STUDY ON THE DEFINITION OF THE NAME, LIMITS AND BUFFER ZONES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY IN QUITO, ECUADOR

- Analysis of planning maps for delimitation of the “historic center” based on the chronological transition of preservation legal instruments
- Preservation of the “City of Quito” in Ecuador (Figure 1), is one of the first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978. However, through the analysis of planning maps and the Nomination Dossier, which were submitted in 1978, several ambiguous items related to the name, limits and buffer zones of the property could be found. This ambiguity makes difficult to discern if the entire “City of Quito” or the “Historic Center” is the concerned World Heritage property. This study is aimed to analyze the planning maps, Nomination Dossier and submitted maps related to the nomination of the “City of Quito”, in order to determine the name, limits and buffer zones of the World Heritage property, and in addition to determine the changes on the planning maps until the present. Based on the analysis, this study has concluded that it would be better to revise the name of the World Heritage property to “Historic Center” instead of “City of Quito” according to the Legal Status of the Nomination Dossier. As a result, it would be better to revise the limits and buffer zones according to the current planning maps of legal instruments.

** Gonzalo HOYOS BUCHELI*, Satoshi ASANO** and Masuro URAYAMA***

Keywords: Ecuador, World Heritage Property, City of Quito, Historic Center, Buffer Zones, Planning Maps

Fig. 1 Location of "City of Quito" and "Historic Center"
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study, the Municipality of Quito has been considering WHP limits and buffer zones required in World Heritage Operational Guidelines\textsuperscript{15} but these areas had not been indicated in any municipal legal instrument\textsuperscript{16}.

Based on these antecedents, this study is considering necessary to define clearly the name, limits and buffer zones of the WHP of “City of Quito”, regarding its importance as one of the first inscribed properties. Clarification of these elements is essential to allow further studies concerning the current situation of the inscribed property, in order to determine the characteristics and problems in a more specific and delimited area. This study can show in addition, how the Municipality of Quito has been modifying the limits for of “Historic Center” through the elaboration of planning maps of legal instruments.

1.2. Overview of Related World Heritage Properties

The “City of Quito” is not however, an isolated case considering that there are at the present, seven properties inscribed in the WHL as “City of...” \textsuperscript{17}, “City of Quito” (Ecuador, 1978); “City of Valletta” (Malta, 1980); “City of Cuzco” (Peru, 1983); “City of Bath” (United Kingdom, 1987); “City of Potosí” (Bolivia, 1987); “City of Safranbolu” (Turkey, 1994); and, “City of Verona (Historic Center)” (Italy, 2000).

Most of the above mentioned properties\textsuperscript{18} inscribed before 2000, except “City of Verona (Historic Center)”, have indicated ambiguously the Name of the Property compared to the area based on the Legal Status of the Nomination Dossier. In other words, the limits of the inscribed properties based on the Legal Status in most of the cases, correspond just to the historic core (i.e. Historic Center, etc.); and the buffer zones (where indicated) surround this historic core.

In the case of “City of Bath”, the City Council of Bath has recognized the ambiguity of the WHP regarding the name, limits and absence of buffer zones\textsuperscript{19}, and has revised the areas accordingly\textsuperscript{20}.

1.3. Study Aims and Methodology

Considering the above mentioned concerns, this study is aimed to accomplish the followings: (1) to make a clear definition of the name, limits and buffer zones of the WHP of “City of Quito”, based on the analysis of the chronological transition of planning maps of legal instruments elaborated by the Municipality of Quito used as well, in the Legal Status of the Nomination Dossier, and; (2) to identify the changes on planning maps for the delimitation of “Historic Center” since the inscription on the WHL until the present, based on the chronological analysis and evaluation of planning maps of legal instruments in the above mentioned periods.

The method used to carry out this study is based on analyzing planning maps of legal instruments (Periods I, II and III), Nomination Dossier (including annexed maps), ICOMOS Advisory Body Evaluation, as well as bibliographic documentation related to the inscription on the WHL. The planning maps were provided through interviews to authorities of the Municipality of Quito\textsuperscript{21}, Ecuador National Institute of Cultural Heritage (INPC, Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural by its abbreviation in Spanish\textsuperscript{22}) and ICOMOS-Ecuador\textsuperscript{23}). Nomination Dossier and maps related to the inscription of the “City of Quito” were courtesy of UNESCO World Heritage Centre\textsuperscript{24}) and ICOMOS Documentation Centre\textsuperscript{25}). Ortiz Crespo A., member of ICOMOS-Ecuador, provided publications of Pallares Rodrigo\textsuperscript{26}) and Lara Salvador Jorge\textsuperscript{27}).

For analyzing the above-mentioned data, it is important to make first a comparison of legal definitions of the “City of Quito” and “Historic Center”. Then, the most important legal instruments before the inscription on the WHL are analyzed (Period I: “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map (1968)\textsuperscript{28}), MO #1377\textsuperscript{29}) and “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map\textsuperscript{30}) of MO #1727 (1975)\textsuperscript{31}). Next, the most important legal instruments after inscription are analyzed (Period II: Nomination Dossier and “Delimitation of Historic Areas of the Quito City” Map\textsuperscript{32}) of MO #2342, 1984\textsuperscript{33})). With regard to the Nomination Dossier (and annexed maps), the answers or items are tabulated in order to determine applicability, inapplicability or ambiguity concerning the “City of Quito” or “Historic Center” respectively (Table 1). Finally, the most important current legal instruments (Period III: “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito”\textsuperscript{34}) of PUOS, 2003\textsuperscript{35}) and maps of the “Special Plan of the Historic Center”, 2004\textsuperscript{36}) are analyzed in order to illustrate changes on limits of the “Historic Center” from the inscription until the present.

2. COMPARISON BETWEEN THE LEGAL DEFINITIONS OF “CITY OF QUITO” AND “HISTORIC CENTER”

Before analyzing planning maps of legal instruments from Chapter 3, it is indispensable to make clear the difference between “City of Quito” and “Historic Center”, based on a comparison of the definitions used in legal instruments. It is fundamental to note this difference in order to recognize the ambiguity of the name of the inscribed WHP.

2.1. Legal Definition of “City of Quito”

In 1978, year of the inscription on the WHL, the “City of Quito” was indicated according to the Quito city map, which was elaborated by Military Geographical Institute (IGM)\textsuperscript{37}). The “urbanized areas”\textsuperscript{38} of the city shown
Map 1: "Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification" Map (1968) / 1968年の歴史都心地区の計画図

Map 2: "Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification" Map of MO #1727 (1975) / 1975年の市条例1727号の計画図

Map 3: "Delimitation of Historic Areas of the City of Quito" Map of MO #2342 (1984) / 1984年の市条例2342号の計画図


Fig. 3 Analyzed Planning Maps in Periods I, II and III
in this map have been expanding and the current PGDT Plan has estimated the limits of “City of Quito”\(^{47}\). The “City of Quito” is administrated by the Municipality of Quito, and the administrative limits of the municipality occupy a wider area known as Metropolitan District of Quito\(^{38}\).

2.2. Legal Definition of “Historic Center”

The limits of “Historic Center” have already been established in planning maps such as the “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” map of 1968. The current limits of “Historic Center” were established by virtue of the “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS (2003) and “Special Plan of the Historic Center” (2004)\(^{33,35}\).

2.3. Comparison between “City of Quito” and “Historic Center”

According to legal instruments elaborated by the municipality on the one hand, “City of Quito” refers to the area represented on dots area in Figure 2, which has been under continuous growing. On the other hand, “Historic Center” refers to the historical core of the city, which was delimited since 1968. These limits have been constantly changing until the present as can be observed in detail in Figure 2.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF PLANNING MAPS RELATED TO THE INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

#### 3.1. Period I (1941-1978)

In this period the “Historic Center” was delimited and several ordinances were enacted for its preservation\(^{40}\). The planning maps analyzed in this period are: (1) “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map (1968); (2) MO #1377 (1971), and; “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map of MO #1727 (1975).

1. “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map (1968)

This planning map\(^{41}\) was the result of a study for the delimitation of “Historic Center” that included a detailed inventory of historical buildings in the area\(^{42}\). According to this map, we specified the limits of “Control Zone” (represented in a curved line), and “Central Nucleus” of the “Historic Center” (Fig. 3, Map 1).

2. MO #1377 (1971) and “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map of MO #1727 (1975)

MO #1377 was enacted in 1971 and was aimed at regulating the construction of new buildings in the “Historic Center”\(^{43}\) and did not have any planning map.

MO #1727 was enacted in 1975 and was used, together with MO #1377 in the Legal Status for the inscription on the WHL. The planning map of this ordinance was based on the “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification” Map (1968). This planning map was annexed to the Nomination Dossier for the World Heritage inscription. The “Historic Center” limits were indicated as “Control Zone”\(^{44}\) that include the “Central Nucleus”\(^{45}\), which contains the most representative and oldest part of the city. However, this planning map does not indicate buffer zones (Fig. 3, Map 2). In this ordinance was mentioned in addition, “Central Nucleus” of “Santuario de Guápulo” and its surroundings\(^{46}\) as well as “Landscape Green Zones”\(^{37}\), but they had not been shown in planning maps\(^{48}\).

#### 3.2. Period II (1978-2001)

This period started with the creation of the National Bureau of
Fig. 4 Planning Maps for the Inscription of “City of Quito” on the World Heritage List
Artistic Heritage in 1978 by National Government. After the creation of this institution “City of Quito” was inscribed on the WHL\textsuperscript{49}. Here are analyzed: (1) Nomination Dossier, including annexed maps, and; (2) “Delimitation of Historic Areas of Quito City” Map of MO\# 2342 (1984).

(1) The Nomination Dossier (1978)

The Nomination Dossier indicates the supporting documentation for the inclusion of the property on the WHL\textsuperscript{50}, established according the “Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Committee” of 1977, that included: 1) “Specific Location”; 2) “Juridical Data”; 3) “Identificiation”; 4) “State of Preservation - Conservation”; 5) “Justification for Inclusion in the World Heritage List”. The contents of the Nomination Dossier can be analyzed by dividing them from items A-1 to A-48\textsuperscript{51} as shown in Table 1. Applicability or inapplicability of items are indicated by “+” or “×” respectively. Ambiguous items are identified by “●” when items are applicable for “City of Quito” and “Historic Center” at the same time.

As a result, items A-1 and A-2 are ambiguous because both places are located in the same country and province.

Item A-3, as well as A-5, are applicable to “City of Quito” because the “Name of the Property” was indicated this place as the “property concerned”.

A-6 is an ambiguous item because the owner of the property was indicated as “the community dwelling in the city”.

Ambiguity is also found in items A-7 and A-9, related to Legal Status and Responsible Administration, because was indicated that “the city is administrated” by the Municipality of Quito. However in item A-8, also referred to the Legal Status, were indicated MO’s #1377 and #1727. As analyzed in Period I, these ordinances are applicable exclusively to the “Historic Center”.

Item A-10 is an ambiguous description of the property because both are located at the same latitude. In A-11, although “City of Quito” is bounded by the Pichincha Volcano, only the “Historic Center” is bounded by the Ichimbiu Hill (Fig. 2).

From item A-12 to A-16, “Description and Inventory” of the property are only applicable to “Historic Center”. In item A-15 was mentioned in addition, the monumental building of Santuario de Guápulo that is in the outskirts of “Historic Center”, but was not indicated in the annexed maps.

Item A-17 is applicable to “Historic Center” because was indicated that “Quito... has resulted in an achievement unique of its kind”, but this achievement is related to the characteristics described in item A-16. Similarly, item A-18 is also applicable to “Historic Center” because was indicated that “Quito forms a harmonious and indivisible whole” that is logically connected to items A-16 and A-17.

From A-19 to A-23, annexed maps show specifically the “Historic Center”. Accordingly, there is the historic map the City of Quito elaborated by Dionisio Alcedo y Herrera in 1734 (Fig. 4, Map 1); historic map elaborated by Jorge Juan and Antonio de Ulloa in 1748 (Fig. 4, Map 2); “Plano de San Francisco de Quito” (City of San Francisco de Quito Map) that shows a transcription of historic maps until 1748 (Fig. 4, Map 3); planning map of MO #1727 for the Historic Center (Fig. 4, Map 4); “Centro de Quito, Obras de Restauración Actualmente en Ejecución” (Center of Quito, Current Projects Restoration Works, Fig. 4, Map 5);

“Centro Histórico de Quito, Plan de Iluminación” (Historic Center of Quito, Illumination Plan) (Fig. 4, Map 6). Although in the titles of two of the maps was written “Plano de la Ciudad de Quito” (City of Quito Map) (Fig. 4, Maps 2 and 4), the area shown corresponds to the Historic Center. Then, in Map 7-A is written “Map of the City of Quito...”\textsuperscript{52}, and is remarked in 7-B the “Central District”\textsuperscript{53} (Fig. 4. Maps 7-A and 7-B).

From items A-24 to A-32, annexed documentation is applicable to “Historic Center”, as well as A-33 where were indicated the historic antecedents of the city since its origins, Spanish foundation and independence period.

From items A-34 to A-41 were indicated the diagnosis, responsible agent, history of preservation/conservation, means of preservation and management plans applicable to “Historic Center”.

Finally, about the justification to inscribe the property on the WHL, items A-42 and A-43 are ambiguous because “City of Quito” as well as “Historic Center” could be interpreted as a “unit” and a “whole fabric” which is “accordingly shaped by the ecological and by the urban environment”. Item A-42 was also specified in the justification of the ICOMOS Advisory Body Evaluation. From items A-44 to A-48, the justification is only applicable to the “Historic Center”.

(2) “Delimitation of Historic Areas of the Quito City” Map of MO #2342 (1984)

The planning map of this ordinance enacted in 1984\textsuperscript{54}, was based on the “Historic Center of Quito, Inventory and Classification Map” of MO #1727 (1975). According to the legend used in this map, the following changes have been detected: “1st Rate Area”\textsuperscript{55} was changed instead of “Central Nucleus”; “Urban Environmental Control Area”\textsuperscript{56} instead of “Control Zone”. In addition were established the “Scenery Surrounding Area”\textsuperscript{57}, and “Designated Buildings Preservation and Control Area”\textsuperscript{58}, which contains several historical buildings inventoried by the INPC\textsuperscript{59}. In addition, in this planning map were indicated “1st Rate Area” of Santuario de Guápulo with its own “Urban Environmental Control Area” (Fig. 3. Map 3).

3.3. Period III (2001–present)

This period represents the current legal instruments for the preservation of historical environments, that is a group of plans and ordinances for long term development of the Metropolitan District of Quito, with some ordinances enacted for specific preservation measures, all constantly under revision and change\textsuperscript{60}.

In this period are analyzed the planning maps of: (1) “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS (2003), and; (2) “Special Plan for the Historic Center” (2004).

(1) “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS (2003)

Through this plan has been established the standards for building occupation, coverage ratio, land division, height zones, traffic, etc. “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito”\textsuperscript{61} has been established according to the general parameters of PGDT\textsuperscript{62}.

Comparing “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS with the previous “Delimitation of Historic Areas of the Quito City” of MO #2342, the following changes has been detected: “Historic
Center Area" was changed instead of “Urban Environment Control Area”; “Natural Environment Preservation Area” instead of “Scenery Surrounding Area”, and: “Inventoried Buildings Area” instead of “Designated Buildings Preservation and Control Area”. In the case of Santuario de Guápulo, was delimited in PUOS as “Historic Center Area” instead of “Designated Buildings Preservation and Control Area” (Fig. 3, Map 4).

(2) Planning Map of the “Special Plan of the Historic Center” (2004)

This plan was focused on the analysis of the current condition and proposal for the development of the “Historic Center”.

“Historic Center” limits are the same as established in “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS. Comparing planning map of “Special Plan of the Historic Center” with the previous “Delimitation of Historic Areas of the Quito City” of the MO #2342, “Historic Center Nucleus” was changed instead of “1st Rate Area”. In addition, this plan proposed several projects for the surroundings of “Historic Center”. These projects are located in “Environmental Protection Projects Area” and “Urban Renovation Projects Area” (Fig. 3, Map 5).

4. EVALUATION OF THE CHANGES IN PLANNING MAPS THROUGHOUT PERIODS I, II AND III

The analysis of the planning maps of the most important legal instruments in the different periods has been helpful to clarify name, limits and buffer zones of the WHP in Quito, as described as follows:

(1) Period I

The first period had been crucial as starting point for the delimitation of “Historic Center”. The planning maps elaborated in this period (“Historic Center, Inventory and Classification” Map (1968), MO #1377 (1971) and “Historic Center, Inventory and Classification” Map of MO #1727 (1975)) shows that “Historic Center” had been delimitated before the inscription on the WHL, and these limits were annexed in the Nomination Dossier.

(2) Period II

The analysis of the Nomination Dossier (1978) has indicated several ambiguous items, but most of these items were referred to “Historic Center”, and this was according to the analysis, the intended property to be inscribed on the WHL. In fact, according to the Legal Status, that is the most certain reference point, the limits of the property corresponds to “Historic Center” established on the “Historic Center, Inventory and Classification” Map of MO #1727 (1975). Consequently, it would be better if the “Name of the Property” is revised according to the Legal Status shown in the Nomination Dossier (MO #1727), to “Historic Center”; or else, “City of Quito (Historic Center)”, like the case of “City of Verona (Historic Center)” where is indicated clearly the name of the property based on the Legal Status.

Ambiguity between the “Name of the Property” and the inscribed area was not considered for the inscription of “City of Quito”. In fact, about this particular issue, since the review of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in February 2005, had established that “boundaries of the property being proposed shall be clearly defined, unambiguously distinguishing between the nominated property and any buffer zone...”. Then, ambiguity found in the justification specified in the ICOMOS Advisory Body Evaluation, is the same one of the Nomination Dossier (Table 1, item A-42) that corresponds to the “Historic Center”.

The Municipality of Quito has been continually modifying the boundary of the “Historic Center” after the inscription in the WHL. Consequently was clarified that the limits Santuario de Guápulo which were mentioned in the Nomination Dossier but without been showed in maps, had appeared for the first time in the “Delimitation of Historic Areas of Quito City” map of MO #2342 (1984).

Regarding buffer zones for the WHP were not indicated in the Nomination Dossier, however, the Municipality of Quito has been improving the protection for surrounding areas of the Historic Center (Designated Buildings Preservation and Control Area), established on the Map of the MO #2342 (1984).

(3) Period III

The results of most recent changes on the limits of “Historic Center” and its surroundings were indicated in the current legal instruments established by the municipality. Here, limits of “Historic Center” and Santuario de Guápulo has been changed in “Map of Historic Areas of the Metropolitan District of Quito” of PUOS (2003) and “Special Plan of the Historic Center” (2004), based on the planning maps which were elaborated in previous periods. According to these planning maps, the limits of the World Heritage can be specified according the “Historic Center Area” of PUOS. Buffer zones can be specified according to the “Inventoried Buildings Area” of PUOS, “Environmental Protection Projects Area” and “Urban Renovation Projects Area” of Special Plan of the Historic Center. Nevertheless, there is the need of further studies aimed to determine the characteristics and problems of those limits and surrounding areas.

5. CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE NAME, LIMITS AND BUFFER ZONES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY

According to the analysis and evaluation of legal instruments and
planning maps in the different periods, this study concludes the following:

(1) Through the analysis of Periods I, II, and III, has been clarified that “Historic Center” was the property intended to be inscribed on the List. As a result, it would be better to revise the “Name of the Property” to “ Historic Center” that is the name of the area used in MO #1727 for the Legal Status in the Nomination Dossier, instead of “City of Quito”.

(2) Analysis of planning maps also has clarified the changes of limits of “Historic Center” and the inclusion of Santuario de Guápulo, which was not indicated in the Nomination Dossier. As a result, it would be better to revise the limits and buffer zones of the WHP including Santuario de Guápulo, according to the current regulatory instruments improved by the Municipality of Quito, as proposed in Figure 5.

This study finally has considered the need for more detailed analysis based on the morphological and historical growth of the city, in order to determine the current situation, characteristics and problems in the limits and buffer zones of the WHP.
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NOTES

*1) Guidelines prepared by UNESCO World Heritage Committee on its first session (27 June - 1 July 1977). It is important to note that the Operational Guidelines has been constantly changing and improving. At that time, submission of nominations was established from November 1977 to April – May 1978, and the more suitable properties were inscribed in the World Heritage List in September 1978. In other words, the entire process only took around 10 months. Currently, the valid document is the “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention” (2008). There is specified that the nominated properties will be included first in a “Tentative List” to be evaluated by Advisory Bodies. Changes and improvements in the Operational Guidelines require a particular analysis, for this reason they are not mentioned in this study.

*2) The Ecuadorian properties “City of Quito” and “Galapagos Islands”, among other properties (natural and cultural), were the first ones to be inscribed by the World Heritage Committee on the Session celebrated in Washington (5-8 September 1978). http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opcon78.htm2.


*4) Translation from Spanish Dirección Nacional de Patrimonio Artístico: Institution created by National Government in 1945, for management and protection of the Cultural Heritage. This institution is the current INPC (Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural).


*6) Hoyos, Asano, Ururyama, 2007, pp. 77-84.

*7) Ibid, p. 84.


*9) Ibid. In the evaluation it was indicated that “all documentation is adequate” (regarding Maps, Photographs and Bibliography), in addition in the Justification for the Inscription in the WHL was indicated that “Quito forms a harmonious ensemble sui-generis, were the actions of man and of nature are brought to create a work unique and transcendent of its kind”, p. 2, Paragraph 5.


*11) ...el delegado de Ecuador, Rodrigo Pallares Zaldumbide, Director del Instituto Nacional del Patrimonio Cultural, presentó las candidaturas del Archipiélago de Galápagos...y del Centro Histórico de Quito, para la del Patrimonio Cultural...”, Lara Jorge Salvador, 2004, p. 73.

*12) “...These historical and architectural attributes of Quito were recognized by UNESCO, and in 1979 the organization added two hundred hectares containing buildings from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century to its World Heritage List”, Scarpace Joseph, 2005, pp. 80-81.

*13) “When setting the limits of a property to be nominated to the List, the concept of buffer zone around the property may be applied where appropriate. In such instances the nominations would include: a) a precise definition of the surface area of the property itself, including the sub-surface area where necessary. b) an indication of the buffer zone around the property itself (i.e. the natural or man-made surroundings that influence the physical state of the property or the way it the property is perceived). Such buffer zones will be determined in each case though technical studies and provided with adequate protection”, UNESCO Operational Guidelines, 1977, p.16, Art. IV, Num. 26.

*14) Hoyos, Asano, Ururyama, 2007, pp. 84, Note #7.

*15) See Table 1 in the following page. The data regarding the Name of the Property, Country, Inscription Year, Area Based on the Legal Status, Situation of the Limits and Situation of Buffer Zones were obtained mainly from the World Heritage Centre official website: http://www.whc.unesco.org/en/list, ICOMOS Documentation Centre (“City of Cuzco” and “City of Potosi”), and from City Council of Bath’s official home page: http://www.bathnes.gov.uk.

*16) Ambiguity was found by comparing the Name of the Property with the Name of the Area Based on the Legal Status (note 15) as follows: “City of Quito”: Ambiguity in the name of the property because was indicated “Historic Center” in the Legal Status; “City of Cuzco”: Ambiguity in the name of the property because was...
indicated “Monumental Zone” in the Legal Status; “City of Bath”: Ambiguity in the name of the property because was indicated “…monumental ensemble of Bath” in the ICOMOS evaluation (see notes 17 and 18); “City of Potosí”: Ambiguity in the name of the property because was indicated “…ensemble centered around the city of Potosí” in the ICOMOS evaluation.


*18) Ibid. p.5, paragraph 2.2.2.

*19) Interviews in the Municipality of Quito: Cifuentes Colon, Arch., Urban Planning Unit, Metropolitan Division of Urban Planning (2007/06/27); Bermudez Nury, Arch. Information and Research Unit, Metropolitan Division of Urban Planning (2007/7/20).

*20) Interview to Armendariz Ivan, Ing., Director of the Ecuador National Institute of Cultural Heritage (2007/7/10).

*21) Interview with Ortiz Crespo, Alfonso, Arch., member of ICOMOS-Ecuador (2007/7/2).

*22) A PDF version of the Nomination Dossier for the inscription of the “City of Quito” was elaborated by the Municipality of Quito under the supervision of Ilustre Municipio de Quito, 2003.

*23) Scanned images and photos of the original maps annexed for the inscription of the “City of Quito” were courtesy of Mr. García Vicente Jose, on charge of the ICOMOS Documentation Centre, Paris.


*27) Municipio de Quito, Ordenanza N°1377: “Ordenanza que regula el tipo de exterior de construcción de los edificios que se levanten en los frentes de la Avenida Pichincha, desde la calle Oriente hasta la prolongación de la calle Sacco”, 1971.


*33) PUOS (Plan de Uso y Ocupación del Suelo by its abbreviation in Spanish).

*34) Trans. from Spanish: “Plan Especial del Centro Histórico”. This plan have several maps. The analyzed maps in this study are the “Ambito Territorial” map (p. 61) and “Proyectos de Borde” map (p. 72). Municipio de Quito, 2004.


*37) Accordingly, “City of Quito” has been established as the territory that occupies an area of approximately 19,000 ha. located in a longitudinal valley of 42 km. length and an average of 4.5 km. wide, where approximately lives 1 450,000 inhabitants (Trans. from Spanish). Municipio de Quito, PGDT, 2001, p.29.

*38) “City of Quito” indicated as “Urban Control Area” in a previous publication is the same area located in the Metropolitan District of Quito according to PGDT Plan. See Hoyos, Asano, Urayama, p.80.


*40) Hoyos, 2007, p.79.

*41) This map was elaborated by the Municipality of Quito under the supervision of Arcos Alfredo C., and is the first map where the limits of “Historic Center” were technically shown. “Centro Histórico de Quito. Inventario y Clasificación”, Municipality of Quito, 1968, Courtesy of INPC, Quito.


*43) Ilustre Municipio de Quito, Libro de Ordenanzas del I. Municipio de Quito, Ord. #1377, 1971.


*46) Ibid. Paragraph a, Line 5.


*48) Ibid. Paragraph c.

*49) Hoyos, Asano, Urayama, 2007, p.82.

*50) It is important to note that according to Pallares’s publication, documentation for the case of “Historic Center” was based on MO’s as also publications written by journalists, who assisted to the Regional Project for Andean Culture Heritage, sponsored by UNESCO, but he had not provided bibliographic information about those publications and were neither indicated in Nomination Dossier: “Los articulos de estos periodistas extranjeros, la mayoría profundamente ilustrados, dan cuenta de los programas llevados a cabo con asesoría internacional... La UNESCO recopiló estos articulos y nos envio copias de ellos, fueron incorporados a la documentación sobre Quito, enviada al Comite del Patrimonio Mundial…”, Pallares Rodrigo, 1998, p. 3. Column 1, Line 19-64.

*51) Division of the Nomination Dossier contents (items A-1 to A-48) was proposed by choosing those contents that illustrate the differences or ambiguity between “City of Quito” and “Historic Center”.

*52) Translated from Spanish: “Plano de la Ciudad de Quito, Compilado por el Instituto Geografico Militar, Año 1975”. Courtesy of ICOMOS.

*53) Map Legend Translated from Spanish. In the legend is written lit.: “Distrito Central”, “Distrito Norte”, “Distrito Sur”, and “Zonas”.

*54) In addition, this planning map was used when the National Congress declared the “Historic Center” of Quito, Urban Nucleus of Guápulo, Chilloagallo and Cotocollao as National Cultural Property, Torres Galo, 1992-1996, pp. 205-208.


*60) Hoyos, Asano, Urayama, 2007, pp.81.

*61) “Las áreas patrimoniales, la reilminación del CHQ y de las núcleos históricos parroquiales, las áreas naturales vinculadas, áreas de inventario e inventario selectivo de los bienes patrimoniales se identifican en el Mapa B4-B y en sus anexos gráficos de detalle...”, PUOS, 2003.


*64) Ibid. Legend trans. from Spanish: “Áreas Históricas del DMQ: Preservacion Ambiental”.

*65) Ibid. Legend trans. from Spanish: “Áreas Históricas del DMQ: Área de Inventario”.


*67) Ibid. p.73.

*68) UNESCO 2008, Paragraph 143.
和文要約

本研究は、1978年に世界で最初に登録された世界遺産の1つであるエクアドルの「CITY OF QUITO」を対象にしたものである。筆者による既往研究（参考文献7）を通じて、「CITY OF QUITO」は、1978年以来現在まで約30年間に渡って世界遺産に登録されてきているが、登録申請書類であるNOMINATION DOSSIERを分析すると、世界遺産の名称、範囲及び緩衝地帯が不明確であるといういくつかの曖昧な内容が含まれていることが明らかとなった。この曖昧さにより、世界遺産の名称は「CITY OF QUITO」であるものの、世界遺産として本当のキト市全体（CITY OF QUITO）を指すことが適切であるのか、あるいは市の歴史都心地区（HISTORIC CENTER）を指すことが適切であるのか、などという問題が生じていると考えられる。

以上の点を踏まえて、本研究は、エクアドルの「CITY OF QUITO」を対象にして、登録申請に関連する都市計画図や申請書類であるNOMINATION DOSSIER、NOMINATION DOSSIERに対するICOMOSの評価への分析を通して、その名称、範囲及び緩衝地帯の定義について明確にすることを目的としている。

本研究の主な結論は以下の通りである。世界遺産登録前の第1期（1941〜1978年）は、HISTORIC CENTERの範囲を決めた出発点として大変に重要といえる。この時期には、HISTORIC CENTERの範囲を決めるための都市計画図及び市条例（1968年の歴史都心地区の計画図、1971年の市条例1377号及び1975年の市条例1727号）が制定され、これらに基づいた範囲がユネスコに提出されることとなった。

第2期（1978〜2001年）は、世界遺産登録後であり、NOMINATION DOSSIERの内容を分析すると、実質的にはキト市全体ではなくHISTORIC CENTERを指して世界遺産として説明していることが明らかとなった。また緩衝地帯は、NOMINATION DOSSIERにおいても、またこの時期の市条例においても示されてはいなかった。

第3期（2001年〜現在）は、キト市によって現行計画であるPODSプランや歴史都心地区特別プランといった重要な都市計画図が作成された時期であり、これらの計画図においてHISTORIC CENTERとその周辺地域の範囲が明確に示されたことにより、世界遺産及び緩衝地帯の範囲が明確になったと考えられる。

以上を踏まえて、まずNOMINATION DOSSIERに示された世界遺産の名称をCITY OF QUITOからHISTORIC CENTERへと変更することが望ましいこと、そしてその範囲を第3期の都市計画図に示されたHISTORIC CENTERへと変更すること、NOMINATION DOSSIERには示されなかった緩衝地帯については同様に第3期の都市計画図を踏まえて明確に位置づけること、といった変更が、今後、必要であると考えられる。

（2008年1月9日原稿受理、2008年7月9日採用決定）