSs). What we don’t have is <i>consistent</i> support within the wider Council at operational level (eg Strategy and Insight, Place Directorate) • Cumulative and overlapping impacts over the spectrum of plans at various spatial and operational levels – we know this! We need to harness other policy work that is ongoing in the city in a more effective way.... • We need to work effectively in partnership with the different sectors/communities with an interest in the WHS • We need to provide training to policy and decision-makers across the spectrum of organisations that have an influence in shaping the city • We need to incorporate robust monitoring and evaluation processes into our strategy to feed back into the policy loop
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue of lack of consistent support within the wider operational level in CEC • Edinburgh’s WHS stakeholders are working across a broad set of agendas – EWH is seen as a box rather than an enabling platform (NH) • EWH’s working remit is somewhat restricted by the WHS border, and this limits EWH’s impact when working with CEC • Conceptualising the city through people-centred values helps to see the city beyond the WHS boundary (WHS benefits and impacts those outside the boundary) • Heritage needs to be integrated across all council activities: EWH wants to work outwith the planning department in CEC, and be owned by the leadership • A robust monitoring and evaluation process will enable more effective participatory and partnership working across different sectors and communities

Field	3. Population and housing
--------------	---------------------------

<p>Description</p>	<p>This section is about the needs of local residents of the WHS. Its aim is to provide them with a safe, resilient and sustainable city in which to live – this is in line with UN Sustainable Development Goal 11. Ultimately, this section underlines the “people-centred approach” to management of the WHS, as people live in, work in and use the WHS as a living and breathing site and not a museum exhibit. In turn, this continued use of the WHS (with its homes and amenities) is key to its maintenance.</p> <p>This section is almost a miniature version of the whole methodology, as it presents a physical issue (re. housing) alongside a focus on the local residents living in the WHS (population) – this two pronged approach is seen throughout the methodology, where there is a shift from focusing solely on the maintenance of the WHS built environment towards including the needs and requirements of those living within it. Again, the values of the WHS couched within how they impact on the lives of local communities.</p>
<p>Key findings</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WHS is a place where people live, and this should be emphasized <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Livability narrative / residential function of WHS can be enhanced – sustainable choice of housing (occupying historic buildings) can be promoted b. Strengthens community identity 2. Policies should adapt to encourage people to continue living in the WHS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Monitoring and evaluation crucial to people-centred approach and being able to adapt to the needs of the residents and maintain local resident populations b. Have to take into account issues specific to Edinburgh: declining population of the Old Town, over-tourism, gentrification, student housing; be mindful of different needs of different groups (elderly, refugees, students, single women) 3. Different types of housing, including social/affordable housing, appeal to different groups of people, and can be adapted to meet changing needs 4. Provide community facilities to enhance development of WHS as a place to live <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Community building: provision of public/community services: public realm b. Strengthens community identity
<p>Broader themes / conclusions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People-centred approach will succeed with regular monitoring, engagement and evaluation, with flexible and adaptable actions • Local residents have a vested interest in the care and management of the WHS • Heritage is a sustainable concept

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good management of the WHS contributes to the wellbeing of local residents
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing and population was consciously left out of the previous Management Plan • Key thing which differentiates urban WHS from other WHS is that they are places of living for communities and not just museum pieces • Therefore, neglecting the needs of residents leaves these sites like a husk • There is a strong need for robust data regarding population and housing within the WHS, combined with a holistic solution covering short term lets, schooling, retail, and the notion of the '15 minute city' • This needs to take into account the different dynamics occurring within the WHS, especially regards tourism; local plans are not fit for purpose in this way

Field	4. Tourism, culture and economy
Description	<p>Tourism</p> <p>Sustainable tourism is defined as “tourism that respects both local people and the traveller, cultural heritage and the environment” (Fien et al. 2010). Tourism must be responsible for the sustainable development of cities through fair sharing of economic benefits, the development of just and decent working conditions, the promotion of social inclusion and gender equality, the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, and poverty reduction (González et al. 2018, UNWTO 2015).</p> <p>However, tourism is also responsible for increasing pressure on the territory and local communities (Wise 2016), mainly due to growing congestion and consequent environmental degradation (Kim et al. 2013), overcrowding and erosion of local culture (Richards 2009), and safety issues.</p> <p>Culture and Economy</p> <p>Culture, which contributes to local identity and knowledge exchange, is characterized by its ability to bring us closer to intangible heritage and the need to protect individual ideas and creativity from increasing massification and homogenization. Creative activities are also important to the vitality of historic heritage sites.</p>
Key findings	<p>Tourism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Defining capacity, acceptable levels of tourism impacts, linked to dispersal strategies is central 2. Local communities must benefit from tourism through quality jobs, and area development 3. The tourism ‘product’ should be improved and developed in partnership with local people 4. Effective regulation is key (traffic, accommodation, economic/trade)

	<p>5. Negative impacts of tourism must be called out and planned for (environmental, traffic, health and safety, energy and water use)</p> <p>Culture and Economy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More needs to be done to encourage, protect, regulate, and if needed, certificate local and regional products from the effects of over-commercialisation 2. Public/private partnerships, and better collaboration with universities is recommended 3. Investment should be considered in SMEs/art incubators/local artist co-ops etc. 4. Limits should be placed on unregulated growth of tourist retail
<p>Broader themes / conclusions</p>	<p>Tourism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity and dispersal have been talked about in Edinburgh for many years – this now needs addressing • Local people and community groups must be involved in the development of the visitor economy, including the post-COVID planning • We should be more assertive in articulating the kind of visitor, and visitor economy the city wants • We need to look at regulation and ask ourselves whether it is fit for purpose within the WHS <p>Culture and Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiar themes here – we know visitors want to purchase authentic goods, and services, but what is the best way to regulate the market in a UK/Scottish context? • We also need to address the festivals – and whether they contribute to the authenticity of Edinburgh intangible cultural heritage or whether they are a form of ‘cultural colonialism’.
<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tourism ‘product’, the heritage, is neglected • Negative impacts of tourism are not considered in the same way as in a natural site, such as worn out paths • Big question surrounding the contribution of Edinburgh’s festivals to the city’s authenticity – are they part of Edinburgh’s intangible cultural heritage? • Data is needed to illustrate how much tourism and culture actually contributes to the local economy • Imbalance of culture throughout the year, with majority of investment concentrated only in August • Investment to benefit ratio is imbalanced but the culture convenor and committee do not address this • Compare with community involvement in festivals in other parts of the city, e.g. Leith

Field	5. Community engagement and capacity building
Description	<p>Community engagement is a fundamental element of good governance and vital to stimulate citizenship. Local communities are key contributors to the efforts to protect, promote, and ensure the sustainable future of WHS and perpetuate the cultural dimension associated with them.</p> <p>The last decades saw an increased recognition of the role of communities and integration of community engagement in UNESCO’s World Heritage Program and Conventions: ‘individuals’ and ‘indigenous communities’ are primary stakeholders of their own cultural heritage (Di Giovine 2015, Adell et al. 2015).</p> <p>“Acknowledging that heritage is now better understood as being both determined by and the responsibility of local communities, their participation from the outset is clearly essential to reach a common understanding of the objectives connected to it” (Ripp & Rodwell 2018, p. 18).</p> <p>Communities include local/indigenous people and tourists. Active participation may lead to a partnership and collaboration between governmental and citizen. Involves much more investment and proactivity but opens up the possibility of transformation.</p> <p>Adaptive governance positions the resilience of systems as a critical factor for their sustainability, recognizes the importance of incorporating voices other than expert ones and diversified knowledge, and makes use of complex knowledge systems - alternative to traditional governance, for providing some answers to complex problems such as disaster risk reduction (Coimbra 2015).</p> <p>Capacity building: the process of extending and broadening capacity, ‘the ability to do something’, so that a given entity can endure change.</p>
Key findings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The point of view of local communities is now considered important in determining the meaning and the authenticity of heritage, and the voice of local communities essential for the governance of the site (Lusiani et al. 2018). 2 Two level of engagement for the community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive participation: Stewardship – Safeguarding – Conservation • Transformative engagement: Active local governance – Transformation – Proactivity 3 5 distinct loci/moments of participation: shaping the meanings of the site (nomination process), governance/management of the site, monitoring (including planning process), reporting, and sharing the value generated by the site - Lusiani et al. (2018)/Brown and Hay-Edie (2013)

	<p>4 Critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment for devolution: investment is necessary, but participation must be orchestrated to be relevant and efficient in terms of tangible outputs and timeframe (structured methodologies and principles) • Power Differentials: within the participatory processes - between institutions/experts and citizens, but also between different citizen groups • Emphasis on belonging: the sustainable development (environmental, social and economic aspect) of local communities of the WHS, as part of a sense of stability and belonging, is a key parameter to their successful engagement with the WHS <p>5 Community engagement in WHS: as much of supporting existing positive dynamics, actions, and networks, as of creating new ones</p> <p>6 Key to Identify the power dynamics and levels of community engagement (grassroots and/or collaborative)</p> <p>7 Capacity building should target local community and decision makers/implementers</p>
<p>Broader themes / conclusions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to understand what has been done with communities in terms of Passive participation/ Transformative engagement, define gaps and priorities for the future • We need to define how participation (Passive/Transformative) can be incorporated in the moments of participation • We need to define structured methodologies and principles in terms of community engagement and define the appropriate level of investment • We need to identify the power dynamics and levels of community engagement (grassroots and/or collaborative) with the stakeholders of the WHS • We need to identify local coordinators acting as key links and playing “a critical role as ‘facilitators’ of community engagement • We need to define a capacity building programme and the targeted stakeholders (community and decisions makers)
<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building is couched within resilience, risk aversion and protection of the WHS, with the local community (local residents and site users) a key stakeholder • Much community engagement at the moment is tokenism, but the Methodology highlights a number of examples of good participatory governance as things EWH has already done • Difficulty in (a) steering away from the loudest voices (unrepresentative, minority view) and (b) ensuring proper active engagement if EWH is by definition more powerful than the people trying to be engaged • People’s perception of influence and sense of control was a key theme of the previous Management Plan (JB)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, robust data will be a good starting point in drafting a better engagement process, along with constant monitoring and evaluation • Likewise, thorough identification and definition of our audiences to be undertaken (combination of marketing and community engagement methodologies) • Must make sure we engage outside our usual stakeholder partners, and talk to college students about tourism and builders about conservation, for example • Must be wary of engagement and transformative approach, e.g. Twelve Closes and Basil – if we always come up with the solutions, engagement will always be passive
--	--

Field	Management systems
Description	<p>The management system is defined as “a series of processes which together deliver a set of results, some of which feed back into the system to create an upward spiral of continuous improvement of the system, its actions and its achievements” (UNESCO et al. (2013, p. 23))</p> <p>The management system is a key element of a Management Plan. An efficient, effective and sustainable management system is one which is values-led, anticipates and manages change and invests in the relationship between heritage and people, constantly examining why and how cultural heritage should be conserved, and for and with whom.</p> <p>It must take into consideration the complex institutional context, the different management levels and the diverse institutions involved in World Heritage Site management, and conflicts which can arise from these.</p> <p>The management system should involve communities in the management of the World Heritage Site and in particular in decision-making – called “participatory governance”. Participatory governance better balances civil society and government agencies. It aids transparency and gives a voice to communities.</p> <p>It should include a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback, as well as an assessment of the vulnerabilities of the Site. Specific outcomes should be defined for the Site and its stakeholders. A management system should assess progress against these outcomes and analyse discrepancies and their causes. Remedial actions should be identified and implemented.</p>
Key findings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutions to collaborate at multiple levels, be accountable and have roles clearly assigned 2. The involvement of communities in the management of the World Heritage Site to be increased

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Conflict management mechanisms to be embedded in the management plan 4. The implementation and impact of a management plan to be monitored and evaluated 5. Impact assessments to be carried out for all proposed interventions in the Site
Broader themes / conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A management system is only as good as the institutional context within which it operates • Strong community participation in decision-making makes for good governance • Conflict resolution is crucial to the successful implementation of a management plan • Implementing monitoring and evaluation systems is essential
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a constant feedback loop – monitoring and evaluation of stakeholder/partnership involvement • Previous Management Plan worked closely with ICOMOS, Chamber of Commerce, community councils (except Old Town), and different council convenors and built up good working practices, but group has not met under current planning convenor – another stumbling block to WHS being under the sole auspices of planning at CEC • Idea of a ‘Board’ for the WHS which is properly representative of the communities served by the WHS, for ongoing, participatory governance (NH) – will need executive support, allocation of resources and monitoring and evaluation throughout • Therefore the embedding of resourcing, monitoring and evaluation in governance systems in the management of the WHS is crucial

2.4 QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER FOR EDINBURGH

The discussion of the strategic fields focused on a few recurring themes:

- A move away from top-down understanding of the values of a WHS, towards a bottom-up approach and renewed interest in intangible heritage and understanding of WHS as a living, breathing place
- The values of the WHS should be couched within how they impact on the lives of local communities
- People-centred, participatory governance
 - Community and stakeholder engagement
 - Robust monitoring and evaluation, constant feedback
 - Date-driven research into audiences, communities and use of the site for tourism and housing
- Management systems

- EWH's partnerships and accountability of different stakeholders
- Re-evaluation of status of heritage within City of Edinburgh Council

Therefore, the discussion brought out some key questions to consider ahead of the next Management Plan:

- What data do we need to better understand:
 - The residential makeup of the WHS?
 - The contribution of tourism and culture to the local economy?
 - How best to engage with local communities?
- How can we use the CCRA project as a starting point for understanding local people's values of the WHS?
- How will we effectively monitor and evaluate our decisions?
 - What criteria will we use and how often will this take place?

3. NEXT STEPS

Another workshop will take place to consider the Methodology within the wider context of the evaluation of the current Management Plan, the Historic City Management study for Edinburgh, and other key research areas. This will inform recommendations for the next Management Plan.

This report will be presented to the World Heritage Site steering group members Historic Environment Scotland and City of Edinburgh Council. Then we can begin to understand how our partners feed into the rest of the process.

The next workshop will be held on 10 September 2020 and will be focused on evaluating the current Management Plan.

APPENDIX B – MAINSTREAMING HERITAGE REPORT

Mainstreaming heritage in the City of Edinburgh

EDINBURGH WORLD HERITAGE

APRIL 2021



ATLAS
World Heritage
Heritage in the
Atlantic Area
Sustainability of the urban
world heritage sites



Credits

Title: Mainstreaming heritage: City of Edinburgh report

Coordination: Edinburgh World Heritage

Authors: Christina Sinclair, Nicholas Hotham, Edinburgh World Heritage

Date: April 2021

City: Edinburgh

Copyright notice:

© 2021 ATLAS-WH Consortium Partners. All rights reserved. ATLAS-WH has received funding from the European Union's Atlantic Area for "4.2. Enhancing natural and cultural assets to stimulate economic development" under grant agreement no. EAPA_631/2016. For more information on the project, its partners, and contributors please see <http://www.atlaswh.eu>. You are permitted to copy and distribute verbatim copies of this document, containing this copyright notice, but modifying this document is not allowed. All contents are reserved by default and may not be disclosed to third parties without the written consent of the ATLAS-WH partners, except as mandated by the European Commission contract, for reviewing and dissemination purposes. All trademarks and other rights on third party products mentioned in this document are acknowledged and owned by the respective holders.

The information contained in this document represents the views of ATLAS-WH members as of the date they are published. The ATLAS-WH consortium does not guarantee that any information contained herein is error-free, or up to date, nor makes warranties, express, implied, or statutory, by publishing this document. The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.

CONTENTS

0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. METHODOLOGY	6
3. BARRIERS.....	7
4. CONCLUSION	12
APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
APPENDIX 2 – UNESCO’S HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH.....	14

0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Edinburgh's heritage makes a major contribution to the life of the city – in economic terms, as a driver of tourism and inward investment, but also as key factor in the high quality of life residents enjoy, as a contributor to the cultural life of the city, and as a driver of our international reputation. However, our research demonstrates that the potential of the sector to play a more dynamic role that benefits everyone is being held back. This report attempts to identify several of the barriers which are preventing the sector delivering more for Edinburgh, and recommends a series of practical actions to address a range of opportunities.

The historic environment strategy for Scotland, Our Place in Time, sets an ambitious vision for the sector. Scotland's historic environment will be 'understood and valued, cared for and protected, enjoyed and enhanced'. The strategy states: 'given its many values and benefits, the historic environment should be viewed as an integral and important part of the fabric of our society'. It goes on, 'there is a need for leaders from across Scotland to champion the historic environment at both the national and local level'. Our research indicates that, as yet, this vision has not been delivered fully in Edinburgh. As we rebuild our economy and shared cultural life post-COVID, we believe that now is time to deliver on this vision.

This report has been enabled by the AtlaS.WH project. The main findings and recommendations within it are based on international comparisons, especially with Edinburgh partner cities within the AtlaS.WH project, as well as relevant UK local government comparisons, and a series of in-depth interviews with individuals involved in the management of the city, both within City of Edinburgh Council and outwith. The report has revealed four main barriers preventing the mainstreaming of heritage in Edinburgh:

1. Heritage is not viewed consistently as a key driver of urban renewal
2. There is an inconsistent interface between the World Heritage Site Management Plan and other city management systems, plans and processes
3. Heritage is often seen as an issue to be managed within the planning department, which can prevent it playing a broader role across diverse areas of city life
4. Resources dedicated to the management of the city's heritage, both financial and organisational, are constrained

We believe that these barriers are not unsurmountable – far from it. International comparisons suggest that with effective and determined leadership, we should be able to unleash the potential of the heritage sector in Edinburgh to make a far greater contribution to the life of the city. We therefore recommend 10 interventions designed to realise this potential. Highlights from these new measures include:

- Comprehensive training, provided by Edinburgh World Heritage, across departments within City of Edinburgh Council and other institutions
- Integrated planning and governance for the World Heritage Site Management Plan, in line with recommendations from the AtlaS.WH partnership

- Providing additional expert resource to City of Edinburgh Council, via secondments, to address skills gaps
- Giving heritage a 'seat at the table' when key decisions are taken

A full description of the 10 interventions is highlighted within the report, and summarised at [Appendix 1](#). We believe that mainstreaming heritage will result in a wide range of benefits to the city in areas as diverse as health and wellbeing, the provision of affordable housing, and the response to the climate emergency. More specifically, implementing these recommendations will lead to:

- More informed decision making across all areas of city life, including the crucial response to the climate emergency.
- Heritage will play a greater role in supporting people's well-being and mental health
- Staff working in city institutions will have a greater sense of ownership and understanding of the city's cultural heritage
- Money will be saved because heritage is considered at a project's outset, and therefore re-work is avoided.
- And the site becomes better protected for both current and future generations

We would like to express our thanks all those who gave their time during the research period both within City of Edinburgh Council, and other city and national institutions. Without this commitment, we would not have been able to write the report or craft its specific recommendations.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been enabled by the AtlaS.WH project, which aims to address a series of common challenges faced by urban World Heritage Sites related to the protection of their identity, while enhancing their cultural assets, in order to stimulate heritage-led economic and cultural development. The project seeks to address challenges related to the sustainable management of historic cities and recommend potential solutions to issues related to tourism, gentrification, risk management, climate change, and energy efficiency. The project is a partnership of several urban World Heritage sites - Porto, Santiago de Compostela, Bordeaux, Florence and Edinburgh - and has set out a methodology and strategic framework for the development of World Heritage Site Management Plans to ensure each site is fully integrated within relevant local plans and management systems.

Our report is part of a broader programme being led by Edinburgh World Heritage designed to improve the management of heritage within our complex urban site. Our aim is to ensure that the vision set out in 'Our place in time', as well as the recommendations from the AtlaS.WH partnership, are implemented in Edinburgh. Through doing so, the broader benefits that may be derived from the historic environment will be felt in more areas of city life, the management of the city's heritage will move from being primarily reactive to proactive, and the value of the city's heritage will be enhanced.

2. METHODOLOGY

The main findings and recommendations within this report are based on three main sources:

- International comparisons and case studies, primarily drawing on two key publications from the AtlaS.WH project: *The [Thematic Study of Common Challenges](#)* and the *[Diagnostic Study of Urban World Heritage Sites within the Atlantic Area](#)*.
- Interviews with heritage managers other UK local authorities, including Manchester, Durham, Stirling, and Inverness.
- Interviews with senior officers and politicians within City of Edinburgh Council.

The report also references various City of Edinburgh Council plans and documents, including the Accounts Commission [Best Value Assurance Report](#) on the City of Edinburgh Council 2020.

3. BARRIERS

The research identified four main barriers preventing the more consistent mainstreaming of heritage with the City of Edinburgh Council.

3.1 Heritage is not viewed consistently as a key driver of urban renewal

This barrier, expressed in various ways, has emerged from our research in Edinburgh, across other cities in Scotland, and the balance of the UK. In Edinburgh specifically, our interviews indicate that at one extreme, Heritage can even be seen as a barrier, potentially preventing investment in urban renewal in some parts of the city. In other instances, the city's rich historic environment and World Heritage status, may simply be seen as irrelevant. While these views are not typical, there are nevertheless many instances when heritage values are not considered at the outset of key projects, but instead only enter discussion once overall strategy and design concept has been established. This can result in rework, additional expense, and, occasionally, lower quality overall design.

In the case of the George Street, and first New Town redesign project, the heritage value of the area was not an integral element of the planning at the outset, which resulted in several rounds of rework and additional expense. Heritage managers from both City of Edinburgh Council, as well as Edinburgh World Heritage, were involved later in the process, and found themselves playing a reactive role versus proactively working towards a common solution. We are pleased however that the proposal on the table as of the writing of this report does respect the architectural integrity of this key thoroughfare, while also improving active travel infrastructure, and enhancing aesthetic values through the use of high-quality materials sensitive to the exceptional historic environment.

In the case of the re-development of Waverley Station, the work was initiated by Network Rail was initiated before a common understanding of the heritage value of the Waverley Valley was established. Heritage assets were defined narrowly, for example, 'the ticket office', when in fact many aspects of the station, from the roof, to its elaborate supporting structures, have high heritage value. We are hopeful, that after several years of discussions, the heritage values of the station and the area are now being more effectively incorporated into the design concept for the station.

Conversely, when heritage values are placed at the centre of planning for developing historic parts of the city, the results are encouraging. Holyrood North is a positive example of this approach. Here, an area of mixed 19th century industrial heritage buildings, adjacent to a number of significant older heritage buildings, was sensitively transformed into a vibrant area, with a unique local character.

Data from our European partner cities also indicates that by putting heritage at the heart of planning for urban renewal, high quality development can be achieved, which places conservation and community at the heart of future growth while also attracting high levels of private investment. The renewal of Bordeaux's historic *bassin à flot* port area of 140 hectares was achieved through a process of 'negotiated urbanism', which harnessed the power of the area's rich heritage as a key driver for renewal. A detailed planning document was published in 2010 following the Historic Urban Landscape approach (see [Appendix 2](#)), which aims to integrate conservation and management of cultural heritage in city planning. The plan took into account the qualities and resources of the existing buildings, as well as the open spaces and the usage of space by the community, all of which contribute to the tangible, and intangible elements unique to the area. This approach will be replicated in future projects in Bordeaux. Following publication of the plan, a series of workshops were conducted to engage with a wide range of stakeholders in order to share the vision, answer

questions, and give reassurance to potential investors concerning the quality of the future environment. As a result of this programme, and despite having minimal land holding in the area, the municipality was able to effectively deliver positive change to an area which had previously suffered from significant neglect.

The two studies produced by the AtlaS.WH programme suggest that this is not a problem that is unique to Edinburgh. Lack of training among managers involved in the management of place across departments, staff reductions, as well as lack of clear direction from more senior management levels, can all contribute to heritage value not being effectively integrated into the management of the city's built environment.

Recommendations:

1. Giving heritage a 'seat at the table' when key decisions are taken. Heritage is a cross-departmental phenomena, which can make a contribution to all aspects of city life. We believe that improved clarity within City of Edinburgh Council as to who 'owns' different aspects of heritage at the most senior levels, will significantly improve mainstreaming.
2. Deliver comprehensive heritage management training across departments within City of Edinburgh Council and other institutions. While we would expect strong uptake for this from individuals involved in planning and public realm management, we would encourage managers and officers from all areas of city life to take the on-line training including transport, culture, education, and economic development. To this end, an on-line training, which breaks down heritage management into a series of straightforward one-hour sessions, has already been piloted, ready for deployment.

3.2 There is an inconsistent interface between the World Heritage Site Management Plan and other city management systems, plans and processes.

Edinburgh is a city with no shortage of plans. From the City Vision 2050, to the City Plan 2030, the City Mobility Plan 2030, and the forthcoming Carbon Zero Plan 2030, different groups and interests within the city compete for resource and priority, and the attempt to capture the public's imagination through consultation. To some extent this is a sign of a dynamic, growing city, which is taking a long-term view of how it should develop over the period to the middle of the century. However, this level of complexity can make the integration of the World Heritage Site Management Plan, with other city plans more challenging.

For background, the Management Plan for the World Heritage Site is a statutory requirement, and is currently in its third iteration for the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh. The plan, which is jointly authored by the three World Heritage Site partners (City of Edinburgh Council, Historic Environment Scotland, and Edinburgh World Heritage), sets out the key issues and opportunities relevant to the Outstanding Universal Values of the site, and then articulates a detailed action plan. The scope of the most recent report was set by the use of the Scottish Government's placemaking methodology, as well as through a wide-ranging process of consultation with residents, specialists, and other representatives of civic society.

Interviews with heritage managers across the UK have revealed that accountability and clear roles and responsibilities for actions within heritage plans are a common problem which better integration and planning may solve. Clearly identifying which manager at the Director/Chief Executive level is responsible for the integration of heritage across departments emerged from this research as a

potential solution. An analysis of the action plan from the 2017-22 Old and New Towns of Edinburgh Management Plan has revealed that only those actions with clear ‘owners’ within the small heritage team at City of Edinburgh Council and Edinburgh World Heritage look likely to be completed on time. Those actions which rely on active support and participation from other departments are generally off-track.

The Management Plan of the Historic Centre of Florence, though its office ‘*Firenze Patrimonio Mondiale*’ is viewed as a valuable tool for the city government – for conserving and safeguarding, but also for enhancing knowledge and raising awareness of Florence’s broader cultural heritage. The new Management Plan, approved in January 2019, is an operational tool capable of combining the complex issues and realities which exist in the historic centre of the city, and for effectively dealing with threats to the site. It identifies objectives and strategic actions shared by Florence’s stakeholders and residents. As one example, the regulations for economic activities are proof of the effort made by the city government to limit commercial activities which are not compatible with the World Heritage values, and to protect traditional shops, local handicraft activities, and the intangible heritage of the city. The City of Florence can also act as a guide with regard to the collection, acquisition and management of data. Its Management Plan also has a degree of flexibility that makes it suitable to tackle the challenges of its World Heritage site.

More generally, the two studies produced by the AtlaS.WH programme set out a number of simple recommendations in order to improve the effectiveness of Management Plans.

- Ensure inclusive participation in the production of the World Heritage Site Management Plan
- Ensure the World Heritage Site Steering Committee is composed of representatives from institutions and bodies that have direct competencies and responsibilities for the management of the site and
- Ensure the World Heritage Site Steering Committee is charged with and undertakes the task of guiding the implementation, monitoring, updating and reviewing of the Management Plan

Recommendations:

3. Develop a programme of active consultation for the new Management Plan in order to effectively identify the most significant issues and opportunities relevant to the Old and New Towns World Heritage Site.
4. Ensure the steering committee for the development and implementation of the new Management Plan is made up of members that match the scope of the plan in terms of authority and responsibility.
5. Create a robust governance and monitoring support structure for the new plan, including an oversight group made up of senior leaders within partner organisations, as well as representatives of the community

3.3 Heritage is often seen as an issue to be managed within the planning department, which can prevent it playing a broader role across diverse areas of city life.

Ensuring that new development within the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh is appropriate to its historic context, and does not damage Outstanding Universal Value is vitally important, but

represents only one aspect of heritage management within the city. Within the 2017-22 Management Plan for the World Heritage Site, new development is just one of six themes highlighted within the document. Other diverse areas of city life included in the plan are visitor management, public engagement and awareness of World Heritage status, and the influence and sense of control felt by residents and local businesses on key decisions. And yet, World Heritage is a matter managed in Edinburgh largely within the planning department. The World Heritage Site Management Plan is approved by the Development Management Sub-committee, rather than by full Council. And the site co-ordinator, a role funded by both City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Environment Scotland, works within planning, and reports to a planning manager.

Few people would disagree that heritage has a role to play beyond planning and the regulation of new development within Edinburgh, and this is borne out by our analysis of examples across the UK and the balance of Europe. For example, our World Heritage Sites are an open-air educational resource for our children. Creative educational programming can introduce children to a range of relevant topics across arts, humanities and science curriculum, as well as engender a strong sense of place attachment in young people from diverse backgrounds. Understanding the heritage values of our historic urban city centres, and the way the city has evolved over the centuries, can also help inform better solutions for active travel interventions such as the move to pedestrianise key areas of the city, and the need for safe, well-designed cycling infrastructure. Engaging with heritage, through walking, guided-tours, lectures, and through well designed interpretation, can support people's health and sense of well-being. And most recently, the heritage sector, including our World Heritage Sites, have become leaders in developing an effective response to the climate emergency with the objective of helping cities achieve net-zero carbon emissions.

There are clearly arguments both ways concerning where World Heritage should 'sit' within any council structure. Being within planning does ensure that on a day-to-day basis, heritage more broadly, and OUVs specifically are considered routinely in the context of the majority of planning applications. Conversely, it could be argued that given our World Heritage status, as well as the presence of conservation areas and listed building protections, heritage values must be taken into account by law, and is something all planning officers should be fully aware of and trained in. Limited dedicated resource would therefore be better placed within another department, or within a wider-ranging reporting structure, with oversight over more areas of council activity. Our interviews have suggested however that while it is widely accepted that the city's heritage can play a much wider role beyond planning, the challenge remains over how this might be structured in a pragmatic and efficient way.

Our review of organisational structures within our partner cities across Europe indicate that in most case, World Heritage resources sit within the city's culture department, but with dedicated planning resource as required. One of the most helpful examples among peer cities is Florence, where, since 2018, the World Heritage office is placed within the Deputy Director General's department, who takes a direct role in supervising the activities of the department. This ensures high-level sponsorship within the city for heritage, giving heritage a 'seat at the table' in all important discussions in the city. It also facilitates working across departmental 'silos'. Before that, the office was within the department of culture. From a political point of view, senior councillors responsible for culture and urban planning are jointly responsible for heritage and the management of the World Heritage Site. Finally, the update of the Management Plan is approved by the entire city council.

Additionally, the UNESCO Bordeaux Local Committee (CLUB) is a civic forum designed to ensure that the management of the city's heritage is supported by and has the input from a wide range of experts from different areas of city life. The key is to foster the construction of a shared vision of

heritage as well as the positive impact it can make at a local level. The members of the CLUB include experts from civil society, historians of art, architecture and urbanism, leading figures from the world of conservation, urban planning and architecture, as well as community representatives.

Recommendation:

6. Review options for optimal organisational structure regarding heritage resource within City of Edinburgh Council.

3.4 Resources dedicated to the management of the city’s heritage, both financial and organisational, are constrained.

Heritage management within Edinburgh, a city with more listed buildings, conservation areas, historic monuments and important areas of public realm versus its European peer group, is underfunded and under resourced compared to other historic cities in the UK and across Europe. While we need to be realistic in facing up to the financial constraints the city faces, we believe that through creativity and partnership additional resources can and should be identified to support the mainstreaming of heritage within the city.

Organisational resource dedicated to conservation within City of Edinburgh Council now stands at 1.5 FTE. In place of dedicated resources, responsibility for heritage matters has been absorbed into the work of a larger number of officers and managers, often individuals without specific heritage training or expertise. While this change has resulted in savings, the overall level of expertise within City of Edinburgh Council has been reduced which can result in insensitive interventions within our historic environment, and rework. During this period, funding from Historic Environment Scotland has remained constant, while private and institutional investment in area regeneration within heritage areas has significantly increased, with noteworthy examples such as Advocates’ Close, the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation, and the conservation of a series of historic tenements on the Canongate.

Across the UK and Europe, resources are also constrained, but not to the degree we see in Edinburgh. Our partner World Heritage cities have maintained small teams of dedicated experts with expertise in both planning and public engagement and education and have found creative ways to invest in their cities. For example, in 2018, the Municipality of Porto introduced a Tourist Tax which has financed a number of activities including the cleanliness of the city, promotion of the local economy, maintenance of the public realm, and cultural and leisure activities.

Other Scottish cities, for example Stirling, have maintained a small team of conservation officers. There is no doubt that Edinburgh has faced acute financial constraints over the past five years, and has made annual savings of between £35m and £75m per annum. It is also clear that there are structural differences in how local government is funded in the UK, and this funding has been disproportionately reduced as a result of the years of austerity.

The current low level of funding for heritage within City of Edinburgh Council can cause a range of negative consequences. Some examples:

- Heritage management tends to be reactive rather than proactive. As illustration, although the 2017-22 Management Plan captured residents’ desire for new development which used higher quality materials and was more sympathetic to the Old and New Towns architectural context, the city has lacked the resources to proactively address this aspiration. Despite a commitment

to produce place briefs for sensitive historic locations, none have so far been completed for the World Heritage Site.

- A backlog of work continues to build up for the city's estate of significant heritage buildings. Long-term issues, such as finding a sustainable use for the Tron, or the old Royal High School remain unsolved.
- Important heritage details can be missed, for example in how the public realm and streetscape is managed and enhanced

Recommendations

7. Extend the secondment of an Edinburgh World Heritage architect to City of Edinburgh Council for one further year
8. Take advantage of NLHF funding to provide additional resource to support the consultation process for the new World Heritage Site Management Plan (2022-27)
9. Explore options for the funding of additional resource for the World Heritage Site Co-ordinator from fiscal year 2022/23 onwards
10. Make the case for appropriate hypothecation for the Transient Visitor Levy, in line with best European practice.

4. CONCLUSION

The extraordinary cultural heritage of the City of Edinburgh, both tangible and intangible, sets us apart from our peers, and brings joy and inspiration to residents and visitors alike. But we believe there is a major opportunity for the heritage sector to make an even more substantive and wide-ranging contribution to city life in future years. In the post-COVID period, the city has declared two broad priorities, to address inequality in the city, and to effectively respond to the challenges represented by the climate emergency. In both these areas, as well as many others, the city's remarkable heritage can play a major role – for example through supporting area regeneration, and through the retrofit of historic structures in the context of climate change. The ten measures proposed in this report are not a panacea for the challenges we face, but will help the heritage sector play a more meaningful role in the life of the city.

APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Action	Responsible?	When? (month/year)
1. Giving heritage a 'seat at the table' when key decisions are taken.	CEC	6/21
2. Comprehensive training across departments within City of Edinburgh Council and other institutions.	EWH	5-6/21
3. Develop a programme of active consultation for the new Management	CEC/EWH	9-10/21
4. Ensure the steering committee for the development and implementation of the new Management Plan is made up of members that match the scope of the plan	CEC/EWH/HES	5-6/21
5. Ensure a robust governance and monitoring support structure for the new plan	CEC/EWH/HES	5-6/21
6. Review options for optimal organisational structure regarding heritage resource within City of Edinburgh Council	CEC/EWH	5-6/21
7. Extend the secondment of an Edinburgh World Heritage architect to City of Edinburgh Council for one further year	EWH	4/21
8. Provide additional resource to support the consultation process for the new World Heritage Site Management Plan	EWH	6/21
9. Explore options for the funding of an additional officer-level support resource for the World Heritage Site Co-ordinator	CEC	3/22
10. Make the case for appropriate hypothecation for the Transient Visitor Levy, in line with best European practice	EWH	10-12/221

APPENDIX 2 – UNESCO’S HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE APPROACH

In 2011, UNESCO adopted a new recommendation on the [Historic Urban Landscape](#). This is an approach which aims to help historic cities manage change while retaining what is distinct and valued about their identity, culture and environment. The Historic Urban Landscape approach acknowledges the complexities of managing historic urban areas and take account of challenges such as climate change, social transformations, the role of communities and financial deficiencies.

According to the Historic Urban Landscape approach, four tools can be utilised to help manage urban World Heritage Sites:

1. Regulatory mechanisms: this includes city governance structures, strategies and plans, local and national legislation and monitoring mechanisms
2. Civic engagement tools: the inclusion of all levels of society in decision-making processes with high levels of public participation for people-centred solutions
3. Knowledge and planning tools: enhancing the knowledge and awareness
4. Financial tools: investing in conservation-led activities to boost employment and economic growth

The Historic Urban Landscape approach uses a detailed, rich and localised understanding of a place to drive sustainable outcomes for cities and their communities.