

유산영향평가 제도 도입에 따른 세계유산 공간관리 정책방안 연구 -세계유산지구 밖 주변환경을 중심으로

A Study on the Policy for the Spatial Management of World Heritage Following the Introduction
of the Heritage Impact Assessment System
-Focusing on the Wider Setting outside the World Heritage District

손은신 Son, Eunshin
이상민 Lee, Sangmin
방보람 Bang, Boram
김충호 Kim, Chungho
박희성 Park, Heesung
길지혜 Gil, Jihye

(a u r i

A Study on the Policy for the Spatial Management of World Heritage Following the Introduction of the Heritage Impact Assessment System -Focusing on the Wider Setting outside the World Heritage District

Son, Eunshin
Lee, Sangmin
Bang, Boram
Kim, Chunggho
Park, Heesung
Gil, Jihye

Chapter 1: Introduction

Recently, UNESCO has been calling for the mandatory implementation of Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) in states parties with World Heritage Sites since 2018 to prevent damage to World Heritage Sites due to development, as the number of World Heritage Sites has reached 1,200. HIA is a preliminary assessment of the impact that a potential development may have on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of a World Heritage Site. In Korea, the “Special Act on Conservation, Management and Utilization of World Heritage” (hereinafter referred to as the “World Heritage Act”), which came into effect in 2021, added provisions related to the implementation, review, and implementation of heritage impact assessments through a revision of the law in 2023.

As of 2024, all of the 16 World Heritage Sites in Korea (14 cultural heritage sites and 2 natural heritage sites) are managed as nationally designated cultural and natural heritage, with the exception of the 'Getbol, Korean Tidal Flats'. In accordance with the World Heritage Act, the World Heritage (nominated) property area is managed under the national heritage protection system as a designated heritage and protection zone, and the Buffer Zone of World Heritage property is managed as a historical and cultural environment conservation area. The World Heritage Property Area and the Buffer Zone are collectively referred to as the World Heritage District. However, the scope of such protection and management has been gradually expanding in recent years. The 2022 UNESCO's HIA toolkit state that HIA can be conducted on development activities that have a significant impact on the OUV of the heritage, even in the wider setting outside the World Heritage District. Accordingly, the wider setting outside the current World Heritage District is also included in the scope of the heritage impact assessment, and the law stipulates that an HIA can be conducted if the OUV is significantly affected even outside the district, as stipulated in Article 11-2(2) of the World Heritage Act.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to effectively manage the World Heritage Site in accordance with the management plan submitted at the time of inscription, and to specifically prepare a spatial management plan for the World Heritage Site, including the wider setting. In particular, at the time when the World Heritage Act is about to be enacted and the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is about to be institutionally implemented, the issues and major current status of the spatial management of World Heritage were examined and policy proposals for the efficient management of the World Heritage Districts and their wider setting were presented.

Chapter 2: Current Status and Issues of the Introduction of Heritage Impact Assessment in Korea

Chapter 2 reviewed the UNESCO's World Heritage Conservation Policy, the current status of its legalization in Korea, and the current status of HIA cases in Korea, and identified issues related to the legal introduction of HIA in Korea. In the case of the wider

setting, rather than a concept with a clearly defined scope like the World Heritage District, there are no boundaries or restrictions on the area in practice, as the heritage can be affected by certain development activities. According to UNESCO's HIA toolkit, the scope of the wider setting is determined by the physical attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the World Heritage and the scale of development activities around the heritage. In general, property area and buffer zones are not established with the consideration of extensive and comprehensive large-scale development, and it is not appropriate to manage the wider setting outside the World Heritage District with the same standards as the areas subject to permission and review for changes to the cultural heritage in Korea. According to the current draft decree, outside the World Heritage District, the HIA can be conducted upon the recommendation of the Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage Committee and UNESCO. In fact, the Gongju Second Geumgang Bridge Construction Project and the Magoksa Geumwon Temple Construction Project are examples of projects that occurred within the boundaries of the buffer zone or in adjacent areas, and were recommended by the Cultural Heritage Committee to conduct an HIA.

However, the Korean urban planning system is a kind of “land register system” in which the use of land is designated in advance, and based on this, the developer can predict in advance the development potential and regulations of the land, and check the extent to which development is possible before proceeding with the project. Therefore, there is a possibility that the evaluation of whether or not to conduct an HIA at the mid-stage of the project, as recommended by the committee, will be a significant burden. Due to the conditions of the domestic system, it is necessary to specify the scope and standards of the wider setting and the means of consultation, etc. that can be used to check the impact on the heritage at the planning stage of the development project and to consult with the wider setting, if possible. The HIA steps are divided into three stages: screening, scoping, and assessing. The scope of the wider setting should be set to strengthen the screening and the scope of the scoping and assessment should be reduced in sequence. In addition, it is necessary to explore the effectiveness of spatial management through the system, such as designating and notifying management areas by other laws, so that the scope, standards, and means of consultation can be set in advance to increase the predictability of HIA.

Chapter 3: Current Status of Spatial Management of World Heritage District in Korea

Chapter 3 analyzes the current status of spatial management of World Heritage in Korea. The purpose of the analysis is to analyze the current state of spatial management of World Heritage in Korea and to derive the characteristics of the heritage that require management of the wider setting, thereby examining the possibility of using existing systems for space management. Therefore, this study analyzed the current state of spatial management by selecting three single heritage sites, including Suwon Hwaseong Fortress, Seokguram Grotto and Bulguksa Temple, and Namhansanseong Fortress, and two serial heritage sites, including the Gongju area of the Baekje Historic Areas and the Seoreung Royal Tomb in Goyang, to comprehensively examine the various characteristics that affect the spatial management of World Heritage.

The results of the analysis of the current status of spatial management for World Heritage in Korea are as follows. First, in the case of Korean World Heritage, which are mostly designated cultural heritage and protection zones, it is difficult to quantify the impact assessment targets in a lump sum because the OUV and location conditions differ for each heritage site, unlike the natural environment, which is subject to environmental impact assessment (EIA). If the OUV is mostly located within the World Heritage (nominated) property area and there is little threat of development, such as in the case of Seokguram Grotto and Bulguksa Temple, or if the surrounding environment is designated as a national park and there is little chance of development, such as in the case of Namhansanseong Fortress, a separate management plan for the wider setting is not required.

On the other hand, if the location characteristics based on feng shui, such as the Royal Tombs of the Joseon Dynasty, correspond to the OUV, or if the heritage is closely related to an urban area, such as the Gongju area of the Baekje Historic Areas or Suwon Hwaseong Fortress, and there is a high possibility of urban development projects occurring in the surrounding area, a separate spatial management plan for the wider setting is required. Given the nature of the OUV, these heritage sites require extensive spatial management measures outside the World Heritage District. Therefore, this study examined the status of districts and zones designated by other laws, including the areas

extending to the wider setting outside the World Heritage District, and examined the possibility of developing the surrounding environment by checking the standards for restrictions on actions in districts and zones, etc. that are being managed by other laws.

Chapter 4: Case Studies on the Spatial Management of World Heritage Sites Abroad

Chapter 4 examined case studies on the spatial management of World Heritage abroad to derive implications for the spatial management of World Heritage in Korea. First, the last three years' World Heritage Committee conservation agenda was reviewed to examine the latest international recommendations and trends in HIA implementation. The World Heritage Committee adopts World Heritage properties that are considered to have broad and comprehensive threats to their OUV as targets of the Committee's conservation agenda and recommends conducting HIAs for the purpose of preventing risk factors in advance. It is worth noting that the factors that pose a threat to the OUV are very diverse, and as a result, the scope of the buffer zone is being recommended to extend beyond the wider setting and include the HIA implementation scope. The main risk factors identified were threats to housing, commercial facilities, and transportation infrastructure such as roads, terminals, and cable cars, as well as the development of urban complexes, along with the increase in tourists. Recommendations for the establishment of management plans that encompass a wider setting, as well as matters related to continuous monitoring, consultation, and review, are emphasized.

Next, we reviewed the progress of the HIA in the 'Historic Centre of Vienna', Austria, and the 'Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City', UK, which can be said to be representative examples of HIA conducted overseas. We confirmed that both World Heritages had undergone HIA as a result of a wide range of ongoing development projects in the areas of the World Heritage located in urban areas. In both cases, it can be seen that the impacts are not caused by the construction of one or two new buildings in a single area, but by various projects occurring in the nominated property area, buffer zone, and wider setting. In particular, the study found that the further away from the

property area, the more threatening the height and scale of new buildings and infrastructure were to the World Heritage.

Meanwhile, as HIA has been continuously conducted in connection with the World Heritage District development project, changes have taken place in Austria and the UK to improve the urban planning-related systems and policies for the conservation and management of World Heritage. Various means are used to improve these systems and policies, ranging from laws to ordinances, urban planning, and the establishment of integrated heritage management plans. This is also true in the cases of the systems and plans of various countries that have established overseas world heritage management systems in accordance with recent international trends, even in countries that have not yet conducted HIA. In the countries examined in this study, such as Japan, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the Philippines, along with the enactment and revision of laws and regulations, the basis for heritage management is being established by preparing HIA guidelines or amending local government ordinances. In some cases, urban planning is being revised or even urban planning, heritage management planning, and landscape management planning for individual World Heritage Sites are being integrated into spatial management planning.

Chapter 5: Policy Measures for the Spatial Management of World Heritage

Chapter 5 proposes policy measures for the spatial management of World Heritage. The basic direction of the World Heritage spatial management proposed in this study is to minimize the feasibility of conducting an HIA by ensuring the predictability of the HIA. To do this, the current state of spatial management in the World Heritage District and the wider setting must be analyzed, and based on the results of the analysis, the means, legal procedures, scope, and standards for managing the wider setting must be proposed to suit the conditions of each heritage site if spatial management with an expanded scope is required. In addition, when establishing a spatial management plan for each World Heritage Site, it is necessary to consider the direction of minimizing the need for HIA by

planning and notifying in advance the scope of the wider setting, management standards, consultation procedures, and methods.

When establishing a spatial management plan for a wider setting outside the World Heritage District, the establishment procedure is as follows. First, we need to identify the world heritage that require management of wider settings according to the OUV attributes. Given the nature of OUV and location, not all World Heritage properties require management of an extended scope that includes wider settings. Therefore, we must first derive attributes based on the OUV for all of the world heritage sites in Korea, and then overlap them with the world heritage sites to derive heritage lists that require management of an extended range, including the wider setting. Once the heritage list of heritage requiring spatial management of a wider range have been organized, the range of the wider setting management area is set for each World Heritage, taking into account the OUV attributes, and the means of spatial management plan suitable for management are reviewed.

The term “spatial management plan” used in this study is a general term for “integrated spatial management plans” such as the Comprehensive Preservation Management Plan for Kyoto City (2023), which is established in conjunction with various means of other laws such as the ‘Focused Landscape Management Area’ and ‘Landscape Plans’ under the “Landscape Act,” the ‘District-unit Planning Zones’ under the “National Land Planning and Utilization Act”, or the “integrated spatial management plans” such as the Kyoto City Comprehensive Preservation Management Plan (2023), which was established in cooperation with various other laws and regulations, such as the Kyoto City Preservation Management Plan. The means and scope of spatial management plans can be expanded as new systems are introduced or existing systems are supplemented.

In the case of a heritage that requires management of an extended range of wider settings, the spatial management plan for the wider setting should be established in a way that complements the existing spatial management plan, and if the area of wider setting does not have an existing spatial management plan, a new spatial management plan can be considered. When establishing a new spatial management plan, the establishment body of district-unit planning zones and focused landscape management areas, which are generally considered to be management tools for urban spaces, is the local government, so it is necessary to establish a new spatial management plan through consultation between the local government and the National Heritage Service.

Once a spatial management plan targeting a wider setting is established, when a project or development action occurs in the area, a business that meets the criteria of the spatial management plan does not need to conduct an HIA, while a business that exceeds the criteria of the management plan undergoes a primary screening through a committee responsible for deliberation of the management zone. If the deliberation concludes that no further discussion is required, the HIA will not be conducted. The HIA may only be conducted if the deliberation reveals that further discussion is required.

In this study, three major policy measures for the spatial management of World Heritage were presented. First, as a way to manage the wider setting through inter-agency cooperation, the following measures were suggested: designating 'focused landscape management area' under the "Landscape Act" and 'district-unit planning zones' under the "National Land Planning and Utilization Act"; and using the environmental impact assessment (EIA) and natural impact assessment consultation system for cases where development is unlikely but monitoring is required, such as national parks. In Korea, the representative examples of managing the wider setting of World Heritage as a focused landscape management area are 'Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes' and 'Hwaseong Fortress' in Suwon, and the areas adjacent to 'Hwaseong Fortress' in Suwon are also managed as district-unit planning zones. In the case of the Royal Tombs of the Joseon Dynasty, many of the royal tombs are managed as key landscape management areas, while the areas adjacent to Jongmyo Shrine and Changdeokgung Palace in Seoul are managed as district-unit planning areas. In this case, the scope of the management area is often smaller than or does not cover the World Heritage District, so it is possible to consider using the existing system by adjusting the scope of the existing management area and regulatory standards according to the OUV of the heritage.

Secondly, it proposed the establishment of an integrated spatial management plan for each World Heritage site that covers cultural heritage management, urban areas, and landscape management. For example, in the case of Kyoto City, a comprehensive conservation management plan (2023) has been established and is being implemented to manage the 17 World Heritage Sites distributed throughout the city. As in the case of Kyoto City, for World Heritage sites that require comprehensive management, it is necessary to establish a management plan for the purpose of preserving and managing World Heritage sites by establishing an integrated spatial management plan for each World Heritage through consultation between the National Heritage Service and local

governments and linking the means under the “National Heritage Act” and other laws. Finally, we proposed a plan for establishing local government ordinances and implementation plans to strengthen the role and obligations of local governments, which are the actual spatial management entities of World Heritage. Local governments are the main actors that should take a leading role in terms of integrated spatial management of World Heritage sites. When a site is inscribed on the World Heritage List, the local government enacts ordinances to support the inscription, and after the inscription, these ordinances need to be converted to a nature that supports management. In particular, the ordinance provides a basis for securing institutional and financial resources for local governments to establish and designate legal management planning areas to preserve the value of the OUV. To this end, the National Heritage Service may consider distributing a draft ordinance on standards for the preservation and management of world heritage sites, and may also consider preparing guidelines for conducting HIAs of individual heritage sites that reflect the characteristics of the region where the world heritage site is located, as is the case in the UK.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study was conducted for the purpose of securing the effectiveness of the provisions related to heritage impact assessment and preparing a policy plan for spatial management measures in accordance with the enforcement of the amendment to the World Heritage Act on November 1, 2024. In particular, the significance of this study lies in the fact that, at the time when the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was introduced into the domestic system for the purpose of preserving world heritage, the study examined spatial management plans to promote the preservation and utilization of heritage in line with its original purpose. In particular, this study aimed to present effective management measures for the wider setting outside the World Heritage District in order to increase the predictability of the heritage impact assessment (HIA) and minimize the feasibility of its implementation. Therefore, we proposed a plan to establish a spatial management planning zone through inter-agency cooperation, a plan

to establish an integrated spatial management plan, and the establishment of local government ordinances and implementation plans focused on the management of world heritage.

Based on the results of this study, which was conducted at the initial stage of the introduction and implementation of the heritage impact assessment system in Korea, various future tasks are needed. Currently, inter-ministerial consultations are underway on the proposed amendments to the enforcement decrees and enforcement regulations pursuant to the revision of the World Heritage Act, and it is necessary to urgently come up with a plan for implementing the system based on the consultations. In addition, it is necessary to map each attribute of the heritage derived from the OUV statement for each heritage onto the actual space and identify the characteristics of the region, district, and area where each attribute is located to derive a list of world heritage that require management to be expanded to a wider setting and the scope of spatial management. To date, studies have been conducted to derive the OUV attributes for each heritage site, but no studies have been conducted to map the attributes in space and derive the boundaries and criteria of the management areas based on them. Therefore, in future research, it is necessary to derive the scope of heritage management for each World Heritage and, if an expanded scope of spatial management is required, to derive the appropriate scope and management measures for the wider setting. In addition, if there is a need for coordination between various methods of management and if there is a need to explore various management methods and support project plans, such as resident participation, research should be conducted in sequence to establish an integrated spatial management plan suitable for the heritage.

Keywords

World Heritage, Heritage Impact Assessment, Wider Setting, Spatial Management