

The Delegation of **Spain** asked for clarification from the World Heritage Centre as to why the mission undertaken had not been mentioned in the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that a mission had taken place in 2005 and that no other was foreseen. The city had informed the World Heritage Centre of its intention to host a meeting with international experts in September 2006.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked if the State Party could be invited to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** recalled that it and the department store concerned wished to find a high-quality solution and expressed its wish for an expert mission to advise the next steps.

The **World Heritage Centre** observed that, as it would not be a reactive monitoring mission, it should not be financed from the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, it did not believe that a mission was necessary – one had taken place in 2005 and clear written advice had been provided.

The Delegation of **Canada** withdrew its proposal on the basis of the information provided.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that it was not the first time that the Committee had had to address problems arising from international competitions. It believed that the Committee should issue a statement and agreed to prepare a draft for the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.76** adopted as amended.

Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (C 1156)

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the State Party had provided all Committee members with information published by the City of Dresden under cover of a letter dated 26 June 2006.

The ICOMOS evaluation of the situation and Visual Impact Study (VIS) received on 28 June 2006 stated that the construction of a bridge would place a threat to the cultural landscape of the site. Moreover, the bridge did not respect the legal framework set by European Union concerning noise protection and air protection. The World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that it had learned on 10 July 2006 that the City of Dresden would hold an extraordinary meeting on 19 July 2006 to take final decisions about granting the building concession for the traffic axis of Waldschloesschen Bridge in order to proceed with the construction of the bridge.

Noting the complexity of the case, the **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to read out the amendments that had been submitted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** regretted that as a result of bad communication or misinformation the Committee had not been aware of the bridge at the time of inscription in 2004. In the light of the conflicting information it had received about what the voters had been told, it wished to hear from the State Party its views on the possibility of danger listing.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred. It appeared to be another case demonstrating the conflict between conservation and development. However, recent case history showed that it was possible to effect change and stop inappropriate construction. The Committee should consider issuing a statement clarifying what could and could not be done.

ICOMOS recalled that the city was planning to make its final decision on 19 July 2006.

Noting that the Committee had to decide that day, the **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** observed that the case of Cologne Cathedral demonstrated the seriousness with which it approached heritage conservation. It regretted that ICOMOS had not presented all relevant information at the time of the original application. The representative of the Mayor of Dresden took the floor to read out a statement saying that the bridge was intended to benefit the city and that ICOMOS had seen no conflict between the proposed bridge and the application. The city was willing to consider introducing measures to restrict heavy traffic on the bridge.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party if it would agree to danger listing.

In reply, the Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it could not give an answer pending consultations with the relevant authorities.

The Delegation of **Norway** observed that it was a very serious case. Paragraph 6 of the draft Decision clearly stated that the construction of the bridge would “irreversibly damage the values and integrity of the property”. In other words, if the bridge were constructed, the property should no longer be included in the World Heritage List. It proposed adding new text to paragraph 8 of the draft Decision to flag the possibility of deletion from the List if the plans were carried through.

The **Chairperson** invited further comments.

The Delegation of **India** said it had no difficulty with the Delegation of Norway’s proposal if the outstanding universal value was irreversibly lost and sought clarification from ICOMOS as to why the proposed bridge had not been brought to the Committee’s attention at the time of inscription.

ICOMOS said that the idea of a bridge had been discussed at various times since the nineteenth century but had always been dropped because of the impact on the valley. The *Operational Guidelines* required that major construction should be notified during the

nomination process – but in the case under consideration, no crystallized plans had existed at the relevant time.

The **Chairperson** invited further comments on possible de-listing.

The Delegation of **Norway** clarified that it had proposed considering de-listing in 2007.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification on Norway's proposal.

The **Chairperson** observed an emerging consensus.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime sa perplexité vis-à-vis du projet de décision tel que présenté. Elle considère en outre qu'une seule mission de suivi réactif ne suffirait sans doute pas pour déterminer d'une façon définitive si la valeur du bien pourrait se dégrader de manière irréversible au cas où le projet du pont serait réalisé. Il faudrait au contraire privilégier un regard plus flexible afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de poursuivre la réflexion.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the city would make its final decision on 19 July 2006 – there was no time for a mission.

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concerns that had been expressed but observed that de-listing was a drastic step. It urged due process and prudence.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it had listened with interest to the Mayor's statement. It was clear that the community wanted to make a choice. But the Committee also had a choice. Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines* defined potential danger. The Committee had a duty to recognize its responsibility. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of Norway.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** sought clarification of what was being proposed in the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the proposal sought to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to consider, in a prudent manner, deleting it from the World Heritage List at the 31st session if the plans were carried through.

The Delegation of **Norway** indicated its consent.

La délégation de **Madagascar** exprime sa préoccupation à l'égard du projet de décision et demande si les conséquences entraînées par la réalisation du projet pourraient affecter de manière irréversible la valeur du bien et, en cas de réponse affirmative, dans quelle mesure.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it was extremely concerned about the proposed bridge. It noted some contradictions with the Committee's decision on the Tower of London.

The Delegation of **Peru** recalled that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger required the previous agreement of the State Party concerned. It then suggested that the procedure to be followed by the Committee – in the specific case under consideration as well in other similar cases of conflict between development and protection of World Heritage properties – was to give a warning message to the State Party by indicating the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should the State Party decide to insist on the execution of the project, bearing in mind the possible deletion of the property from the World Heritage List as an extreme measure. It further said that if that was the perspective inspiring the amendment proposed by Norway, it would certainly support it.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there were precedents for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger without State Party consent.

The Delegation of **Norway** confirmed its intentions for the benefit of the Delegation of Peru. The issue of the conflict between heritage and economy would undoubtedly recur but the Committee had a clear duty to protect the heritage. The difference between the case under review and London was that, for London, more information was needed. But in the case now before the Committee it was clear that, if the work was carried out, the outstanding universal value would be lost. The State Party had to choose between the bridge and World Heritage status. The Committee had no other option. It had no objections to softening the language provided the intention remained clear.

La délégation de la **Tunisie** rappelle que l'Etat partie a démontré comment le pont pourrait aussi servir pour donner une plus ample possibilité à la population de mieux apprécier la valeur du bien.

La délégation du **Bénin** exprime son accord pour que le Comité envoie un message fort et sans équivoque à l'Etat partie et à la population locale qui soutient la construction du pont et soutient la proposition avancée par la Norvège.

La délégation du **Maroc** demande d'entendre la position de l'Allemagne au sujet de l'amendement proposé par la Norvège.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said it had mixed feelings but could not give a definitive view pending consultation with the relevant parties.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that four properties had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger without State Party consent: Manas in 1992; Sangay in 1992; Ichkeul in 1996; and Simien National Park in 1996.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it would report to the city council on the seriousness of the position.

The Delegation of **Israel** believed that in the light of the comments by the State Party the proposed amendment of the Delegation of Norway should be adopted. There were differences between the case under review and the Tower of London because the Dresden Elbe Valley had been inscribed as a cultural landscape.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with both of those points. The Delegation of Norway's proposal would send out a strong message. If that helped maintain the outstanding universal value the Committee would have achieved its objectives. It also agreed with the Delegation of Tunisia that it would be important for the Committee to have a debate on the tensions between heritage and development.

The Delegation of **Peru** fully supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway which would certainly convey a strong message to the State Party, in a perspective of helping it in resolving the contrast that seemed to exist within the State Party itself between the federal administration and the local community.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its full support for the Delegation of Norway's proposal and its belief that the credibility of the Committee and of the *Convention* were at stake.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** took the floor to state that its previous comments did not imply conflict between the State Party and the City of Dresden. There had simply not been sufficient time for proper consultations with all concerned.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that, although it was a good friend of Germany, it had to be guided by the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*. It therefore supported Norway.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway but agreed with Israel in recalling that the property was inscribed as a cultural landscape and, in that regard, asked ICOMOS to confirm that the property would be wholly compromised under the perspective of cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stressed that the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Norway mentioned the possibility of removing the property from the World Heritage List as the value of the property would be totally and irremediably compromised and not simply affected should the bridge be constructed. In that connection, it asked ICOMOS or the World Heritage Centre to clarify if they agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway.

The **Chairperson** noted that the ICOMOS position was set out in the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the property had been inscribed as a continuing cultural landscape. The Visual Impact Study undertaken by the State Party made it clear that the bridge would compromise the values for which it had been inscribed.

The **Chairperson** sought confirmation of consensus from the Committee

La délégation de la **Tunisie** affirme que les images du bien montrant l'impact visuel du pont ne sont pas convaincantes car elles ont été prises à des saisons différentes par rapport à celles du bien dans son état actuel.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Delegation of Tunisia agreed.

The Delegation of **Japan** also indicated its assent but asked that its concerns about the speed with which the process was moving be recorded.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that its concerns about inscribing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger be recorded.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.77** adopted as amended.

Mr. Van der Ploeg (Netherlands) took the Chair.

Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation) (C 540)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the report of the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to St. Petersburg had been sent to the State Party for comments on 26 May 2006. No additional information or comment had been provided by the authorities.

Following the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission, the national authorities had requested International Assistance for the organization of a regional seminar "Scientific and Technical Challenges for the Management and Conservation of Historic Centres of Towns inscribed on the World Heritage List"

ICOMOS confirmed that the reduction by 10 metres of the height of the proposed new Mariinsky Theatre would mean there would be no impact on the cityscape except in the immediate vicinity.

The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments to the draft Decision had been submitted.

The Delegation of **Israel** read out its proposed statement regarding international architectural competitions.