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Introduction

TOWN WALLS DO NOT A PRISON MAKE misquotes Richard Lovelace the metaphysical poet, born in 1618, who despite imprisonment could find freedom in his love. Towns, even when walled, are not prisons but the paradox holds. A condition for cultural freedom is a degree of security but security can stultify freedom. The urge for freedom, to escape and to trade has to be balanced with the need for personal safety and the safe storage and exchange of goods and services. Gates are therefore defining features town walls often meant more to towns and their citizens than merely control. But through the centuries and in some instances still the town wall normally controls the “density and proximity [which, as Rodger and Pinol put it]... identify a place as uniquely urban.”

Virtually every town in Lovelace’s world was walled -- his Oxford still fairly clearly; his Cambridge surrounded by marshes, like Venice was a rare exception. Some had post artillery scientific systems of fortification akin to and demonstrated by the ‘ideal’ renaissance fortress town of Palma Nova, built by
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2 Theresienstadt, (now Terezin in the Czech Republic) was the exception: notoriously the “City the Fuehrer gave to the Jews” as the 1944 Nazi Propaganda film put it(http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0194445/accessed 09-08-10); it was an 18th Century fortified town, whose walls were in effect turned inside out to make it into a Concentration Camp.

the Venetians in 1593 near their Turk-threatened Eastern land border (Figure 1). However mostly town walls, though still administratively important, were militarily, mediavely obsolete, like Bristol's (Figure 2(a)); Within Colonel Lovelace's short lifetime -- he died an impoverished Cavalier under Cromwell's Commonwealth in 1657⁴ - many even most towns in Europe, including Britain and Ireland, would need to defend themselves against marauding armies threatening heavy artillery. Just prior to that Thirty Years War, which broke out in 1618, over 400 towns and cities in (mainly) Europe were recorded and illustrated in the first great city atlas the Civitates Orbis Terrarum, edited, written and engraved by Georg Braun and Frans Hogenberg⁵ in Antwerp and Cologne.

This paper examines how their city walls and inclusion in such an atlas have shaped the modern history of these cities and created, in many cases, their current identity. The tourism or visitor value of city walls will be contrasted with the negative connotations of walls as barriers, both historically and in the 21st Century but with due awareness of the dissonance that may still result⁶. It also develops outcomes from a network project for walled towns, part-funded by a European INTERREG project 2003-8, named ARCHWAY. The project demanded that the towns involved reflect on their historic form and traditions to focus on access to the cultural heritage for the disabled and disadvantaged and identified the visible barriers of the historic town walls as symbolic of invisible or less visible barriers, deterring 'access for all' to the urban heritage⁷.

2. Walled towns in the Braun and Hogenberg Urban Atlas

The Braun and Hogenberg images of walled towns have informed the historic development and present day self-image of the towns and cities: firstly by acting as a source, stimulus and even prototype for early City Guides and secondly by valuing the view and form of the city core as captured in the differing perspectives of the City Atlas. In time, but not at the time, inclusion came to offer a guarantee of authenticity as an historic city.

The cities and towns themselves are usually only aware (if at all) of the one or in a some cases two or three, print representation(s) of their own city and are therefore largely unaware of their defined place in the pattern of European urban development. In the past the rarity and great value of the complete 'Civitates' or 'Cities of the World' (about €250.000) was some excuse and even the 1966 Skelton British Museum facsimile edition is, at about €6000, beyond the reach of most towns or their municipal libraries. Recently published is a single large volume Taschen edition (€150 Fuesel 2008) with extracts from the text but every illustration (most much reduced in size). Over half – 270 towns are listed - are now available to download from the Historic Cities project⁸.

The urban atlas was published with substantial success over a near fifty year period 1572-1618 of pen and ink letter networking with many of the cities and towns involved. Using various artists,
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chorographers and topographers, Braun and Hogenberg represented graphically about 470 different towns and cities (53 of which are represented more than once) among the 546 illustrations on 360 plates or about 60 per large volume approximately 40 by 25 centimetres with most plates spread across a double page. Each perspective is accompanied on the reverse of the sheets by a potted history of the city illustrated, in all cases in Latin and in some of the intermediate volume editions in either German or French (for instance prints for Bristol are extant with French and German versions of its history and anecdotes to about 1578). Towns are illustrated with either a chorographic plan, oblique view or profile perspective: Bristol, Edinburgh and Oxford exemplify these (see Figure 1, a, b, c). It is noticeable that almost every city was visibly walled.

Despite many differing origins for the views used and these different presentations, the six volumes were effectively edited and engraved by Braun and Hogenberg to give a distinctive and consistent impression. The inclusion of local costumed figures in the foreground is part of this, as is the inclusion of landscape around the town, containing illustrative agricultural or industrial activities – sheep in the cases of Bristol and Oxford, a hunting dog for Windsor Castle. Other cities show industry for example Angers with its slate making (Vol V.20). The intention was not to illustrate the cities ‘from life’ - only a minority had been visited by the principal contributor and illuminator, Joris (Georg) Hoefnagel - but as Nuti has demonstrated ‘lifelike’.

Each engraving had text summarising the history, or at least anecdotes of interest to outsiders on the reverse. These were initially and most authoritatively in Latin but editions with French and German texts also appeared. In the case of Bristol, the reverse page of the French edition begins “BRISTOVVE…la plus renômmée & marchande d'Angleterre exceptè Londres,…” Clearly perceived by a continental European observer, based in Cologne as ‘the most renowned and mercantile city in England except London’ this is the endorsement of ‘second city’ status on which the city so long relied. The nine hundred words of text give some extra information in the more concise Latin version but are similar in each language. Drawing on usually well known contemporary sources, these may be of little interest to the historian of an individual city but are valuable in portraying the city’s contemporary reputation among outsiders, visitors and ‘tourists’. In examining the Braun and Hogenberg Atlas, it is apparent that the City views were not primarily or even at all designed for the use of the local citizens, administrators or indeed developers. This has led to local criticism of the accuracy of the portrayals. For instance the Bristol view is castigated:

“This plan of Bristol seems to have been based on an earlier unpublished one measured and laid in Platforme (i.e. Plan form) by me, W. Smith, at my being at Bristow, the 30 & 31 July: Ano Dni 1568, which still survives in manuscript form and is the earliest known plan of the city. Some additional information, notably street names, has been incorporated, but inevitably some mistakes were made in copying. …. Unfortunately because of the wide distribution of the atlas [author’s emphasis] this plan was used as a basis by many other engravers and these mistakes were perpetuated.”

It can be argued that this was NOT a misfortune, even if there were these minor topographical inaccuracies perpetuated, because it demonstrated Bristol’s place among European cities. The Atlas continued in print for over a century and retained its place in aristocratic libraries thereafter. Single sheets, often from the original publishers circulated in significant numbers
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9 Braun’s introduction to the 1581 3rd Volume suggest these were to deter the (Moslem) Turks from making use of the Atlas as intelligence of fortifications!


11 in its caption in the City Museum, Queen Street, Bristol (observed 10th April 2010)
3. The Outsider’s or Tourist’s Perspective over Four Hundred Years

Outsiders have always been critical to the success of cities. The protected crossroads of the ancient Egyptian hieroglyph expresses the organised meeting point for people, goods and ideas that has been the city’s contribution to civilization (a word that itself expresses city living). Unlike a Castle, designed to dominate and control, the city or town depends on outsiders trading at the city gate, entering with ideas and supplies and demand for the city’s services12 (and compare Oxford and Windsor Castle in Hoefnagel’s print (Figure 2(c)). The travels of Joris Hoefnagel, illuminator, original draughtsman or adaptor of over one hundred of the plates can be described at least until 1578 as those of a proto grand tourist (although the Grand Tour would not be established until later, particularly in the 18th Century and the word ‘tourist’ would not come into use much before Wordsworth’s 1801 poem13). Hoefnagel was an amateur, largely self taught, artist and travelled for pleasure. Only after the Spanish destruction of Antwerp and with it the Hoefnagel family fortune, did he travel as a professional artist and illuminator mainly for the Atlas. He, Braun and often the philosopher, geographer and atlas originator Abraham Ortelius visited and or wrote about cities (except Cologne and Antwerp) as outsiders. It was visitors who appreciated the city as a cultural object Nuti’s (page 3) quotation of Charles de Brosse’s 16th Century first impression of Bologna exemplifies this.14 Brosse recorded the how the Bologna seemed smaller when walked across than when seen from outside, because of the concentration effect of the sharply defined [walled] city edge.

By time the last volume of the urban atlas had appeared Hoefnagel and Hogenberg were dead and the editorship had passed to the next generation. In 1617, that final volume was dedicated to the Archduke Ferdinand of Habsburg, King-elect of Bohemia and was issued to the public in early 1618, the very year that Protestant and Nationalist rebellion in Bohemia against the Catholic and Imperial Ferdinand triggered what became known as the Thirty Years War15. This terrible war arguably marked the transition of Europe from mediaeval to modern times but in some ways the conflict, which made travel without an army dangerous and tiresome, assured the long-term success of the Civitates.

The city atlas itself aimed to illustrate history with geography but given its physical weight of about five kilos a volume it was by promoting armchair travel “in one’s own home far from all danger” as Georg Braun put it in the preface to volume III in 158116; nevertheless it was a precursor of tourist guidebooks17. The atlas established the chorographic view which illustrated early guidebooks for tourists to Italy, such as Schott’s (1600) but only with chorographs and city plans from the 1615 edition.18

When more general order and peace returned in the second half of the 17th and particularly in the 18th Century, it was an encouragement to the Grand Tour, with the Atlas being found in the grand libraries of the wealthy participants, for example Robert Jones of Fonmon Castle in South Wales in
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12 Lewis Mumford’s magisterial ‘The City in History: its origins, its transformations and its prospects’ (1961) remains the best overview, even though, perhaps because it pre-dates Skelton’s facsimile, it omits to mention Braun and Hogenberg.
13 William Wordsworth’s poem ‘The Brothers’
15 Wedgwood C.V., 1938, The Thirty Years War, Jonathan Cape
16 From Skelton op.cit. page vi
17 See Bruce 2010 p95 Chapter 7 Baedeker: the perceived ‘inventor’ of the formal guidebook, a bible for travellers in the 19th century, in Giants of Tourism Butler and Russell Eds CABI Wallingford
18 Frangenberg T 1994 Chorographies of Florence the use of city views and city plans in the sixteenth century Imago Mundi, 46: pp41 - 64
after 1702. The cities tend to feature in the guidebooks produced for the Grand Tour, including Thomas Nugent’s four volumes of 1749, which coined the phrase. Mariana Stark and John Murray III continued the pattern into the 19th Century and many of the same cities (including Ghent – Braun and Hogenberg Vol I.16) appear mapped and therefore emphasised in Baedeker nineteenth and early twentieth century guide books. They continue to figure strongly in twenty first century compendia of must see world cities; disproportionately the latest (2010 August) 910 strong World Heritage List is nearly 20 percent historic walled cities or related to them and about a third of these world heritage cities are also in Braun and Hogenberg (57 in all).

Nuti identified how, by publishing in Latin in Cologne, Braun and Hogenberg provided a European audience for Italian City views. It seems that the idea of the Italian City as a distinctive element of Italian culture at the beginning of the modern era was not developed within Italy but diffused throughout Europe and finally re-imported via the participants of the Grand Tour helped shape the Italy’s indigenous awareness of its own identity. Similarly each city, Like Bristol, relishing its ‘second city’ status drew pride from the views visual and verbal of outsiders.

In contrast the tradition of ichnographic (or birds-eye accurate) city plans came from fortification engineers, developers and estate agents and were then “employed for architectural and urban planning, administration and warfare”. Warfare built the walls or at least the modernist fortifications associated with the name of Vauban (and in the Low Countries van Coehorn). Parts of medieval and modernist town walls and gates have remained in place by chance but more usually by continued border or linguistic boundary sensitivities - dozens of the Braun and Hogenberg cities have different names given by different peoples, who at different times have been dominant at or around the city. Sometimes, as with Brugge (Bruges) or Rothenburg-ob-der-Tauber the diversion of trade kept the town in aspic. Sometimes the new fortifications (and frontiers) as in Le Quesnoy in Northern France, themselves stifled the trade of a prosperous medieval centre.

19 From visit to library at Fonmon August 2008. Robert Oliver Jones, whose name plate is to be found in the Atlas is known to gone on the Grand Tour to Italy and some prints he returned with are extant in the Castle but he does not seem to have left diary or itinerary of his tour.
20 Grand Tour: a journey through the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and France
21 Starke M 1834 Travels in Europe: Information and Directions for Travellers on the Continent including the Isle of Sicily, John Murray London
22 Belgique et Hollande 1910:150 Karl Baedeker Leipzig for Ghent; and see Otness H.M 1980 Index to nineteenth century city plans appearing in guidebooks: Baedeker, Murray, Joanne, Black, Appleton, Meyer, plus selected other works ...Western Association of map Libraries, Santa Cruz Ca.
24 Bruce and Creighton 2006 op cit ; Creighton 2008
27 Frangenberg op.cit (page 42.)
In medieval times walls had often been a source of civic pride as well as having a controlling or security function. This is demonstrated by use of wall images in city insignia. Bristol is only one example among some twenty-eight captured in the plates of the Braun and Hogenberg.

Where town walls have survived, relatively intact as in Chester or in many Italian cities they are visible reminders of how the city has evolved as a palimpsest of its own history. A palimpsest is a parchment which despite being cleaned for reuse still reveals the original text that was formerly inscribed. So with the city, particularly the walled city shows to visitor and citizen the importance of the layers of experience that have brought it to its current state. Even in Bristol with the assistance of the distinctive Braun and Hogenberg view, the now almost completely hidden walls contain the church protected gates of what has been recognised as a ‘sacred city’ layout. The town wall also concentrates the city’s physical cultural assets. The town profiles illustrated in Braun and Hogenberg show the impact of such concentration. The ‘dreaming spires of Oxford’ is an outsider’s view of the concentration of colleges within the walled precinct of the medieval town of Oxford. It has demanded comparison with the Florence skyline, even possibly to the extent of suggesting the ‘need’ for the dome of the Radcliffe Camera to match the Duomo of that city ‘called the beautiful’ in Braun and Hogenberg.

Bruce and Creighton in 2006 identified

“the key issues and challenges presented by the town walls include their extent, their relationship with the urban context, their effects as barriers within the townscape and the divisive dissonance of a heritage owned used and exploited by different groups over the centuries. Each of these matters is critical to the effective and sensitive conservation of town walls and walled towns, which if successfully managed can create specially valued living places for residents, their surrounding communities and even the tourist who may be attracted to them as sustainable gems of urban conservation. An historic perspective is vital: to some extent urban communities always saw walls as part of their ‘heritage’, and the strong local civic value of extant walls remains as clear as ever.”

Four hundred years of the Braun and Hogenberg City has authenticated itself as the essential historic city; as Ashworth and Tunbridge have put it – emphasising the role of the outsider in the process – ‘the Tourist-Historic City’.
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28 Crang M 1996 Envisioning urban histories: Bristol as palimpsest Environment and Planning A vol 28: 429-452. On page 430 he identifies the ‘the humble knowledges of local areas…’ as significant for history.


30 Florence Vol 1 plate 45

31 Bruce and Creighton 2006 op. cit

4. Current Uses of Town Walls in Historic Cities

Bearing in mind the due caution expressed by Ashworth and Bruce (2009) “As intense examples of the more general ‘tourist-historic city’, walled towns epitomise both the mono-functional and medium sized tourist-historic city (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000)”[33], [but] success will depend upon careful analysis, conscious and often controversial decisions, considerable effort and a large portion of good fortune. The existence of none of these can be relied upon, but perhaps the civic pride, which is a notable feature of even the smallest walled towns, will produce the determination to make solutions effective.”[34]. Creating an 'enabling heritage city' rather than just a slightly less inaccessible old town was therefore the challenge taken on by nine historic towns in the course of an EC INTERREGiiiC network project (2004-8). Walls and Gateways, barriers and access are the essence of managing all historic towns. The multiple requirements of making a barred city accessible to all as demand a spatially and functionally integrated approach to city management. The project with the acronym 'ARCHWAY' – Access and Regeneration of the Cultural Heritage of Walled historic towns – was led by Chester City Council. The partners sought the transformation of (tourism and other) experiences in historic or heritage towns by confronting, analysing and surmounting the 'barriers', which history, geography and the physical attributes of the cultural built heritage (CBH) represent. Each of the partner towns was more or less completely walled except one similarly constrained but by rivers, railways and national frontiers; each had special experience of addressing physical barrier issues. ARCHWAY encouraged them to address the implications of the 'social model of disability', that is to say, a model in which Society has obligations to make facilities available to people with a wide range of physical, mental and social ‘disabilities’. [35].

The towns, from both 'old' and 'new' Europe, ranged from Valletta, UNESCO WHS capital of Malta, to Lucca and Verona in Italy, to a consortium of small towns in the Basque country to Piran and Pécs in central Europe. All except one are in the Walled Towns Friendship Circle[36]; five signify in the Braun and Hogenberg plates (Chester, s’Hertogenbosch, Lucca; Valletta &Verona). Different aspects - spatial planning, transport, conservation, tourism and cultural heritage management towns were addressed with different towns in the lead role. s’Hertogenbosch in the Netherlands led on Conservation; a consortium of small Basque region Spanish towns led on spatial planning, Valletta in Malta on local transport; Piran in Slovenia on tourism, Lucca on cultural and creative heritage management.

The ten well recorded workshops were grounded on comprehensive scoping questionnaires and allowed sometimes heated debate among officials from the nine partner towns and cities as well as the representative of the academic partner – UWE, Bristol. Culminating in a legacy conference (in Chester June 2007) the records from the workshops formed the basis for five Good Practice Guides[37] and an ongoing technical network[38] and have generated extensive extra research data. All historic towns were seen through the perspective of barriers, what effects barriers have had, what significance barriers have and how to acknowledge that some of the barriers including many town walls may be part of the cultural heritage and attraction of the town. ARCHWAY’s particular focus on disabled and
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33 Ashworth& Tunbridge, op cit
35 Pendlebury, Townsend & Gilroy (2004) ‘Disability in the Culturally Built Heritage' IJHS the social model is contrasted with the ‘medical model’, which emphasis ‘curing’ and the adaptation of the disabled to the ‘normal’ physical and other conditions of living.
36 see Bruce D 1994 Tourism in Walled Towns Tourism Management
38 WTFC TEKNET http://arabarrien.wordpress.com/wtfc-teknet/
social ACCESS related the European Directive and national legislation that has become a legal obligation for Local Authorities.

That legislation, properly, does not distinguish between resident or stranger disabled people. ALL must be fairly catered for and a social inclusion agenda addressed. In effect this requires city government to think about the rights of people from outside, not just the rights of their own citizens. It is a social inclusion agenda for the cultural built heritage, on which historic towns trade. Historic buildings are not naturally easy to access; particularly walls designed as barriers. An aim of ARCHWAY was to involve stakeholders, including outsiders, insiders, different parts of the community, all sort of the community in the management of the ‘enabled’ city. That raised the question of how tourism, (because its essence is about people from outside), should be integrated into the urban management process. ARCHWAY developed shared expertise on key urban development issues and in tackling such issues from an historic (walled) town standpoint suggested best practice relevant in and for Europe's most distinctive and historic cities. Mainly small and medium sized, the partner historic (walled) towns enjoy close relationships with rural hinterlands and are affected by regional, and international frontiers as well as the other social, cultural and linguistic barriers, which constrain sustainable regeneration.

![Figure 3: Five ARCHWAY themes related to Palma Nova](image)

Every Good Practice guide aimed to achieve this holistic approach to driving forward an Access Agenda and "How are the themes were linked" was explained at the Chester legacy conference but this diagram featured specifically only in the Tourism Development and the Cultural Heritage Management. The Access Agenda sought to impose itself by breaking out into the overlapping policy mazes surrounding it. The maze depicted is from the loggia of the cathedral in Lucca: its medieval symbolism reflecting “the erring paths of human life” more appropriate to 21st century realities than the Renaissance model of the simple fortified city and here represents the necessary complexity of combining the five approaches in making the historic /(walled) town accessible to all

42 Baedeker, Northern Italy, Handbook for Travellers 1913, p. 530
citizens and visitors regardless of mobility, or social factors and providing alternative ways of appreciating the cultural built heritage (CBH) and the less tangible cultural heritage for different audiences. Accessibility for disabled and disadvantaged tourists (not just residents) needs to be achieved because of the European Disability Directive, which has been brought into national law by Acts such as the British Disability Discrimination Act, implemented in 2004.

Typically historic (walled) towns have substantial differences in levels of various parts of the town (Valletta in Malta, Piran Slovenia and La Guardia in Alava, Spain and Chester in the UK were each significant ARCHWAY examples caused by natural topography reinforced by fortification while Lucca and den Bosch showed how fortification could artificially create differences of level all of which affect acceptable walking distances/time for different sorts of people. This physical accessibility needs combining with visual accessibility – tactile interpretation for the less well sighted – and social accessibility – the stories told as inclusive of outsiders not designed to exclude.

The five dimensions comprehended in ARCHWAY were mainly those of a typical British local authority Planning and Development Department – not surprising as it was largely designed within Chester’s offices: spatial planning, transport and conservation. Less conventional was the inclusion of creative or cultural heritage management and tourism development. Bringing together professionals from these from these five areas and through the workshops giving them the opportunity to meet and work with their opposite numbers from other European Union countries had great potential for sparking innovation from different approaches. Two further dimensions emerged as significant: firstly housing management, including provision for affordable homes and the issues raised by second homes and migration. These elements were mentioned but perhaps under-emphasised in the Spatial Planning GPG. The retail and commercial dimension emerged as an agenda for future projects, although, perhaps strangely, the Conservation GPG, led as it was by s’Hertogenbosch placed an unusual emphasis on the need for dynamism within the historic city to encourage the transformation of (decayed) historic buildings, fortifications and structures as part of or incorporated within often radical new architecture.

Each of the five themes was led by a different partner town and resulted in a ‘Good Practice Guide’ which were unified by a common commitment to general principles. Six in final number, they derived from and were accepted by all partners as history, sustainability, accessibility, dynamism, territorial balance and involvement.

As historic (walled) towns history had to be a guiding principle. Sustainability is about the interests of future generations socially, environmentally and economically and to be promoted though Local Agenda 21. Accessibility, Access for All is fundamental. ‘Dynamism’ in the living historic (walled) city recognised the need for and the value of appropriate change and development, while a principle of territorial balance planned for mutually supportive benefits for the historic (walled) city and its suburbs and countryside as well as between networks of towns. The involvement principle aims to build broad-based inclusive stakeholder coalitions for development and heritage interpretation.

The guiding Principle of history is informed by and aware of the contested heritages of walled towns and focuses attention on different approaches in restoration including reversibility and the non-destruction of the built heritage as well as the degree of the preservation of monuments as tourist
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43 Bruce and Creighton 2006 op. cit.
47 UNCED 1992 and later; climate change increasingly dominates this discourse.
48 Bruce and Creighton 2006 op cit.
attractions or for other purposes; further issues of how and whether to conserve past defence works in a modern city, question their historical relevance. This principle links naturally to the discussion of the Braun and Hogenberg City.

The public histories of these 470 cities and towns over the last four hundred years have established them as ‘historic towns’, possibly in some cases to the detriment their economic advance. Rothenburg-ob-der-Tauber, (of which more later), Bruges (Brugge) and even Bristol might be cases in point although other factors for their absolute or relative decline and resultant preservation are more convincing. In Bruges’s (Brugge’s) case the blockade of its links to the sea and parallel increase in the size of ocean going ships, this later a key factor in Bristol’s eclipse by Liverpool. Rothenburg also found itself sidelined by trade routes as well as being in the eighteenth century (to 1804) politically fossilised. Rothenburg’s problematic 20th century history as ‘the jewel of the German Past’ epitomises the conflicts and symbioses between tourism, preservation and nationalism.49

The conservation of town walls creates a wide variety of dilemmas, paradoxes, conflicting interests, drawbacks and burdens but is part of an inseparable bond with the setting and therefore with the authenticity of visitor and resident’s experience. Research showing how walled towns share common issues is expanded upon by Ashworth and Bruce50.

The principle of sustainability looks to the interests of future generations socially, environmentally and economically particularly through the techniques and approaches associated with local Agenda 21. Global warming is brought in through the long distance transport (mainly for tourism) issue and in the local transport theme by a strict hierarchy of priority to walking then cycling then public transport then deliveries and only lastly private cars and visitor parking

The principle of Accessibility itself acknowledges the rights of all, whether locals or strangers to have the historic (walled) city and its heritage physically and socially enabled for the disabled and disadvantaged tourists and residents. Not only does this require good physical and visual accessibility with proper attention paid to differences in level of various parts of the town and therefore acceptable walking distances/time for different sorts of people, but also (linking to the history principle) to socially accessible interpretation, which encourages and enables rather than deters the visitor. Further discussion of such issues is merited particularly in cities such as Bristol with a dubious past prosperity based on the Atlantic triangular slave trade.

A principle of Dynamism – the historic (walled) ‘Cities as Living Monuments’52 recognises the value of appropriate change and development o ensure that the towns do not decline into moribund ‘museums’. Even “modern innovative buildings should not be regarded as [inevitably] disruptive... “ said the ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective) proposition 159 but sensitivity in the historic urban environment is clearly critical. Questions requiring careful local decision making include tourism related local transport and parking e.g. for coaches as well as cars especially in smaller towns. How information services for tourists can work to the advantage of the town and residents as well as serving visitors perhaps by helping to spread pressures created by the concentration of visitors by day of week and week of year.

---

50 Ashworth and Bruce 2009 op cit.
53 ESDP 1999
A principle of Territorial Balance\textsuperscript{54} is perhaps more unusual but planning for mutual benefits for networks of towns and mutually supportive historic (walled) cities with their surrounding suburbs and countryside has been found important and often made difficult by false frontiers with a mismatch of economic and administrative boundaries often exacerbated by local/regional political tensions. The changing demand for land around the line of the walls as well as local transport constraints associated with the size of the town (within the walls), its development density and its topography.

Finally though not as an afterthought is the principle of Social Involvement, reflecting the need to build broad-based inclusive stakeholder participation with consensus in development and heritage interpretation. It can be significant how conservation rules are enforced on local people as well as the need to achieve social diversity by means of housing policy when the baleful influence of second (tourist) homes affects the social structure of the community. In can also encompass managing the interaction of tourists and local residents\textsuperscript{55}

Conservation and enhancement strategies have drawn on the experience of s’Hertogenbosch, Chester, Lucca, Verona and Lörrach and provide examples of effective contemporary architecture woven into the ancient city fabric after sensible decisions have been made to select which land uses to promote in such concentrated and potentially congested areas as historic (walled) central areas. S’Hertogenbosch has subsequently (2010) won a Europa Nostra Prize for its achievement.

New forms of approaching transport issues were found in Valletta with its new Park’n’Ride, Piran with its cycle ways and vehicle entry fees – in effect local road pricing, Lucca with local distribution of goods and nearly completely car free and cycle/pedestrian friendly walled town centre, in Chester its hierarchy of access to the central area. Walled Towns as regional attractions suffer from the cars carrying welcome visitors but their relative lack of dependence on long distance (air) transport makes them less unsustainable in terms of global warming than many other forms of tourism\textsuperscript{56}. These and further examples are illustrated in the Good Practice Guides\textsuperscript{57}. Tourism’s significance was enhanced because of the importance of catering for the needs of outsiders with physical and or social disabilities as well as for disadvantaged local people. The precedent would be the health and safety of the public realm, a natural responsibility of the town and city authorities. The value placed on the heritage environment within the historic city is as high in the minds of visiting outsiders as for local citizens (or even higher).

The attitude towards the walls is twofold. On one hand, the walls can be seen as a barrier and as a limitation to physical development of the inner town. Walls also need funds for maintenance. On the other hand, town walls can also be regarded as an asset and/or an opportunity for further exploitation of the heritage. The participants of the ARCHWAY workshops agreed that the walls should be regarded not just as a barrier, but almost as a conceptual link between the inner town and the outside area. The walls can serve as a reference point to visitors and residents alike. As the walls are usually very noticeable, they are convenient for meeting at a specific town gate for instance or to give directions. A walk on the wall can provide a good basic orientation to newcomers and visitors of the town. Another distinctive asset of a walled town is that it can provide the experience of authentic medieval urban space with a clear delimitation of the inner and outside world. In some instances, the walls are suitable for recreational activities. Climbing, walking and jogging on the walls are some examples of potential use. They are often also used as an element in brochures, postcards and other promotional materials.


\textsuperscript{55} ibid

\textsuperscript{56} Bruce and Brezovec 2008 available at www.archway-interreg.com (accessed 25-Aug-2010)

\textsuperscript{57} available at www.archway-interreg.com (accessed 25-Aug-2010)
Walled towns as tourist destinations attract visitors from far away as well as from their regional and national catchments. They therefore generate transport and the often ill-effects that accompany it. These ill-effects of long distance transport for leisure (and business) tourism are a significant element in man-made global warming. Although 75%-85% of leisure tourists come to walled towns and cities by car, they do so in efficient group sizes (e.g. a full family car) and not over very long distances. On the other hand, they only stay for a relatively short time.

Table 1: Average stay of visitors/tourists at specific destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Arabarri Towns</th>
<th>The Arba</th>
<th>Lucca</th>
<th>Valletta</th>
<th>Verona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>2 - 3 nights</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>2.60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Bosch</td>
<td>4 - 6 hours</td>
<td>Piran</td>
<td>2 1/4 days</td>
<td>2.60 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only certain world renowned cities attract intercontinental tourists to themselves. Of towns included in this research only Verona and perhaps Valletta fall into this category as both World Heritage Sites and as Braun Hogenberg Cities. Chester aspires to with its entry into the British ‘tentative list for World Heritage designation in 2009. Valletta is also capital of an island economy and apart from cruise holidays, which it is actively promoting, is inevitably heavily dependent on air transport to bring in tourists. All the others, and indeed also Verona in most instances, serve to provide valuable tourist experiences either closer to home or as part of a holiday, which the interest of a walled town may tend to make longer. The impact of their tourism on global warming is therefore probably positive, if only relative to many other forms of tourism.58

The focus of the ARCHWAY project was stated to be access for the disabled and disadvantaged, yet this did not emerge as the top principle espoused by the Good Practice Guides. (It was the fourth of the 6 or 7 listed in the different GPG’s). Pendlebury’s analysis of the issues involved in making the historic built environment more socially accessible59 was taken on board but the priorities tended to emerge as those of the (mainly) able-bodied urban professionals. For them and therefore the ARCHWAY network as a whole, first came the ‘History’, then ‘Sustainable Development’, then ‘the city as a living monuments’.

Chester, the lead partner, had put forward good cases. For instance at the Conservation workshop, Chester’s stated in answer to a scoping questionnaire: “Are your town/city walls accessible to all citizens regardless of mobility, or do they create a barrier to access? What steps are you taking to overcome any constraints whilst respecting the need for conservation?”

“Chester City Council takes the issue of ‘access’ very seriously. Indeed one of the five corporate aims of the Councils is the creation of ‘An Accessible Chester’. Central to this theme is a strategy (based on the social model of disability) to improve the quality of life and independence of disabled people who live, work or visit Chester District. The Chester Walls were developed in an age when the needs of disabled people were not considered in the design process. Nevertheless approximately 90% of the Walls are accessible (excluding the Gate Structures) to wheelchair users. This level of accessibility is tempered by the fact that wheelchairs will often need to retrace their route to exit the Walls at the point they originally entered the Walls. The City Council has improved the accessibility of the Walls in recent years. This has been achieved by a combination of Planning Gain, External Grant aid and the Councils own financial resources. Any access improvements implemented on the Walls are discussed and agreed jointly by the Council’s Access and Conservation Sections and where appropriate with English Heritage before been carried out. It is essential to ensure that any access improvement carried out on the Walls are in keeping and sympathy with the architectural, historical and conservation values of this ancient monument. This invariably means that detailed attention need to be paid to quality design, materials and workmanship. The City Council has recently established a £60,000 ‘City Walls Access Budget’. The aim of this budget is to further improve the accessibility of the Walls and to help the City Council meet its legal duties in relation to the recently implemented Part III duties of the Disability Discrimination Act. The initial focus for this budget will be the provision suitably designed handrails for steps and stairs and the installation of tactile paving to aid blind and partially sighted people. A longer term aim is to provide new accessible entry points to the Walls. The City Council believes that improving accessibility of the Walls for disabled people will benefit all Walls users such as parents with buggies/prams and elderly people - we can all get a dividend from an investment in access”60


59 Pendlebury et al.2004 op cit

While the good practice guides themselves however were not nearly as specific as they might have been\textsuperscript{61}, at very least the project has added to and developed the discourse and left a wealth of material for further study.

Because ARCHWAY was intended and funded to strengthen and develop the network rather than being a policy development project, it has left plenty of scope for further work to take forward the prospect of enabling cities in the future. Sharing potential solutions and approaches shows how cities gain from co-working, collaborating more productively than by competing in the place market. Moreover they specifically recognised the risks of imitation for the built environment, which can quickly lead a city from being "someplace" to "anyplace" and dangerously close to being "noplac" at all.(Lucca 2008) By developing and applying best practice and innovative new approaches clearly related to the needs of the whole management process for historic (walled) towns, the strong focus on access and mobility for all aims to create enabling heritage cities rather than just slightly less inaccessible old towns. Such 'enabling heritage cities' have times, ages and cultures juxtaposed and the capacity to create 'co-incidence' - where people meet by chance or are facilitated to meet each other and visitors or tourists, who are often the dynamic element, the change driver.\textsuperscript{62}

The Enabling City will aspire to excellence in accessible monuments, accessible transport, accessible space, accessible tourism and accessible creative heritage; that is to say ‘Access for All’, for every type of visitor to the Living Monuments that can be the Enabling Historic (walled) City. Building on history, managed for accessibility of all both socially and physically, old historic (walled) towns, can examine their barriers to social inclusivity and to physical access and develop plans for long term change. In such ways they can become truly enabling heritage cities, which welcome all visitors and bring prosperity and open attitudes to their residents. However hard it is to create an enabling rather than disabling historic town, it will undoubtedly be even harder to sustain and manage it long term for the benefit of the silent (or silenced?) as well as the vocal citizens and articulate visitors.


The wall-less walled town\textsuperscript{63} of Ghent is a stage set for its lively markets by day and the student life by night, dynamic in cultural, creative tourist terms – as a stage set for creativity. One way in which a study such as ARCHWAY can be taken forward is by examining the principles derived by the partnership in different historic urban contexts and how they help define the ‘enabling historic town’. When visitors wander around a town such as Ghent, we see there are different ages, building in different parts of the town. A town is not a single monument - it has these different times and eras juxtaposed as a palimpsest, Towns such as Ghent are good places for conferences but also good for people to meet by chance especially if the people meeting are on foot or a bicycle.

The approaching 4\textsuperscript{th} centenary in 2018 of the completion of the Braun and Hogenberg may well stimulate new studies and creative possibilities which this paper can only hint at. One such study however can be said to have begun by examining the ARCHWAY project. The central intention is to identify and stimulate the multifarious research and creative possibilities that networking with the current administrations, museums and academic institutions of the cities illustrated can generate.

\textsuperscript{61} More recently and building partly on ARCHWAY though this author as academic adviser to the Walled Towns Friendship Circle, the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions has produced guidelines for Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Historic Towns and Cities\textsuperscript{(www.historic-towns.org accessed 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2009)}. European Commission funding is being sought to test these in selected cities and towns across Europe.

\textsuperscript{62} Comparison and contrasts may be made with the commercially, pluralistically postmodern enabling city of Wigmans G. 2001, Contingent governance and the enabling city: The case of Rotterdam, City, Vol. 5, No. 2.

\textsuperscript{63} A concept developed by Greg Ashworth at a Walled Towns Friendship Circle Symposium in 1994
Questions to be addressed in projects and perhaps prepared for a conference in anticipation of the 4th Centenary in 2018 might include:

| 1. | What has the last 400 years done to the historic city and its inhabitants? |
| 2. | How have the images informed the planning and development of the cities themselves? |
| 3. | How has inclusion in this compendium valued cities affected their self perception? |
| 4. | What is the role of public history in informing city decision making and planning? |
| 5. | How have different attitudes, over time and space, to conservation affected the current value of the ‘tourist-historic city’? |
| 6. | How might the same cities appear from the same angle today? |
| 7. | How might today’s artists and cartographers graphically interpret the cities today? |
| 8. | How have cities developed their capacity to be inclusive, to enable rather than disable? |
| 9. | How have city barriers – visible walls and invisible impediments – been addressed? |

This last is being looked at in this conference. There are many others, which could be added as the project develops.

Outcomes might include creating a 21st Century *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* either electronically, on paper or both with both English language versions of all the old potted histories and similarly formatted extensions to bring those potted histories up to date and projected as plans for a sustainable future. A satellite-generated ‘Urban Atlas’ of over 300 European cities and many of the *Civitates* is being produced by the European Commission Directorate General for the Regions as part of a wider Geo-information project[^64]. Google maps and its derivatives also provide relatively simple opportunities but the problems confronted and largely overcome – over a fifty year period - by Braun and Hogenberg 400 years ago in corresponding with 470 different cities will be little changed despite apparent advances in communications technology. English is not even as good a common medium of exchange as Latin was then!
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