The HUL and the Australian Burra Charter - some implications for local heritage practices

The HUL and the Australian Burra Charter —some implications for local heritage practices

Kristal Buckley AM and Susan Fayad

Abstract

This paper considers the experiences of engagement with the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) in the City of Ballarat in relation to the practices established by the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, (The Burra Charter)*. Examining the ways in which Australian local heritage practices have been shaped by the *Burra Charter* allows some of the complementarities and differences of HUL to be explored—for cities, for the ways in which current and future communities respond to change, and for localising heritage practices.

Introduction

Change and the dynamics of urban systems have proven to be challenging for the methods and formal systems of global heritage practices. Globally, and in Australia, many cities are undergoing rapid and transformative changes through population increase, demographic shifts, technological innovations and myriad social and economic factors. As a consequence, many of the most contested contexts for heritage practices are situated in urban areas.

This paper reflects on an Australian example of the implementation of a new approach to managing heritage in urban environments, stimulated in part by UNESCO's Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) (UNESCO 2011; WHITRAP et al. 2016). However, our purpose is not merely to report on this experience, but rather to begin to explore what it suggests for existing Australian approaches to heritage management. In particular, it shines a light on the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance,* (*Burra Charter*) (Australia ICOMOS 2013), and speculates on its capacities to contribute to strategic thinking about local change and urbanisation processes.

The case study for this exploration is the City of Ballarat, located in the central goldfields region of Victoria (see Figure 1). Ballarat's urban character and spatial layout reflects the city's gold rush history, boom and bust periods, the garden city movement, modernism and, more recently, urban sprawl. The city's layout also reflects its natural setting. The town was initially surveyed in relation to natural landmarks, including Mount Warrenheip and Mount Buninyong. Its urban setting includes Lake Wendouree, waterways, a basalt ridge which separates the chaotic alluvial mining area of Ballarat East from the planned central business district, and a forested ridge to the east. These features are integral to Ballarat's cultural landscape. They hold spiritual meanings for the Wadawurrung traditional owners, and they are part of the sense of place, identity and belonging for many citizens. In 2013, Ballarat became the first Australian city, and the first local government authority in the world to formally join the global pilot phase for the HUL, led by a UNESCO Category 2 Centre, the Shanghai-based World Heritage Institute for Training and Research in the Asia-Pacific region (WHITR-AP).

Figure 1: Map showing the location of Ballarat in Victoria's Central Goldfields region, Australia [source: City of Ballarat]

The work in implementing the HUL in the City of Ballarat has resulted in the mainstreaming of heritage and the HUL into a new strategy to guide the city's growth to 2040 (City of Ballarat 2015). An enlivened purpose for heritage has stimulated new community-based methods and knowledge tools (Buckley et al. 2015; Fayad & Buckley [in press]; Fayad [in press]). Building on previous observations, the purpose of this paper is to share some early thinking about the HUL in relation to the *Burra Charter,* and by extension, to Australian heritage practices at the local level.

The *Burra Charter* and Australian heritage practices are well-aligned with the HUL due to their shared values-based foundations. However, experiences with the HUL in Ballarat allow some differences to be identified when comparing 'conventional' practices at the local level with the emerging HUL approach (Buckley et al. 2015: 106). While the international network of cities working with the HUL has been a tremendous source of sharing, encouragement and momentum building (Fayad & Buckley [in press]; Avila & Perez 2016; Go-HUL 2017; van Oers & Roders 2013), there are some issues that are specifically applicable to Australia, and worthy of debate within the membership of Australia ICOMOS.

The Urban Shift

'Today, for the first time in history, humanity is predominantly an urban species'
(UNESCO 2016: 3).

UNESCO's contribution to the 2016 United Nations (UN) Habitat III Conference on Sustainable Urban Development held in Quito, Ecuador, indicates the magnitude of change facing contemporary communities globally, particularly those in urban environments. In 2012, UN-Habitat outlined the scale of this challenge, stating that developed countries like Australia 'will need to double the amount of urban space by 2050 to accommodate expected numbers of people', while developing countries, like many of our regional neighbours 'need to expand urban space by more than 300 per cent' (UN-Habitat 2012: 178).

In Australia, media headlines such as 'Population growth has become Victoria's biggest political issue' (Tomazin 2016), and 'Population Booms: Victoria has four of the five fastest growing suburbs in Australia' (Martin & Lucas 2017) are commonplace. Processes of urbanisation can be beneficial—particularly as cities move to position themselves globally. However, the scale and speed of these changes are associated with contested social, environmental and political issues, insufficiently controlled growth, declining housing affordability, commercial development pressures, unsustainable energy consumption, pollution, poverty, congestion, food insecurity (through loss of rural areas by urban sprawl) and a changing climate (Omnilink 2014). These are signs of a new urban reality for which existing city policy frameworks are not always well-equipped.

Increasingly uniform urban development and design is one response to rapid urbanisation, often with associated losses of heritage, local distinctiveness and diversity. Other common responses are to turn to new iconic architecture (termed 'starchitecture'), city branding, large-scale cultural and sporting events and global tourism trends to *stand-out from the crowd*.

It is therefore unsurprising that UNESCO has focussed on the increasingly complex challenges for urban conservation, which as van Oers (2007: 44) acknowledged, are 'one of the most daunting … of our time'.

An important milestone has been the inclusion of specific mentions of heritage and culture in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNESCO 2015). While a number of the goals and targets are relevant, Goal 11: 'Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable', has been accompanied by a target (11.4): 'Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage'. The explicit mention of heritage in the SDGs is new and acknowledges the crucial role that heritage and culture play in sustainable urban development (UNESCO 2016). It is significant that heritage is now part of the global agenda for city development. This has stimulated new work to ensure that this can be effectively delivered at the city level, complementing work done through the HUL. It has also begun to open new spaces for heritage in global funding programmes, pilots and discussions about culture-led sustainable development. For example, investments and capacity building are available through the United Nations Global Compact—Cities Programme (UNGCCP)[1]; and the new City Partnerships 'sustainable urban development initiative' for Australian cities aims to deliver SDG goals through transparent governance, industry partnerships and high level projects to attract investment (UNGCCP 2017). As heritage practitioners and advocates, it is important to ask whether we are equipped and ready to engage with these new openings.

The HUL approach and the City of Ballarat

UNESCO's General Conference adopted its 'Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape' in 2011, following a programme of consultation about the problems and potential innovations for urban heritage conservation. Contentious issues and debates about World Heritage cities—such as the inclusion of new tall buildings in historic city centres—had pushed the need for the Recommendation. However, its text is inclusive of all the world's urban settlements (Bandarin & van Oers 2012). Its strengs come from the simple but powerful acknowledgement of the challenges, provision of a flexible and adaptable framework for localised application, and the beginnings of a collaborative network of active organisations and individuals.

Typically, the reaction to escalating threats to heritage is to strengthen protective measures; but while planning mechanisms and legal frameworks have their place in the HUL, they are not its primary focus. The HUL moves *beyond* a protection or preservation-focussed lens. It attempts to bring together the goals of social and economic development with the goals of conservation by recognising that places are not static; that new development can reinforce heritage meanings and roles; and, by embracing the possibilities of promoting heritage as an asset for city development (UNESCO 2013a). Through the HUL, an awareness of the fragile nature of urban conservation in constantly changing and dynamic environments has created the basis for *reimagining* heritage and its role in the development of cities. Rather than a separate selected and protected element, often considered 'off to the side' of major urban processes, the HUL poses heritage as a critical resource for the sustainability of the city, to be mainstreamed.

The HUL employs a landscape lens to reconceptualise urban heritage (Buckley et al. 2016). It challenges the bounded and defined status of heritage places, and recognises that tangible and intangible attributes and processes give the 'living' city its complex cultural identity, distinctiveness, sense of place and belonging. By responding to and strengthening, rather than diminishing the city's distinctive identity, the HUL approach recognises that change can contribute to its cultural vitality, resilience and sustainability. It is in this way that the HUL uses identity as a *point of departure*, which provides a framework for aligning the goals of social and economic development with those of urban conservation (UNESCO 2013a) while also providing the basis for a 'comprehensive and integrated approach' to urban conservation 'within an overall sustainable development framework' (UNESCO 2011: pars. 1,10). None of this can be achieved without the active participation of local citizens, localised approaches and collaboration across a multitude of stakeholders.

In 2013, the City of Ballarat joined UNESCO's global pilot programme to operationalise the HUL approach. This enabled Ballarat to contribute through practice-led action research and organisation-wide implementation, feeding lessons back into the international dialogue. Many have asked, why Ballarat? The city is known for its intact heritage streetscapes, grand boulevards and other historic features, however, it was also experiencing above-trend growth, including the development of new areas of urban sprawl at the city's urban fringe. The city's heritage was becoming increasingly vulnerable to market-driven forces and policy shifts, heightening community concerns. In 2013, new projections found that the city was the fastest growing regional city in Victoria with a 60 per cent population increase projected over a twenty-five year period, due in part to the pressures to decentralise population from Melbourne. What was new was the speed and scale of these growth projections, supported by state policy frameworks which aimed to create a 'state of cities' by 'unlock[ing] their growth potential' and 'achiev[ing] accelerated growth' (State of Victoria 2014), including in Ballarat's historic central business district. These factors have generated new challenges for Ballarat's communities, and its heritage and planning practitioners, and have placed additional pressures on local regulatory tools such as the Heritage Overlay planning scheme control.

The Ballarat Strategy 2015 was developed as a key part of a suite of new and revamped tools for community engagement, planning, knowledge, regulation and finances (van Oers 2015; Fayad & Buckley [in press]). Guided by the HUL approach, the Strategy quickly evolved to become the key city development framework for how Ballarat is managed to 2040. The Ballarat Strategy now guides the four-year Council Plan and all other strategies and plans developed by the local government. A participatory process called 'Ballarat Imagine' was a key part of the development of the Strategy—a simple, positively framed survey to identify Ballarat's most valued attributes, future visions and limits of acceptable change by asking what people love, imagine and want to retain for Ballarat. The survey resulted in an overwhelming commitment to conserve and make the most of Ballarat's valued identity and distinctiveness—particularly the city's heritage, historic streetscapes and features and its cultural events and tourism.

Ballarat's experience of implementing the HUL and the effects of the Ballarat Strategy have been transformative on many levels. There has been a new vigour and focus on the city's heritage, new stakeholder involvement and commitment to heritage through an increase in staffing and financial resources, integration in key city initiatives and both regulatory and non-regulatory policies (such as the Ballarat Planning Scheme, Council Plan and CBD Strategy). For the council's heritage and planning officers, the biggest shift has been moving from a rules-based framework to a problem-solving framework (Fayad & Buckley [in press]). For example, the city is developing streetscape regeneration projects based on place-based interpretative themes, together with an understanding of social and economic processes which make each area's heritage both valued and vulnerable. Stories of place are capturing the imagination of stakeholders, inspiring more creative and contextualised solutions and outcomes. Regeneration is being delivered through arts activation, linking social capital with works to keep and attract niche businesses. Previous capital works upgrade projects were focused on general economic activation, but the early signs from the new HUL-inspired approach demonstrate better social and conservation outcomes.

For the city as a whole, using the HUL has strengthened the commitment to Ballarat's distinctive identity and heritage and has added value to various city-wide projects. It has dramatically strengthened the role of culture across all Council functions and is opening planning processes through new types of civic participation and collaboration. An example is the delivery of new community-led local area plans (based on cultural mapping) and integration of Ballarat Imagine community vision throughout the Ballarat Planning Scheme Municipal Strategic Statement.

With the benefits of digital technologies, the HUL in Ballarat has provided a strong platform for new people to take part in the city's future. As the city moves from investigation to implementation phases, the transformations are starting to be felt on-the-ground and require continued effort to support the observable shifts in mindsets and practices. The HUL has opened new ways of understanding Ballarat's historic and modern day legacies, as well as opportunities for the city's future. Most of all, the HUL-oriented Strategy for Ballarat is gradually moving the

city away from a homogenised and prescribed pathway for growth, building instead a platform for localised solutions.

The HUL approach and the *Burra Charter*

Discussion of the HUL in Australia has slowly emerged, but there is now a conversation about its applicability and usefulness (see for example, Taylor 2015). Like the experiences in other parts of the world, the de-centring of the architectural fabric, the consideration of cities as landscapes, the challenges of sustainability, and the development of community-centred methods for determining heritage values are of interest to practitioners (see for example, Rodwell 2011).

Australian heritage practice is guided and influenced by the *Burra Charter* (Australia ICOMOS 2013). Tracking the history, evolution and impact of the *Burra Charter* is beyond the confines of this paper,[2] yet the Charter itself is a relevant focus, since this has been the manner in which new ideas arising through practice have been incorporated into formal and professional systems.

The *Burra Charter* was adopted by Australia ICOMOS in 1979 as a localised adaptation of the *Venice Charter* (International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964) (Walker 2014; Hanna 2015). While the *Venice Charter* anticipated the articulation of further regional and disciplinary applications and texts, the *Burra Charter* was an early attempt at specifying how its ideas could be translated into a specific national setting (Australia ICOMOS 2016). According to Meredith Walker (2014), the early membership of Australia ICOMOS felt that the focus of the *Venice Charter* on 'monuments' could be misunderstood by Australian users, and that a more practical and multi-disciplinary document was needed. She describes how the 1979 *Burra Charter* text took on some of the characteristics that have been retained since that time, including the centrality of a clear and comprehensive understanding of the place before making any decisions. Sheridan Burke (2004: 54) recalls the process as a pragmatic one:

> There was no sense of either wanton criticism or antipodean distaste for the Venice Charter in the work, rather the simple need to respectfully translate the principles to a practical document that would be specifically applicable to Australian places and cultural conditions.

Unlike the *Venice Charter*, the *Burra Charter* is periodically reviewed and has been changed, sometimes substantially, causing an inadvertent but nevertheless apparent drift further from its *Venice Charter* beginnings (Logan 2004). The current version is dated 2013, but the most significant shifts in its content were adopted in 1999, and included changes to more explicitly address Australia's cultural diversity, and to reinforce the recognition of the intangible dimensions (meaning, uses, associations) of place (Truscott 2004). The *Burra Charter* has also been a vehicle for promoting a certain Australian form of practice internationally, and has been applied in other countries. It has been influential in the late-20th century dissemination of the 'values-based' approaches to the identification and management of cultural heritage (de la Torre 2005). For this reason, the *Burra Charter* has been the subject of various external critiques (see for example, Zancheti et. al. 2009; Waterton et.al. 2006).

In Australia, the legal and regulatory frameworks for heritage protection operate at national, state and local levels. While each relies on listing as a means of singling out some areas as 'heritage', they are legally and administratively distinct. This paper is focused on what could be considered 'typical' or 'conventional' practices at the *local* level since this seems most relevant for the mechanisms provided by the HUL. In Victoria, heritage places that are considered significant at the local threshold are listed in schedules to the local government planning scheme, and all places in the schedule are then subject to the provisions of the Heritage Overlay control (DELWP 2014). In general, demolition or significant modification to the fabric of locally listed heritage places requires formal planning permission, guided by the identified heritage values of the place. As a result, the processes for the conservation of local heritage places are integrated into the processes of development decision-making.

As a non-statutory document, the *Burra Charter* sits alongside the framing provided by local laws and planning schemes, but is a common factor in decision-making. The legal and policy frameworks commonly deliver heritage protection through assessments of significance guided by the *Burra Charter*, provide decision guidelines requiring the application of the *Burra Charter* and, in some cases, explicitly reference the *Burra Charter* in local planning schemes. It is relatively common for all 'sides' of heritage conservation planning matters to invoke the Charter's spirit and provisions to advance their positions.

How the *Burra Charter* relates to and supports the approaches foreshadowed in the HUL is therefore relevant. There are many ways in which the Articles of the Burra Charter prepare the ground for the work that has been advanced within the HUL in Ballarat, such as the requirement to fully understand all the values of places before decisions are made. However, it is also the case that at the local level, typical or 'conventional' heritage practices do not always exhibit the breadth of the *Burra Charter's* inclusive intentions.

To aid this reflection, we have highlighted ten elements of the *Burra Charter* that contrast with the evolving HUL approach. This is an initial review that illustrates some potential gaps, and indicates where other tools that could move beyond the confines of the Charter, are needed.

> **1. The notion of 'place':** *The Burra Charter* defines 'place' broadly as 'a geograph-ically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions' (Article 1.1), and can range from a single structure, tree or archaeological deposit to an entire landscape, mountain range or city neighbourhood (see also, Silberman 2016). In the HUL approach, heritage moves beyond the focus on 'place' and includes elements such as community life and identity, intangible heritage, social and economic processes, uses, and ways of moving in and through the urban landscape.

> **2. The notion that values are inherent in place:** This is a commonly criticised part of the *Burra Charter's* underlying worldview (see for example, Smith 2006). Article 1.2 states that 'Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects'. While this seems to usefully acknowledge fluidity in the way that value is constructed, the embodiment of the values in the place itself is strongly asserted. In conventional practices at the local level, this is often distilled into an expectation that values are *tangibly* expressed and embedded in the physical fabric of the place, with a relatively lighter weight given to the social and spiritual values (compared to the aesthetic/architectural and historical). In our experience of the HUL approach, values are carried by people and are applied and evolving rather than inherent.

> **3. The centrality of the Statement of Significance in policy making and management decisions:** Article 6.2 of the *Burra Charter* says that 'Policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance'. This is the heart of the constructed logic of the *Burra Charter* and of most heritage practices in Australia. Yet in practice, Statements of Significance are adopted and applied through formal processes that have not always been fully inclusive and comprehensive; and are then fixed for very long periods of time. In other words, while the *Burra Charter* acknowledges the fluidity of the values that are ascribed to heritage places, this is seldom what happens in practice. In the HUL approach, significance is fluid, and its contestability is recognised as a constant, with the need to recognise and frequently revisit understandings of the multiple 'significances' or 'values' (and importantly, the processes of engagement that are necessary to articulate them).

> **4. The tangible and intangible dimensions of place:** Article 1.1 of the *Burra Charter* clearly indicates the interconnectedness of the tangible and intangible, and many parts of the Charter draw attention to fabric, associations and meanings. As already noted, there is a strong focus on the fabric in local heritage practices, especially the exterior fabric and visual appearance of historic buildings. In the HUL approach, people carry values, which are attributed to tangible and intangible elements. While fabric, space and sense of place can often be critically important, the authentic historic fabric of a place might be only one way of transmitting significant meanings.

5. Localising heritage understanding: Article 1.2 of the *Burra Charter* scopes the possible dimensions of cultural significance as the 'aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations'. In Australia, each jurisdiction has adopted a slightly different version of these qualities;[3] and in practice in Victoria, aesthetic, architectural and historical significance are used more frequently than the others. The HUL approach promotes that cultural significance should be localised—and be more explicitly focussed on the distinctiveness of the place and the values held by people.

6. Factoring in 'uses': The *Burra Charter* says that 'use' can be a component of the cultural significance of a place (Article 7.1), and specifies the importance of 'compatible uses' that respect the place's cultural significance (Article 1.11). However, while adaptive re-use is a commonly applied solution, it is less common for particular uses to be included in the legal recognition of heritage places or in local statutory requirements for their future. The HUL and the *Burra Charter* are similar on this point insofar as values guide the management of change. It is possible that continuity of a particular use might be especially important, or even valued above the retention of historic fabric, although this is poorly reflected in most local regulatory frameworks.

7. Inter-relatedness of nature and culture: The *Burra Charter* suggests that 'conservation of a place should identify all aspects of cultural and natural significance…' (Article 5.1). Yet in practice, natural values are often considered and conserved through separate systems of decision-making. While the rationale for separate systems can be appreciated, there can be a lack of connected thinking and practice that fails to appropriately reflect the lived experience of place, landscape and locality. In the HUL approach, practices should accommodate cultural perspectives that do not separate nature and culture.

8. The problem of boundaries: While the *Burra Charter* urges consideration of the setting of heritage places (Article 8), establishing place boundaries can change the relationships between what is inside and outside. The Victorian planning system allows for the identification of precincts or 'heritage areas', but over time, there can be an incremental loss of contributory elements. The HUL moves away from the need to delineate 'significant' places and areas in order to appreciate the full range of social and economic dynamics and context.

9. Expert-led processes: The *Burra Charter* is mindful of its broad audiences and is oriented at people who provide advice, make decisions or undertake works (Preamble). Compared to the *Venice Charter*, the *Burra Charter* shifted the balance away from expert-based decision-making through the articulation of a transparent decision-making sequence (known as the '*Burra Charter* process'). This is one of the *Burra Charter's* most obvious attributes. Yet, despite good examples where its use has shifted the role of practitioner to one that facilitates processes and outcomes, many every-day local practices remain expert-led. In the HUL approach, methods are community-centred (empowering), interdisciplinary and locally focused, transforming the potential role of heritage expertise.

10. Methods of articulating values: According to the *Burra Charter* (Article 4.1), 'Conservation should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the place'. In practice, methods are heavily focused on physical observations and documentary research. In the HUL approach, new visual and spatial methods of engagement, such as cultural mapping and use of digital tools are increasingly commonplace.

Users of the *Burra Charter* may counter these examples by pointing out that the limitations we have observed are not the fault of the *Burra Charter* itself, but of its limited application within local heritage regimes. As Meredith Walker (2014: 15) comments: 'There are signs that some of the principles of good practice following the Burra Charter are not well-understood or that there are insufficient technical resources, or perhaps goodwill, to address the issues.' While

it is certainly the case that practices could be improved by more faithfully applying the *Burra Charter*, we suggest that there are opportunities to move beyond its confines. When applied to specific places, the *Burra Charter's* logic can be highly instrumental in problem-solving. Yet, there can be a decline in its effective application for complex places that have multiple values, associations, communities and pressures. Its provisions may not work as well when applied to a whole urban area or entire city. Furthermore, the *Burra Charter* is not applicable to the full ambit of culture, heritage and attachment—which are not always specifically anchored to place.

Concluding thoughts

Figure 2: Ballarat's HUL Model [source: City of Ballarat]

Based on this reflection, we propose that more integrated strategic planning, assessment and vision finding processes are needed that can operate ahead of and foreshadow the use of the *Burra Charter* as a supplementary tool that is applicable for specific places. Acknowledging that there are limits to the capacity of the *Burra Charter*, Australia ICOMOS has begun to diversify its guidance texts to include '*Burra Charter* Practice Notes'. These can explain the application of the *Burra Charter* in more detail or demonstrate its application in specific contexts. We therefore propose 'something bigger than Burra' to parallel this kind of diversification.

Ballarat's new HUL-inspired model for urban conservation begins to capture these possibilities. It has moved from posing heritage conservation and development as separate and sometimes opposing processes to form a virtuous cycle (see Figure 2). The things that make the city distinctive and valued are used to inspire change in mutually reinforcing ways (City of Ballarat 2016). The higher-level operation of this model aims at building capacity to deal with challenges facing cities, and requires the following qualities:

- Very high levels of active citizen and stakeholder participation (over time, moving from consultation to empowerment and collaboration);

- An open platform to collect comprehensive knowledge and diverse perspectives about the dynamic and living city, including aspects of vulnerability, opportunity and adaptability; and

- Collaboration with many and diverse partners (including universities), and working towards inter-disciplinarity.

We acknowledge equal measures of optimism and provocation in our intentions for this overview. Reactions to our presentation at the 'People's Ground' conference (Melbourne, October 2016) demonstrate that suggestions about change are contentious, although this is not new within Australia ICOMOS (see for example, Mackay 2004). The *Burra Charter* has had close to 40 years of careful and creative implementation by Australia ICOMOS members, and has been tested by the tribunals and hearings that determine the future of many heritage places. It has proven a robust tool, useful in diverse settings, and capable of evolution. We do not propose that the *Burra Charter* and associated Australian heritage practices should be jettisoned or substantially amended in the face of these ideas and issues. At this stage, the HUL

approach is not easily codified although several promotional guidance materials have been prepared (see UNESCO 2013b; WHITR-AP & City of Ballarat 2016; GO-HUL 2017). Possibly it is this amorphous character that has made the HUL useful, permitting practitioners to step out of (and beyond) the usual conflicts and compromises to experiment with new tools. In many ways, this foreshadows the more flexible and localised responses that are required to achieve adaptable, resilient and sustainable cities.

The example of Ballarat suggests that the HUL offers opportunities to shift some unhelpfully entrenched positions about the relationships between heritage and change. For now, it has had the effect of mainstreaming heritage and culture into the future of the municipality's urban settlements and landscapes. For heritage practices to move from the edges and into the centre of political and social conversations about the 'big issues' facing Australia and the world, we will all need some additional perspectives and tools.

Acknowledgements

References:

Allen, C. 2004, 'The Road from Burra: thoughts on using the Charter in the future', *Historic Environment,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 50-53.

Australia ICOMOS 2013, *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*. Australia ICOMOS Inc., Burwood.

Australia ICOMOS 2016, *Collaboration for Conservation: a brief history of Australia ICOMOS and the Burra Charter.* Australia ICOMOS Inc., Burwood.

Avila, M.E.S. & Perez, J.R. 2016, 'Heritage Values Protection, from the Monument to the Urban Dimension. Case Study: the Historic Centre of Santa Ana de los Rios de Cuenca, Ecuador', *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice,* vol. 7, no. 2-3, pp. 164-176.

Bandarin, F. & van Oers, R. 2012, *The Historic Urban Landscape*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Buckley, K., Cooke, S. & Fayad, S. 2016, 'Using the Historic Urban Landscape to re-imagine Ballarat: the local context', in S. Labadi & W. Logan (eds), *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. International Frameworks, National and Local Governance,* 1st ed. Routledge, Oxon. pp. 93-113.

Burke, S. 2004, 'Working with the Charter overseas: a personal Burra Charter experience', *Historic Environment,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 54-56.

City of Ballarat 2013, 'Ballarat Imagine', viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.ballarat.vic.gov.au/haveyoursay/2013/ballaratimagine.aspx>

City of Ballarat 2015, *Today, Tomorrow, Together: The Ballarat Strategy*, viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.ballarat.vic.gov.au/pbs/city-strategy/ballarat-strategy.aspx>

City of Ballarat 2016, *Our People, Culture & Place. A new heritage plan for Ballarat 2016-2030.* (Preliminary Plan), viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.ballarat.vic.gov.au/media/3985655/preliminary_heritage_plan_our_people__culture_and_place_august_2016.pdf >

de la Torre, M. 2005, *Heritage Values in Site Management: Four Case Studies,* Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles.

Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Victoria (DELWP) 2014, 'Heritage Overlay Guidelines' (online). Melbourne: DELWP, viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.dtpli.vic.gov.au/heritage/local-government/heritage-overlay-guidelines>

Global Observatory on the Historic Urban Landscape (GO-HUL) 2017, [website] viewed 7 April 2017, <https://go-hul.com/>

Fayad, S. & Buckley, K. [in press], 'The Transformational Power of the HUL Approach: lessons from Ballarat, Australia, 2012-2016', in A.P. Roders & F. Bandarin (eds), *Historic Urban Landscape: five years, twenty-five cities, hundred lessons,* Springer, New York.

Fayad, S. [in press], 'The Historic Urban Landscape Approach: finding a better way to manage change in the dynamic historic city of Ballarat', in R. Van Oers (ed.), *Publication of Proceedings for 2014 Symposium on HUL*. WHITRAP, Shanghai.

Hanna, B. 2015, 'Foundations of an Oral History Project: the writing of the Burra Charter', *Historic Environment,* vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 84-95.

Logan, W. 2004, 'Introduction: Voices from the Periphery: the Burra Charter in context', *Historic Environment*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 2-8.

Mackay, R. 2004, 'Associative Value and the Revised Burra Charter: a personal perspective', *Historic Environment,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 35-36.

Martin, P. & Lucas, C. 2016, 'Population booms: Victoria has four of the five fastest growing suburbs in Australia', *The Age,* 30 March 2017 [Online], viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/population-booms-victoria-has-four-of-the-five-fastest-growing-suburbs-in-australia-20170330-gv9smg.html>

Omnilink 2014, '3D Mapping System – Scoping Study. Melbourne'. Unpublished report to the City of Ballarat.

Rodwell, D. 2011, 'Theory and Practice in Sustainable Urban Development', *Historic Environment,* vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 8-14.

Silberman, N.A. 2016, 'Heritage Places: evolving conceptions and changing forms', in W. Logan, M. Nic Craith & U. Kokkel (eds), *A Companion to Heritage Studies*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester. pp. 29-40.

Smith, L. 2006, *Uses of Heritage,* Routledge, London.

State of Victoria 2014, 'Plan Melbourne: Metropolitan Planning Strategy'. Melbourne.

Taylor, K. 2015, 'The HUL concept and cities as cultural landscapes: Canberra a missed opportunity', *Historic Environment,* vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 58-67.

Tomazin, F. 2016, 'Population growth has become Victoria's biggest political issue', *Sydney Morning Herald* [Online], 7 May 2016, viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.smh.com.au/national/population-growth-has-become-victorias-biggest-political-issue-20160506-goo1d6.html>

Truscott, M. 2004, 'Contexts for change: paving the way to the 1999 Burra Charter', *Historic Environment,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 30-34.

UN Habitat 2012, *Urban Planning for City Leaders,* Nairobi.

UN Habitat 2016, *The New Urban Agenda*, Adopted at Quito, Ecuador, 20 October 2016, viewed 7 April 2017, <https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda/>

UNESCO 2011, 'Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape', Paris. viewed 7 April 2017, <http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48857&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html>

UNESCO 2013a, *Summary of the reflection meeting on the implementation of the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape two years after its adoption (HUL+2).* Paris.

UNESCO 2013b, *New Life for Historic Cities: The historic urban landscape approach explained.* Paris.

UNESCO 2015, Culture for Sustainable Development, Paris, viewed 7 April 2017, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/culture-and-development/the-future-we-want-the-role-of-culture/>

UNESCO 2016, 'Culture Urban Future. Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development (Summary)', Paris.

United Nations 2015, 'Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015: 'Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development', A/RES/70/1. New York: United Nations', New York.

United Nations Global Compact Cities Programme (UNGCCP) 2017, 'City Partnerships. Offer to Australian Cities', viewed 3 August 2017. https://citiesprogramme.org/get-involved/city-partnerships/

van Oers, R. & Roders, A.P. 2013, 'Road Map for Application of the HUL Approach in China', *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 4-1.

van Oers, R. 2007, 'Towards new international guidelines for the conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL)', *City & Time,* vol. 3, pp. 43-51.

van Oers, R. 2015, 'The Way Forward: An Agenda for Reconnecting the City', in F. Bandarin & R. van Oers (eds), *Reconnecting the City. The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage,* John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, pp. 317-332.

Walker, M. 2014, 'The Development of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter', *APT Bulletin*, vol. 45, no. 2/3, pp. 9-16.

Waterton, E., Smith, L. & Campbell, G. 2006, 'The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: the Burra Charter and social inclusion', *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 339-355.

World Heritage Institute of Training and Research in Asia and the Pacific (WHITR-AP) and City of Ballarat 2016, *The HUL Guidebook: A practical guide to UNESCO's Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*, Shanghai and Ballarat.

Zancheti, S.M., Hidaka, L.T.F., Ribeiro, C. & Aguiar, B. 2009, 'Judgement and validation in the Burra Charter process: introducing feedback in assessing the cultural significance of heritage sites/ *City and Time* vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 47-53.

Endnotes

1   The City of Ballarat's HUL program rollout has incorporated linkages to work by the UNGCCP.

2   A special issue of *Historic Environment* (Volume 18, no. 1, 2004) outlines this history in detail. It can be viewed on the Australia ICOMOS website.

3   The former Environment Protection and Heritage Ministerial Council agreed that all jurisdictions would standardise the criteria; however, this decision has not been fully implemented.