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Chapter 23
Perspectives for a Historic Urban Landscape Approach in Porto, Portugal

Teresa Cunha Ferreira and Ana Tarrafa Silva

Abstract The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape invites states parties to consider more sustainable development models for urban conservation policies and practices. Urban conservation strategies have a long history in the city of Porto. Hence, this background has a direct influence on the nomination process of the Historic Centre of Porto, inscribed on the World Heritage list in 1996. Presenting a perspective of the existing strategies and policies in urban conservation management and reflecting on the implementation of a HUL approach in Porto, this paper analyses several tools, namely, the Municipal Master Plan (PDM) and the WH Management Plan, among others. The results indicate the existence of strengths and potentialities that need to be developed and improved, through the increase of more participatory processes, as well as more investment in identifying the values and their relation to specific threats.

Keywords Historic urban landscape · Historic Centre of Porto (World Heritage) · Municipal Master Plan · Management Plan

23.1 Introduction
The sustainable management of the balance between urban development and heritage conservation has featured prominently in recent international debate surrounding heritage policies and was recently synthesized in the UNESCO Recommendation...
on the Historic Urban Landscape\(^1\) (UNESCO 2011). This document proposes a holistic understanding of urban historic areas, as well as the implementation of more all-inclusive approaches. According to the HUL Recommendation, urban heritage is interpreted as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, tangible and intangible, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting, as well as all parties interested in their city’s management (UNESCO 2011). Despite not being a binding document, the UNESCO states parties (and local authorities) are invited to identify the “critical steps” which can bring them closer to a HUL approach, through the resources’ mapping, the definition of their cultural value as well as their vulnerability level to change and development. Moreover, these outcomes should be integrated into the broader urban development framework, so that action and change are continuously monitored through a participatory process (UNESCO 2011). The HUL Recommendation is, therefore, a flexible instrument which encompasses adaptation, dissemination and monitoring (UNESCO 2011; Veldpaus 2015; WHITRAP 2016).

In Portugal, there are so far no national initiatives to disseminate this kind of approach. Nevertheless, some recent researches have explored its integration potentials in Portugal (Tarrafa Silva et al. 2017), namely, through the spatial planning tools (Tarrafa Silva 2017), which are indicated by the National Heritage Law (Lei de Bases do Património Cultural, Law no. 107/2001 of 8 September: LBPC2001) as one way to enhance heritage. On the side of spatial planning legislation,\(^2\) heritage is recognized as a resource that should be identified by territorial planning tools, particularly in the Municipal Spatial Plans (Planos Municipais de Ordenamento do Território: PMOT)\(^3\) which should define the application of urban parameters and protection zones. Among those, the Municipal Master Plan (Plano Director Municipal: PDM)\(^4\) is the only mandatory spatial planning tool, binding public and private sectors and defining the general strategic guidelines for more detailed plans - PP and PU (Tarrafa Silva 2017).

This paper explores some perspectives on the implementation of the HUL Recommendation in Porto, Portugal. Recognizing its relation with the Douro River and wine industry (Port wine), as well as its medieval historic centre (World Heritage since 1996), Porto can be a relevant case for exploring the HUL approach, not only

\(^1\)Hereafter HUL Recommendation

\(^2\)Regime Jurídico dos Instrumentos de Gestão Territorial: RJIGT (Law Framework for Spatial Planning Tools): Decree-Law no. 380/99 of 22 September, recently reviewed by the Decree-Law no. 80/2015, of 14 May

\(^3\)Also known as Instrumentos de Gestão Territorial (Spatial Planning Tools), being constituted by the PDM (Plano Director Municipal: Municipal Master Plan), the PU (Plano de Urbanização: Urban Plan) and the PP (Plano de Pormenor: Detailed Plan)

\(^4\)Urban development in Portugal is ruled by the PDMs, which are crucial legal instrument in the management of the municipal territory. The PDM defines the strategic framework of territorial development of the municipality, being the reference instrument for the elaboration of the other municipal plans (RJIGT).
because it is a multilayered urban settlement in a stunning landscape but also due to its own urban conservation history and its management instruments and policies.

Indeed, the Historic Centre of Porto, in a context of opening to the international debate influenced by the Venice Charter of 1964 (Ferreira 2007), was the stage of one of the pioneer studies on urban conservation in Portugal: the “Estudo de Renovação Urbana da Ribeira Barredo” (Távora 1969). Understanding the city as a continuous series of layers that should be respected, along with its resident community (Pinho 2009), Fernando Távora developed a multidisciplinary and integrated study including not only the urban and architectonic perspective but also the physical (environmental, geographic, etc.) and human (sociocultural, demographic, etc.) aspects, as well as developing economic and administrative (legal framework and policies) proposals (Távora 1969). The integration of conservation objectives into the general urban framework, in which change was considered as part of the slogan “continuar-inovando” (“to continue innovating”; Távora 1969), demonstrates a connection with today’s urban rehabilitation doctrines and the objective of HUL approach 50 years later.

This and other experiences have had a profound influence on urban conservation and housing programs in Portugal since the democratic regime of 1974, namely, on a series of technical offices5 disseminated through the country (Pinho 2009). Since then, urban conservation looked towards a new integration of urban development policies and urban conservation objectives (Aguiar 2010).

23.2 The Case Study of Porto

23.2.1 Porto: A Metropolitan Area, a City and a WH Historic Centre

Located in the North of Portugal, the city of Porto is the head of the second largest Portuguese metropolitan area, which includes 16 municipalities and 1,684,901 inhabitants (INE 2009). The municipality of Porto stands out for activities related with higher education and health, and more recently tourism, due to the ubiquity of low-cost travel, which is pressuring the restructuring of the old city, and its functional specializations are now increasingly targeted at visitors rather than residents.

The city of Porto (corresponding to the municipal area – Fig. 23.1) covers an area of 4166 ha with 238,000 residents (INE 2011). The Douro River delimitates the city to the south, developing along a winding valley that determines a rugged topography. The great variations of altitude along the banks determine singular forms of appropriation of the territory that today form the Douro River and Porto landscape.

5 Gabinetes Técnicos Locais: GTL
The metamorphosis of the city and the extensive urbanization of the territory surpassed the defined limits of the old city, growing into its peripheries.

The Historic Centre of Porto is an urban agglomeration of great historical, artistic, cultural and architectural value, confined, for the most part, to the line of fortified walls of the fourteenth century. A geographically important point, favourably exposed to the southern quadrant along the great river, close to the sea, the city of Porto has always been a focal point of populations since prehistoric times. Inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list in 1996 as “Historic Centre of Porto”, under the cultural criterion (iv), the WH committee considers that the site’s OUV lies in the “urban fabric and its many historic buildings bear remarkable testimony to the development over the past thousand years of a European city that looks outward to the west for its cultural and commercial links” (UNESCO 1996). When the Management Plan was published (2010), this historic area contained 1763 buildings. The condition of these buildings varied, with 61% in satisfying condition and 36% classed as worst status (Porto Vivo SRU 2008). Recently, within the requirement of a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value – OUV (UNESCO) – ICOMOS-Portugal recommended the extension of the property name, from “Historic Centre of Porto”, as was inscribed since 1996, to “Historic Centre of Porto, Luiz I Bridge and Monastery of Serra do Pilar”\(^6\) (Fig. 23.2). After all, this constituted a simple extension to the names of the attributes which were already

---

\(^6\)To shorten, in this article authors opted to use the 1996 property name – Historic Centre of Porto.
covered by the 1996 inscription, which included also an area on the other mouth of the river, in the neighbouring municipality of Vila Nova de Gaia.

### 23.2.2 A Mosaic Management

Porto has a long history of conservation management with a variety of strategies conducted by different institutions (local and national) and various management areas, which have been overlapping over the time. Hence, there are different areas (Fig. 23.3) which are managed by different entities and regulations, each of them with different aims and purposes.

The Critical Area for Urban Recovering and Conversion (Área Crítica de Recuperação e Reversão Urbana: ACCRU)\(^7\) covered 1050 ha (one-fourth of the Porto municipal area), which corresponds to the Porto Vivo Sociedade de Reabilitação Urbana (Porto Vivo SRU) intervention area. This area includes other delimitations, such as several Urban Rehabilitation Areas\(^8\) (ARUs), the area listed as Property of Public Interest (IIP) – Zona Historica do Porto and the World Heritage area and respective buffer zone (300 ha), which includes part of Vila Nova de Gaia municipal territory (UNESCO 2006).

---

\(^7\) Decree-Law no. 794/76, of 5 November, changed by the Decree-Laws no. 313/80, of 19 August and no. 400/84, of 31 December.

\(^8\) Área de Reabilitação Urbana: ARU (Law no. 32/2012, of 14 August).
Since 2007, the management of the Historic Centre of Porto has been supported by Porto Vivo SRU, a public limited company (initially 60% state\(^9\) and 40% municipality), whose purpose is to promote the urban rehabilitation of the area corresponding to the parishes of Sé, Miragaia, S. Nicolau, Vitória, Massarelos, Bonfim, Cedofeita and Santo Ildefonso, initially corresponding to the ACRRU. Portuguese law LBPC2001 declares UNESCO properties as national monuments, which are governed by the Directorate-General of Cultural Heritage\(^{10}\) (DGPC), in coordination with the Regional Directorates of Culture of the North\(^{11}\) (DRCN). In 2010, the buffer zone was replaced by an ARU on both municipalities of Porto and Gaia. Urban development in Porto is governed by the Municipal Master Plan (PDM), which defines the strategic framework of territorial development of the municipality, corresponding to the city territory.

\(^9\)Through the Housing and Urban Rehabilitation Institute (Instituto de Reabilitação Urbana: IHRU).

\(^{10}\)Direção Geral do Património Cultural: DGPC.

\(^{11}\)Direção Regional da Cultural Norte: DRCN.
23.3 Methodology

Rather than an analysis of the policies implemented in the city of Porto, this article is an overview and exploration of the urban development model followed in this historic city, grounded in the HUL concept, which goes beyond the notion of “ensemble or historic centre” to the broader geographic and social context (UNESCO 2011). As the Porto territory is managed by a wide range of entities, with different targets and aims, this exercise used the documents produced by each of those actors (Table 23.1). Documents were organized by entity and categorized according to its nature (i.e. identify, manage or assess resources) and by its general target, namely, if it is exclusively meant for urban development, heritage policies or if it is an integrative tool of both policies.

The PDM and the WH Management Plan are the most complete documents and thus the core of this study. Despite being both integrative tools, these two instruments work over different areas and are managed by different entities.

The methodology also consisted of drawing of specific maps (e.g. historic evolution of the city, inventoried properties and assets, listed properties and assets, protected areas). Moreover, complementary statistical analysis was performed (e.g. percent of listed buildings, percent of protected areas) aiming at exploring surveys and resources’ mapping, as well as developing a comparative analysis over the integration of different strategies and tools.

A survey of the Porto Historic Centre inhabitants was also carried out (Ferreira and Pinto 2017). Developed in November 2017, the questionnaires covered a random sample of 22 individuals (11 men and 11 women) of the 4 parishes of the Historic Centre (Miragaia, São Nicolau, Sé, Vitória), 90% adults of which 28%...

### Table 23.1 Data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>DGPC (DRCN)</td>
<td>National inventory (SIPA)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>(ICOMOS-Portugal)</td>
<td>WH list nomination file/ABE report (1995)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHRU</td>
<td>Housing policies</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>UDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation policies</td>
<td>(ARU/ORU)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Porto Town Hall (CMP)</td>
<td>PDM (2006)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage properties charter (IPAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of OUV (2016)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic report (2016)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRU (CMP)</td>
<td>Master plan (2005)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management plan (2008)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*UDP urban development policy, HP heritage policy, IP integrative policy*
were over 65 years old. The majority of the interviewed had basic education (4 years of primary studies).

23.4 Perspectives on the Implementation of HUL Steps in Porto

The HUL Recommendation is clear when assuming the flexible and adaptable nature of the proposed urban development model, its action plan and tools (UNESCO 2011). According to this document, the critical steps can be adapted and followed in a different order, as long as conservation objectives are integrated into the urban development framework, as a crucial activity on the path for the sustainable development. Therefore, in this paper, the results were organized according to the action plan steps proposed by HUL approach and interpreted by Veldpaus (2015), which will enable the estimation of the level of concordance with the current management process (Table 23.2).

23.4.1 Understanding the Context

The deep knowledge of the city resources is the first step for sustainable management (WHITRAP 2016). To achieve this, the HUL approach defines three crucial steps: (1) mapping city resources (natural, human and cultural), (2) identifying values through participatory planning tools aimed at reaching consensus on the attributes and values to preserve and finally (3) assessing the factors affecting those values, revealing their vulnerability level.

| Table 23.2 HUL critical steps and general stages of heritage management process |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Heritage management process (Veldpaus 2015) | HUL steps (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders 2013) |
| Understanding the context | Step 1: Mapping natural, cultural and human resources |
| | Step 2: Reach consensus on what to protect: values and attributes |
| | Step 3: Assess vulnerability to change and development |
| Integration in the wider urban framework | Step 4: Integration in the wider urban framework |
| Managing action | Step 5: Priority actions |
| | Step 6: Establishment of partnerships |
| | Monitoringa |

Adapted from Veldpaus (2015)
aAssumed by HUL Recommendation but not integrated as a critical step
23.4.1.1 Mapping Natural, Cultural and Human Resources

Mapping resources might include three dimensions (Veldpaus and Pereira Roders 2013): (a) identification through textual description of resources, (b) location of resources in a map or a table and (c) the evolution of resources through their compared analysis over time (Gustcoven 2016). A fourth dimension involving the (d) assessment of resources’ state of conservation can also be introduced.

Porto municipality has been identifying heritage properties since the first inventories developed in Portugal, namely, the “National Monuments” list of 1910 (e.g. Porto Cathedral or the Clérigos Church and Tower), as well as in successive inventories and listings. In this regard, it is important to recall the systematic digital inventory Sistema de Inventário Património Arquitectónico (SIPA) created in 1993 by the former General Directorate of National Monuments and Buildings – DGEMN12 (1929–2007).

The local cultural value as an ensemble has been recognized since the 1960s (e.g. Távora 1969). However, the nomination process of the Historic Centre of Porto to the WH list in the 1990s broadened the recognition of this value. This procedure, coordinated by the former Commissariat for the Urban Renovation of Ribeira/Barredo Area – CRUARB13 (Loza 1993, 1998, 2000) – covered a series of comprehensive surveys and studies, which provided a broad understanding of the area and contributed to the compilation of the proposal to the World Heritage list, approved in 1996.

In the following period, since 1998, the Municipal Department for Cultural Heritage (Divisão Municipal do Património Cultural) started developing the Inventário do Património Arquitetónico do Porto - IPAP (1998–2007) – including not only the historic centre but the whole city of Porto – which was later partially integrated into the PDM Heritage Charter14 (PDM Porto 2006), as a georeferenced and web-accessible instrument. Today, this collection of information constitutes a dynamic and flexible database including not only legally protected properties (listed or submitted to listing) but also other inventoried properties recognized with cultural significance (Imóveis de Interesse Patrimonial) according to specific criteria (CMP 2005b, pp. 247–248). The properties and areas defined in PDM Heritage Charter consist mostly of built heritage, from single buildings to ensembles, including also isolated urban elements (e.g. sculptures, bridges, etc.) and, for listed buildings, related protection areas (protection zones). The inventory of heritage (along with the PDM Heritage Charter) came to be a fundamental support to PDM, not only integrating this data but enhancing it with new knowledge.

Each inventoried property is also the object of individual inventory files and georeferenced in PDM Heritage Charter by a location street, the legal protection

---

12 Direção Geral dos Monumentos e Edifícios Nacionais: DGEMN.
13 The CRUARB (Comissariado para a Renovação Urbana da Área de Ribeira/Barredo) was the entity in charge of the rehabilitation and recovering process in the Porto Historic Centre (including the WH classified area) since 1974 until 2003. It has been replaced in 2004 by Porto Vivo SRU.
14 The PDM Heritage Charter is a static tool that can be periodically updated (e.g. the 2006 PDM Heritage Charter was updated in 2012).
level (listing category, when listed) and a code locating it on the map. However, the intention to provide extra information to consider in future interventions, such as significant values and attributes, has never gone beyond that, because the criteria of evaluation and the values to be preserved are not identified in the inventory files.

The PDM Heritage Charter of 2006 (Fig. 23.4) integrates the different kinds of elements proposed in the PDM report (CMP 2005a, b) and described in PDM statutory ordinance (Regulamento do PDM): Properties of Heritage Interest (inventoried and listed), Areas of Urban and Architectonic Interest, Nuclei and Places, Green Areas of Heritage Value, Perimeters of Archaeological Protection (Special Protection Zone/Automatic Protection Zone; Special Perimeter of Archaeological Protection/Zone of Archaeological Potential), ACRRU and Listed Tree Species (zones with trees; isolated trees).

There are other local inventories conducted by the Municipal Department for Cultural Heritage, but they are not integrated. Nevertheless, these may contribute to raising awareness for other heritage attributes typologies (Veldpaus 2015), such as building elements (e.g. public art, azulejos database) or even intangible typologies. Although any citizen can recommend the introduction of new properties and assets, the inclusion process remains mainly supported by expert assessments, with sparse participation of local inhabitants and associations. Some initiatives, such as the projects with scholar communities (e.g. CD-ROM “Porto o nosso Património”), may be preliminary steps to extend this process to the community.
23.4.1.2 Reach Consensus on What to Protect: Values and Attributes

The process of heritage mapping and listing in Portugal is still mostly centralized (Tarrafa Silva et al. 2017). Rather than being the outcome of an anticipatory value-based assessment, the inventory processes occur more frequently in a reactive way, in order to protect a property from an imminent damage or threat, or, because its antiquity has been recognized. This may have problematic results, as urban actors do not know what should be protected, or why, and often see these instruments as an obstacle to development. Reaching a consensus through stakeholder consultation and participatory planning on values and attributes, as recommended by HUL approach (UNESCO 2011), is crucial to solve this conflict (Bandarin and Van Oers 2012; Veldpaus 2015). Following the national perspective (Tarrafa Silva et al. 2017), in Porto, the identification of those values and attributes resulted mostly from expert value assessments, excluding the participation of other interested actors (e.g. promoters/investors, resident community, etc.).

For instance, a recent survey of Porto Historic Centre residents (Ferreira and Pinto 2017) revealed a common unawareness regarding the limits and attributes of the WH site. Moreover, the inquiries reveal the intangible attributes (people and social relations) as the most referenced cultural value (51%), contrasting with the “architectural heritage” mentioned by less than 8% of respondents (Fig. 23.5).

In Portugal, heritage listing process is a procedure that can be opened by any citizen and be evaluated by a group of experts (DGPC or town hall culture departments, [Fig. 23.5 Chart with most valued elements by Historic Centre of Porto residents. (Ferreira and Pinto 2017)](image))
in case of properties of municipal interest) and validated by an assembly democratically elected (national or municipal assemblies). In this way, it can be considered, in theory, as a result of a participatory decision process. The decision process defines that certain property has such a relevant significance that should have a special protection, materialized in the legal requirement of binding advice from DGPC or DRC and in the definition of protection zones. However, for it to move beyond being only theoretically participatory, more actors need to be engaged in the process.

From the analysis of the PDM Heritage Charter, we can observe that about 12% (155 properties) of the inventoried properties (total of 1324 properties) are listed as a National Monument (MN), Property of Public Interest (IIP) or Property of Municipal Interest (IIM), generating protection zones under the safeguarding of the DGPC (Fig. 23.6). Although the LBPC2001 law states that inventorying is the first step of protection, it is important to acknowledge that, in the practical day-to-day management of interventions in the city of Porto, only listed buildings or buildings placed in listed ensembles or protection zones have a more effective legal protection through the binding advice of DRCN or DGPC.

It should also be highlighted that there is a wide range of buildings with legal protection even though they are not listed individually, namely, the assets that are included in Public Interest Ensembles (CIP) or in the area of the Historic Centre of Porto which, according to the Portuguese legislation, is listed as National Monument15 (Fig. 23.7). These ensembles comprise a large number of properties that holding legal protection (corresponding to 18% of the total area of Porto) through binding advice of DRCN or DGPC (Fig. 23.8), and it is in this extended perspective – from the buildings to the ensembles – that we should understand the resource’s mapping of the city of Porto, with a positive remark in a HUL perspective.

---

15The following Public Interest Ensembles (CIP) are currently listed: Avenida dos Aliados, Avenida da Boavista, Avenida Montevideo, Praça da Republica and Rua Álvares Cabral, Conjunto da Foz Velha and Historic Zone of Porto.
Assess Vulnerability to Change and Development

The identification of the factors that might affect heritage properties is the last step to understand the context (step 3), before defining management strategies. Indeed, it is the correlation of the defined cultural significance (attributes and values) and the level of vulnerability of those significant resources, which enables the establishment of a coherent approach towards sustainable development. In this way, the
inheritance of the past is preserved without compromising the needs and aspirations of present and future generations. To be resilient is to be conscious of what can be changed without compromising the authenticity and integrity of the place and on the other hand to accept that conservation is the “management of thoughtful change” (Getty 2010) and not the conflict with any alteration.

The socioeconomic pressures and the impacts derived from climate change have been considered as the two of the greatest groups of threats to heritage (Veillon 2014). More specifically, in World Heritage cultural properties, the problems related to management systems and management plans are the threats with the strongest impact (Veillon 2014, 70).

In the Porto case, regarding the risks derived from natural phenomena (potentially increased with climate change impacts), these range from floods in the Douro River, extreme weather conditions, landslides or small earthquakes. Regarding threats of human origin, which are the most prominent, besides fire, these range from socioeconomic pressures and the incompatibility of uses (Loza 2017, 178), as well as pressure from real estate (generally focused on short-term profit rather than in sustainable or more compatible interventions). Some of those risks derive from tourism (the fifth in the ranking of WH cultural properties’ threats in UNESCO – Veillon 2014, 70), an economic activity that is increasing extensively in the city. Despite the undoubted positive outcomes (e.g. employment, revenues, investment, etc.), tourism also has negative impacts (e.g. gentrification, loss of authenticity and services to residents, price raising, traffic, etc.), which, if not controlled, may cause irreversible damage to the place’s value.

However, in Porto city, the only threats that have been formally reported as having a direct impact in heritage were the loss of population in the Historic Centre of Porto, noticed since the first Periodic Report (UNESCO 2006), as well as development projects, particularly the ones concerning infrastructural works to improve the navigability of the river and the protection of the shorelines (UNESCO 1998). The report sent by ICOMOS-Portugal (2012) regarding the real estate development in Cardosas Area warned of the impact that the proposed strategy might have on cultural significance and, in this case, on OUV.

Although identified, these threats are not represented in any kind of vulnerability tools. For instance, the definition of protection zones for legally protected and inventoried properties consists of a mere graphic representation of buffer zones without the identification of the relationship between properties and threats and thus cannot be considered as vulnerability tools.

In a survey carried out on the inhabitants of the Historic Centre of Porto (Ferreira and Pinto 2017), the major identified problems and threats were the excessive presence of tourist accommodation (and subsequent loss of local population), real estate pressure, as well as the negative impacts of tourism. However, local inhabitants also recognize some benefits from the tourism increase. Hence, as a recommendation, many residents suggested the introduction of policies or measures to protect the remaining residents and to find a more sustainable balance between tourism and local communities.
Finally, concerning understanding the context (steps 1, 2 and 3), HUL recommends, as best practice, full knowledge of the context, integrating positive (attributes and values) and negative (threats) factors. Though Porto is partially accomplishing this, there is a need to incorporate more surveys regarding the significance definition and related vulnerability assessment, applied to the entire city, to fully implement a HUL approach.

23.4.2 Integration in the Wider Urban Framework

The fourth step of HUL approach (Table 23.2, step 4) involves the integration of the outcomes of resource mapping, significance definition and vulnerability assessment into the “wider framework of city development” (UNESCO 2011). The integration of heritage conservation issues into spatial planning frameworks has been established as legally mandatory (Veldpaus 2015) as it is for Portuguese spatial planning tools (Tarrafa Silva 2017). While the step of resource mapping is partially accomplished by PDM (including the comprehensive inventory of the whole Porto city area in the Heritage Charter), the same cannot be said of further steps, which reflect the low investment and knowledge applied to open the discussion over values and attributes to preserve and the development of instruments to assess the impact of threats on defined cultural significance.

Nevertheless, an attempt to reach a consensus on the values to be preserved (Sect. 23.4.1.2) can be explored during the public discussions organized during planning processes (e.g. PDM), where the entire community is invited to discuss the proposed plan. However, heritage issues are not a frequently raised theme, indicating the need to develop more ad hoc initiatives to get the community involved. In a different perspective, acknowledging the value and influence of listing properties, the Porto PDM incorporates a multivariable tool (SIM-Porto) to manage construction rights in rehabilitation interventions within historic area of the ACRRU. In order to better manage the built pressures in this part of the city, the SIM-Porto weighs up social, economic and material variables, including the “heritage value” (given by the listing category) and the conservation status of the property, in order to assign fair construction rights outside the ACRRU area. However, the first analysis of the implementation (DMPOT 2012) of this tool has indicated a poor reception, which could be related to the economic crisis that hit Portugal during this period.

Regarding the assessment of vulnerability, the definition of protection zones, represented in the Restrictions Maps (Carta de Condicionantes) of spatial planning tools, is not effective enough. In fact, the relation between the values to preserve and the threats are not described and thus have no practical effect in the management process.
23.4.3 Managing Action

The last steps of the HUL approach to heritage management (Table 23.2) may be taken as the practical application of the knowledge gained in the earlier stages and integrated into a single broader stage named “managing action” (Veldpaus 2015). This stage consists of (a) the definition of priority actions to be taken with the “management of thoughtful change” (step 5), (b) the establishment of local partnerships (step 6) and (c) the monitoring of those actions (UNESCO 2011; Veldpaus 2015). The establishment of priorities and the monitoring of actions are the least established steps, while the establishment of partnerships is often “associated with the involvement of local community” (Veldpaus 2015, p. 87) and less with other interested parties (e.g. promoters, universities, construction companies, etc.).

Heritage is one of the main targets of Porto urban development, at least as it is defined in the PDM strategic objectives (CMP 2005a, b) and materialized by the continuous public investment in urban rehabilitation actions within the historic areas. Nevertheless, the identified deficiencies in the process (from the significance definition, step 2, and vulnerability assessment, step 3, resulting in considerable implications on further HUL steps) indicate also that the objective might not lie in the values and attributes conservation aims but, rather, in aims that work towards an intermediate target to accomplish other major objectives, seen as more transversal to society (e.g. economic, social, political, etc.).

Moreover, some rehabilitation action priorities were settled by the Management Plan (2008), a document developed by Porto Vivo SRU that, despite covering a bigger area than the Historic Centre of Porto – ACRRU, is still limited to an area smaller than the actual city. Based on a comprehensive survey of this area (including the assessment of conservation status, occupation, ownership and economic dynamics, mobility, environment), it defined four priority operations: Morro da Sé, Mouzinho/Flores, Clérigos and Vitória. Regarding the creation of partnerships, the town hall is very conscious of its importance and has been promoting partnerships in urban rehabilitation programs, between owners, finance institutions and construction companies (Porto Vivo SRU 2008). On a positive note, the university is often called to take part in planning processes such as in PDM revisions (e.g. University of Porto). However, the integration of community in planning and decision actions is still something that could be improved.

Furthermore, as far as monitoring is concerned, it is only assumed by the Management Plan in the Historic Zone of Porto16 and in the proprietary operations. Between 2010 and 2014, Management Plan Monitoring was subject of annual reports, providing the basis for the periodic reports sent to UNESCO every 10 years (Porto Vivo SRU 2010–2014).

Lastly, despite the described initiatives for both heritage stage processes described in 4.2 and 4.3, the integration of the gathered knowledge in the wider

---

16 The historic centre considered in Management Plan corresponds to the area nationally listed as IIP in 1997 (see Fig. 23.3), a slightly larger than the area inscribed in the World Heritage list.
urban policies and further monitoring actions suggested by HUL Recommendation as a good practice are compromised, in Porto, by the incomplete definition of the context, as described on the first global stage (4.1).

23.5 Conclusion and Recommendations

The HUL Recommendation is not a binding document and neither is it a new heritage category. However, as a definition and an approach, it is perfectly clear regarding the flexibility and adaptability to each context of the proposed action plan and tools. The recommendation lies essentially in proceeding with the principles of sustainable development, in which the widest participation possible is crucial, where all involved parts are aware of what has been managed.

Porto has a long history on heritage safeguarding and on its integration into urban development frameworks and strategies. However, some problems still persist, and the dispersion of entities, areas and tools makes management often ineffective. As previously reported, while the identification of the city resources is well developed, the same cannot be said regarding the identification of the values to be preserved and the vulnerability level ascribed to them. In this way, more all-inclusive initiatives are demanded, extended beyond the listed properties, and in which all the interested parts are invited to effectively define the values and attributes to be conserved. Moreover, threats jeopardizing properties should be clearly identified and connected with the values defined to be preserved. The intersection between the defined values and related threats is crucial for every city stakeholder.

As stated before, the deficiencies in the “understanding context” stage compromise the rest of the process. In fact, as it happens in Porto (namely, in the PDM), inventories may be integrated into wider urban development policies, but it has not an effective consequence in the management of city development. Hence, we might conclude that despite the legal obligation to integrate heritage in wider planning frameworks, its perception still remains limited. In other words, heritage is often associated with restrictions to development and not as something that can be changed and adapted to fulfil current needs, without compromising its consensually assumed authenticity and integrity.

The “Management Plan” appears to be the most comprehensive tool and closest to HUL Recommendation, integrating the identification of resources besides cultural ones, identifying some related threats and establishing priority actions and partnerships. It also has its own monitoring process, in which the defined indicators reflect a more inclusive approach. However, it only concerns a part of the city, greater than the historic centre, but still only a part and not the city as a whole. Also, the actions, translated in ARU, which are urban development tools, are very focused on detailed quarters and missing the whole picture.

In Porto city, most of the identified gaps in a HUL perspective may result from the unfamiliarity with these concepts and processes. Hence, the dissemination of initiatives and tools to promote the HUL approach may change the way in which
heritage resources are still treated, which varies in between two extreme opposites: everything is valuable and then everything should be preserved, or in face of the ambiguity, every change is acceptable (including total demolition and disappearance). Part of the required knowledge and tools may be already present, but a perspective in which heritage is fully seen as a city development resource should auspiciously be adopted.
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