Theory and Practice in Sustainable Urban Development

Dennis Rodwell

Abstract

This paper opens by outlining the concept of the sustainable city from a historical perspective and through the eyes of key theorists and practitioners from the early-twentieth century onwards. It relates the concept to traditional patterns of urban development and relationships to their hinterland, and interprets it in the context of today’s holistic agenda of sustainability – environmental, social, economic and cultural – in a globalised world.

The paper illustrates alternative present-day approaches to the strategic and detailed management of historic cities, from the metropolitan scale downwards. It concludes by exampling models and initiatives that equate most closely with an anthropological vision for the balanced evolution of historic cities, one that absorbs challenges and contradictions and treats conservation and creative continuity as two sides of the same coin.

The Sustainable City

The historic city

The archetypal, pre-industrial European historic city shared many characteristics in common (Rodwell 2007: 23-25). It was a centre of power and of social and cultural interaction. It was clearly defined and compact, had few major buildings and a central market place, and was diffused with craft industries and traders. Its community was mixed – always socially, sometimes also by ethnic origin and religion – and it enjoyed a balanced relationship to its locality both physically and ecologically. The historic city possessed strong identity, harmony and sense of place. It functioned at a human scale, with mixed uses in close proximity, and its architectural homogeneity was underscored by the use of constructional materials and craft skills that were predominantly sourced locally – whilst subject to periodic external cultural influences (Figure 1).

Sustainability, localisation and globalisation

In recent years the concept of sustainability has spawned a number of well-known catchphrases (Rodwell 2007: 183-97). Firstly, ‘think global, act local’: this urges people to consider and act, in their communities and cities, in accordance with the needs of the health of the planet. Secondly, the ‘3 Rs’, ‘reduce, reuse and recycle’: this implies maximising what exists, recognising the environmental capital (embodied energy) of resources that have already been invested (for example in existing buildings and urban infrastructure, thus supporting adaptive reuse over redevelopment) and generally adopting an approach of minimum intervention. Thirdly, ‘stay close to source’: this prioritises proximity, whether of sources of materials, energy and food to place of consumption, place of work to residence, or education to leisure. And fourthly, ‘top-down meeting bottom-up’: whilst recognising that continuity of community practices often depends on support from regional or national strategies, this favours local knowledge over received theories from outside.

In the context of cities, the built environment is thus increasingly recognised and valued today as a material and socio-economic resource at least as much as an architectural and historic one.

The concept of sustainability has also encouraged wider usage of the term localisation as the converse of the more familiar globalisation. Within Europe, localisation can still be found in parts of rural Romania, where certain villages retain their traditional, balanced, ecological relationship to their local hinterlands, a strong sense of physical and cultural identity specific to each community, and where the catchphrases of ‘stay close to source’ and ‘reduce, reuse and recycle’ are a fundamental part of life (Rodwell 2008a). The prospects for the survival of such largely self-sufficient communities in today’s world are, however, highly precarious.

The concept of globalisation is not, per se, a twentieth century invention. The 1000 year-old maritime mercantile republics of Venice and Dubrovnik, for example, enjoyed a quasi-globalised

Figure 1 Rothenburg ob der Tauber, Bavaria, Germany: an archetypal medieval, pre-industrial historic town, one that has guarded its harmony and sense of place. (source Dennis Rodwell)
as well as balanced trading, cultural and ecological relationship to their extended hinterlands, and hosted a mélange of ethnic and religious communities from the full length and breadth of the Mediterranean and beyond.

The strong sense of place in these cities was reinforced with strict urban planning regulations. Those of Dubrovnik, for example, date from 1272 and continue to guide building heights and materials (but not architectural style), colours and advertising in that city (Rodwell 2004) (Figure 2).

The protection of sense of place in the context of multiple influences is not a new phenomenon. It is the geo-cultural spread, the diversity and rapidity of communication sources, and the widespread lack of effective regulatory frameworks that is more recent.

**Figure 2** Dubrovnik, Croatia: an historical example of globalisation in the socio-economic sense, but which has guarded its architectural homogeneity, cultural distinctiveness, and sense of place. (source Dennis Rodwell)

### Sustainable development and the city

The classic definition of sustainable development appears in the 1987 *Brundtland Report* (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987): ‘Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’ At the time, the concept was considered to have three ‘pillars’: environmental protection; economic growth; and social equity. This interpretation has since been strengthened to embrace quality of life, geo-cultural identity and diversity. Hence, sustainable development now has a fourth ‘pillar’: cultural continuity.

Patrick Geddes (1854–1932) – biologist, botanist, sociologist and town planner, based in Scotland (Edinburgh) and France (Montpellier) – defined the city as an ecosystem, with cycles of birth, growth, blossoming, decline, decay and rebirth (Rodwell 2007: 30–33). His approach to urban planning was aimed at countering the degenerative tendencies in this cycle by focusing on processes of continuous enhancement in the quality of both environment and life. He highlighted the inter-disciplinary nature of town planning: concerned with people, place and culture. He also identified – before either term had acquired today’s currency – that managing the step-change from localisation to globalisation depends on the global relationship between cities and the world’s natural resources coupled with maintaining the overall balance between the manmade and natural environments. The principles are the same; the variable is scale.

In the context of his work in Edinburgh as a property developer, principally in the 1890s, he devised the term ‘conservative surgery’, by which he meant the combination of restoration, rehabilitation and new insertions in harmony. These initiatives reflected his interpretation of the concept of minimum intervention, and represented an important tangible contribution to his theoretical work on quality of life, sense of place and cultural continuity in cities.

The concept of the city as an ecosystem has been taken forward in the literature on sustainable cities from the early-1990s onwards: notably in the 1994 Aalborg Charter (European Conference on Sustainable Cities & Towns 1994) and other seminal publications (Rogers 1997; Girardet 2004; Newman & Jennings 2008).

Certain key issues arise from this literature that help to define the characteristics of the sustainable city: efficiency in the use of land; renewable sources for materials and energy; limitation of wastes and a focus on recycling; and environmental quality.

From this, there is a general consensus that the sustainable city is compact, dense and mixed in use; daily journeys are limited through the proximity of functions; walking and cycling are prioritised; and it is polycentric in its expansion as well as in its relationship to other cities. Also – as noted already in relation to the catchphrases of sustainability – historic cities are recognised as constituting a material and socio-economic resource as well as a cultural one, thereby considerably enhancing the reasons for their conservation and adaptive reuse (Rodwell 2007: 111–21).

The key issues and general consensus suggest that the historic city is a model for the sustainable city.

### Alternative Models and Shifts in Perception

#### The ‘Western model’ for post-industrial cities

Two inter-related models have acted as drivers for urban planning across much of the Western world. Firstly, the Garden City: the simplistic, two-dimensional, quasi-sociological concept of land use separation for new towns and cities according to housing, recreation, industry and circulation that was devised by Ebenezer Howard (1850–1928) (Howard 1898 and 1946). Secondly, the Modern Movement’s interpretation of and promotion of this concept as the basis for the reconstruction of historic cities according to the same formula of living, recreation, working and transportation, as famously taken up by Le Corbusier (1887–1965) (Le Corbusier 1957). Le Corbusier’s 1925 *Plan Voisin* illustrated the rebuilding of Paris according to this model, including the replacement of the Marais quarter by 18 office-use skyscrapers (Le Corbusier 1947: 285–99).

The legacy of the ‘Western model’ includes urban dispersal and transport dependence; the concentration of volatile redevelopment pressures in sensitive historic centres; the loss of material fabric and socio-economic identity; and inner-city neighbourhoods that have frequently become the focus for degradation and socio-economic problems. This model represents the antithesis of the sustainable city.

#### Alternative vision of complementary development

Gustavo Giovannoni (1873–1947) – architect-planner, restorer and teacher, based in Italy (Rome) – focused his prolific
published output on the inter-relationship between the historic and the modern city at all levels, from the strategic to the detail of practice (Giovannoni 1931 and 1998). He pioneered the idea of mutually supportive harmonious coexistence, arguing that the correct response to the inter-relationship was to understand and work with the respective, complementary qualities and opportunities of each.

Giovannoni characterised the historic city by its compactness; the pedestrian pace and rhythm of life; the small scale of its urban grain and public spaces; the close proximity of its many different activities; its distinctive socio-economic role and vibrancy; and its contextual homogeneity. He characterised the modern city by its possibilities of limitless expansion; its faster pace and dynamism related to non-pedestrian forms of movement; the larger scale of its urban layout, buildings and spaces; and its lack of contextuality – hence its freedom from design constraint.

Giovannoni opposed Le Corbusier’s espousal of the Garden City as the response to the challenge of the historic city as simplistic and out-dated. He was equally opposed to the ‘embalming’ of historic cities for historical, aesthetic or tourist objectives. Thus, whereas Howard and Le Corbusier ignored the concept of the sustainable city, Geddes and Giovannoni anticipated it.

**Broadening perceptions, 1970s to date**

Changing perceptions in the field of architectural and urban conservation can be observed by comparing two publications, one in celebration of European Architectural Heritage Year 1975, the other at the early dawn of the third millennium.

Firstly: by arguing that ‘The starting point in a historic town must be its historic quality and visual character – not secondary social, economic or even ecological arguments’ (Cantacuzino 1975: 4, 18).

Secondly: by questioning ‘... if the conservation movement, as it evolved from the eighteenth century, cannot be considered as concluded, and whether modern conservation should not be redefined in reference to the environmental sustainability of social and economic development within the overall cultural and ecological situation on earth’ (Jokilehto 1999: 19).

In 2003, Sylvio Mutal, international consultant, expressed the latter sentiment more clearly and concisely: ‘Conservation is not sustainable if it is only carried out for cultural reasons’. Rodwell (2007) sets out the complex background to this debate and takes it forward.

This progression related in a theoretical as well as practical sense to a shift in perceptions at international level from a primarily monumental and aesthetic interpretation of ‘monuments’ and ‘groups of buildings’ as physical objects to be protected and conserved in isolation (UNESCO 1972), to ‘inhabited historic towns’ (UNESCO 2008).

This epitomised a broader understanding of historic cities as places of habitation and socio-economic activity, in which individual cultural objects are recognised as components within their wider settings and human context.

This progression runs parallel to the accumulation of complementary concepts and values and the re-interpretation of established ones, including:

- 1992: *cultural landscapes*, as defined in UNESCO (2008) as the ‘combined works of nature and man’;
- 1994: the Nara Document on Authenticity, which involved a reassessment of the concept of authenticity to embrace differing geo-cultural conservation practices (Lemaire & Stovel 1994);
- 2003: The Convention for Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2003), which gave voice to the need and established measures (including a representative list) to safeguard and maintain creative continuity of community-based expressions and skills such as oral traditions and language, performing arts, rituals and festive events, social practices and traditional craftsmanship;
- 2005: The Convention on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO 2005b), which sought to promote respect and raise awareness of the value of cultural diversity at all levels from the local to the international, ‘the importance of the link between culture and development for all countries, particularly developing countries’, and highlighted the challenges to cultural diversity posed by today’s processes of globalisation; and
- 2005: The UNESCO initiative on *historic urban landscapes* (see below).

This progression also runs parallel to the emerging global agendas of sustainable development: namely, the inter-relationship of environmental, social, economic and cultural issues, in which heritage is recognised as a cumulative material, functional, financial and cultural resource; and of climate change, and a heightened awareness of the spectrum of conservation issues as they affect both the natural and man-made worlds.

**The anthropological vision**

This broadening of perceptions and accumulation of parallel agendas constitutes a move from traditional scientific approaches to the conservation of manifestations of tangible cultural heritage for their architectural and historic interest, to a complex world that engages with today’s societies and demands holistic approaches.

It furthermore involves a re-interpretation of the concept of heritage from something that relates only to the past and is preserved as historical evidence and packaged for tourism, to an *anthropological vision* of geo-cultural identity and creative continuity. To be effective and sustainable as an ongoing expression of cultural diversity, this re-interpretation needs to be related to the dynamics of social and cultural processes and the evolving aspirations of peoples and communities (Rodwell 2007: 187).

This represents a step-change from a focus on objects that require to be preserved to processes that require to be revived (where lost or in jeopardy) and sustained. Critically, it embraces intangible cultural heritage traditions, spirit of place (Rodwell 2006d), and relationships at all levels between the human and natural worlds.

**Different Approaches in Practice**

**Museological approach: Ancient Reserve, Plovdiv, Bulgaria, 1950s onwards**

With a history that dates back over 6000 years, Plovdiv is one of Europe’s oldest cities. Today, the upper layering of the historic core boasts over 200 town mansions dating from the mid-nineteenth century and built in the national revival style,
also known as the Bulgarian Renaissance. As the starting point for the city’s urban conservation programme in the 1950s, the inhabitants were relocated to post-war suburban housing estates and the area was designated a cultural, higher education and tourist zone – the Ancient Reserve – and detached from the everyday life of the community. There was a limited perception of appropriate uses for the 200 mansion houses, and today around half remain underused, in poor condition or derelict (Rodwell 2007: 19-20).

There are only so many art galleries, museums, libraries, and institutes that any city can support. The Ancient Reserve has taken on the aspect of an open-air museum, with its associated complement of souvenir shops and stalls, and the city is struggling to find either investment or uses for the many derelict houses.

**Museological to integrated approach: Marais quarter, Paris, 1960s onwards**

Prepared under the provisions of the 1962 loi Malraux, the first plan de sauvegarde et mise en valeur (conservation plan) anticipated that ‘the only solution for the revitalization of the 300 large residences in the Marais is to use them for embassies or head offices of large companies’ (Sorlin 1972) – to which were added art galleries, museums and governmental offices. However, as with the Ancient Reserve at Plovdiv, there were too many. The plan was substantially revised to incorporate other uses, notably housing, through a combination of subdivision and new build; in short, holistic, heritage-led regeneration including the integration of contemporary architecture, thereby echoing the philosophy and practice of Geddes and Giovannoni (Rodwell 2007: 15-18, 128-131).

**Strategic approaches: A Tale of Two Cities – Paris and London, 1950s onwards**

Comparison of photographs of the historic urban landscape of the French capital, viewed westwards from the tower of the cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris and taken at different dates, illustrates a strategic approach to the planning of a major European city that is at substantial variance with Paris’s counterpart in the United Kingdom, London. The only significant variation since at least 1945 is the appearance on the horizon of the administrative and business quarter of La Défense (Rodwell 2007: 59-63) (Figure 3). Paris conforms to the model of a polycentric metropolitan city, one that permits freedom of layout and architectural expression outside the city centre whilst protecting the urban grain and integrity of mixed-use quarters at the historic core – quarters that function seven days a week and support continuity of small-scale artisan businesses and traditions. Paris conforms to the model of harmonious coexistence anticipated by Gustavo Giovannoni.

London, on the other hand, has developed over the same period as an increasingly monocentric metropolitan city, in which the key functions are separated – especially work and residence – and where the physical heart, the City, only functions on weekdays, and small-scale artisan businesses have been driven out (Rodwell 2007: 59-60). London conforms to the Western model for post-industrial cities, as promoted by Howard and Le Corbusier. The skyline of the City of London today, with its plethora of high-rise office buildings, is witness to this (Figure 4). In Paris, the historic urban landscape and continuity of cultural identity have been protected; in London, both have been seriously undermined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The pace of change and dynamics of development in cities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The concentration of these forces in their most vulnerable, historic quarters;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-rise and other out-of-scale buildings within and neighbouring historic city centres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Iconic contemporary architecture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pressures for large-scale floor-space for public administration, commerce, retail and services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The predicted doubling of international tourist numbers by 2020; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The threats these all pose to the fabric, grain, functionality, distinctiveness and urban landscapes of historic cities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban conservation today is plagued by two linguistic constructs. Firstly, heritage. UNESCO defines heritage as an inclusive concept: ‘Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations’ (UNESCO 2000). This definition is neither limited in time nor restricted to material objects. Equally, English Heritage defines the historic environment as an all-embracing concept: ‘It is all about us’ (Historic Environment Review Steering Group 2000). At the same time, English Heritage cites a survey claiming that
70 per cent (only) of the population makes at least one heritage visit in a year. How can these two concepts be separated? One has to ask if the heritage construct is relevant in today’s world, with its focus on environmental sustainability and climate change. How does it help us to understand, let alone articulate and manage, the issues that confront historic cities today?

Secondly, the contemporary construct. Does, as dictionaries tell us, contemporary mean: firstly, occurring at the present time; and secondly, conformity with modern (and transient) ideas in style or fashion? Or, in the context of today’s ‘iconic’ architectural interventions, does it only mean the latter? If so, does this help the objective of harmonious coexistence, or does it make discord and conflict inevitable – both physically and culturally?

Meantime, the theory and practice of urban conservation, a key component and manifestation of sustainable urban development, is challenged by the anthropological vision. This, a dynamic approach to creative cultural continuity that is bottom-up (community-driven) not top-down (academically-contrived) and led more by baseline cultural diversity than external, received ‘norms’, represents an overarching approach that avoids preoccupations with the heritage and contemporary constructs, thereby embracing conservation and development as two sides of the same coin.

The United Kingdom approach

The approach to historic environment protection in the United Kingdom illustrates this debate. From the technical point of view, conservation philosophy and practice are exemplary. Strategically, theory and practice are fragmented and weak. The system of national designations includes individual ancient monuments, listed buildings, parks and gardens – and may eventually include World Heritage Sites. Local designations embrace conservation areas and locally listed buildings.

At first glance, this framework may seem inclusive. The key fragments are, however, designated only for their ‘architectural or historic interest’, the ‘character or appearance’ of which should be ‘preserved or enhanced’ (the key terms that feature throughout the legislation and guidance). Terms such as ‘values’, ‘authenticity’ and ‘integrity’ – essential to the international lexicon – are not recognised. Importantly, the fragmentary approach does not include any provision for overarching designations for historic cities. Nor does it bear any intrinsic relationship to issues of urban landscape, functionality, or intangible cultural heritage (Rodwell 2007: 86-110).

A case in point is ‘Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City’, which was inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 2004 (Rodwell 2008b). The major waterfront developments to the north, seaward side of the Pier Head group (sometimes known as the ‘Three Graces’) post-date that inscription and were not acknowledged in the nomination document to UNESCO. A defining characteristic of the Liverpool waterfront is the historical relationship between the horizontality of the long, low, brick-built warehouses and the vertical punctuation at the higher ground of the commercial and residential city behind. Indeed, the nomination document championed the cause of inscription as a World Heritage Site on the premise that the surviving urban landscape testified to the historical role of Liverpool as a great port city and defined its ‘tangible authenticity’. The trio of buildings at Pier Head is described as the focal point: ‘They form a dramatic manifestation of Liverpool’s historical significance … [whose] vast scale … allows them to dominate the waterfront when approaching by ship’. The fragmentary approach to designations has severely prejudiced this, as has the insistence that modern interventions in the city should be contemporary (Figure 5).

Tom Dyckhoff, architecture critic of The Times, recently described the new waterfront as comprising ‘frivolous, flash-in-the-pan architecture that could have been built by anyone anywhere.’

Photo montages of the City of London, showing St Paul’s Cathedral set against high-rise developments that have already been built and others for which planning consents have been granted, expose parallel consequences even more dramatically – with ever more bizarrely named structures such as the ‘gherkin’, ‘walkie-talkie’, ‘cheese-grater’, ‘helter-skelter’ and ‘shard of glass’. This calls into serious question key governmental guidance and methodologies (CABE & English Heritage 2007; English Heritage 2008; Rodwell 2009a).

In both Liverpool and London there is manifest conflict between the constructs of heritage and contemporary, coupled with a loss of identity, sense of place and cultural continuity.

Tools for a holistic approach

The strategic approach that is manifest in Paris depends on a number of key tools that date back to the middle of the nineteenth century. The polycentric regional plan of which La Défense forms a part dates from the 1950s, building height protection dates from the 1930s, and protection of the small-scale mixed-use urban grain – through a combination of urban planning regulations and protectionist policies towards artisan businesses – dates from the time of Baron Haussmann (Rodwell 2007: 60-63, 65, 128-31). It is evident that if artisan businesses can survive in the heart of metropolitan Paris, so can they survive in any historic city. The beneficial results include the protection of sense of place in the physical sense as well as socio-economic and cultural continuity.

At the international level, the UNESCO historic urban landscapes initiative seeks to convey our holistic understanding of inhabited historic cities as an amalgam of their tangible and intangible cultural heritage aspects and related natural elements (both within cities and in their settings and surroundings), thus constituting ‘the combined works of nature and man’ in the fullest sense (UNESCO 1972 and 2008). It embraces the four components of sustainable development: the social, economic, environmental and cultural. Importantly, it seeks to articulate the city as a continuously evolving process rather than an object fixed in time. The stages of the initiative to date comprise:

Environment’ which, in response to specific threats posed by high-rise and other contentious construction projects in or adjacent to historic cities around the world, resulted in the publication of the Vienna Memorandum (UNESCO 2005a); this was conceived both as a transitional document to inform ongoing debate and ‘as a key statement for an integrated approach linking contemporary architecture, sustainable urban development and landscape integrity based on existing historic patterns, building stock and context’;

- 2006: a regional conference held in Jerusalem (Jerusalem International Workshop 2006), which highlighted the importance of authenticity and integrity, emphasised the importance of natural elements, and recommended elaborating existing and creating new tools such as cultural mapping to promote and better serve the concept of historic urban landscapes through identification, understanding, environmental, visual, social and economic impact assessments, management and monitoring;

- 2007: regional conferences held in Saint Petersburg (UNESCO 2007a) and Olinda (UNESCO 2007b) which highlighted the need for a new approach to urban planning that re-positions it as part of a continuous cultural process that embraces intangible as well as tangible values, reinforces genius loci, and engages with ecological issues;

- 2008 (October): a workshop held during the ICOMOS General Assembly in Quebec City (Rodwell 2008c), which supported the need for policies and indicators that would guide acceptable, balanced change and development in historic cities;

- 2008 (November): a planning workshop held at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris; and, as direct follow-up,

- 2011 (provisionally): a new UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes (covering historic cities worldwide) and revisions to the UNESCO Operational Guidelines (applicable to World Heritage Sites).

The discipline of urban morphology – which, at least in the United Kingdom, is largely unrecognised – has a key role to play in supporting an understanding of individual historic cities as a process rather than an object: not according to established notions of historical or stylistic ‘period’, rather through recognising the evolving relationship between the urban grain, built form, and land and building use in cities; thereby accentuating their unique socio-economic and cultural identity, multiple layering and ‘spirit of place’. The urban morphology discipline avoids the heritage and contemporary constructs and is an important tool for the management of change in historic cities (Rodwell 2009b).

Conclusion

The focus of this seminar was stated as ‘The preservation of historic cities and the built environment’. Personally, I cannot relate to this. According to the Burra Charter ‘Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration’ (ICOMOS-Australia 1999). To me, preservation has nothing to do with the management of historic cities and the built environment in the twenty-first century. Historic cities are concerned with managing change; or, as some prefer, ‘managing conservation in a changing world’ (Rodwell 2008d).

Additionally, two key questions were posed for this seminar. Firstly, ‘How can cultural and natural landscapes be sustained in a rapidly globalising world?’ In this, I suggest that it is imperative to understand and articulate historic cities as a process rather than as an object, and to manage them as such.

Secondly, ‘How can professionals involved in heritage practice deal with the challenges of modernity without the risk of losing cultural uniqueness and diversity?’ In this, I consider that we should abandon the heritage and contemporary constructs, engage with the anthropological vision and the discipline of urban morphology, and place the historic environment and its conservation as a core part of the training in key professions such as urban planning and architecture; not as separate, supplementary specialisms.

Finally, we need to be fully conscious of the dangers implicit in Giovannoni’s opposition to the embalming of historic cities for historical, aesthetic or tourist objectives. As Youngson (1990) wrote: ‘Tourism is a great modern industry. [...] We had lots of those during the Industrial Revolution and we have been cleaning up the mess ever since’ (Figure 6).

Figure 6  Warsaw, Poland. The old town is at serious risk of being overwhelmed by mass tourism. Here, a hurdy-gurdy in the market square. (source Dennis Rodwell)

End Notes


2 In the television programme ‘A Year in the Life’, broadcast on BBC2 on 19 January 2008, which reported on Liverpool, European Capital of Culture 2008.
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