Introduction

Cultural landscapes continue to be present on the political and scientific agendas as well as in planning. In the past, they inspired painters and writers. They shaped disciplines such as geography and they made institutions and organizations develop means for their protection and management. Cultural landscapes are undergoing severe changes, caused by current developments in agriculture and land use changes resulting in landscape dissection and soil sealing. Those developments point in two opposite directions: some areas become derelict land, while other areas are used more and more intensively, for example, by highly energetic, industrial agriculture or peri-urbanization close to large agglomerations. Those transformations are considered by many people as a threat to the cultural landscape. This is why applied aspects gain ground. Perspectives for cultural landscapes need to be developed and assessed, and programmes for conservation and development of cultural landscapes need to be set up and realized (Schenk, 1997b).

New aspects enter the discussion, in which the traditional handling of cultural landscapes is commented on in a critical way. Often cultural landscape research is restricted to rural areas, the visual, material heritage and the historical cultural landscape. Contemporary landscapes as well as landscape dynamics have for a long time been neglected. Starting with Rio 1992, the sustainable use of heritage has become presentable and has also been proposed for landscapes (e.g. Job et al., 2000). New perspectives are also necessary within an expanding Europe. Different institutions and organizations are dealing with protection and management of cultural landscapes. Their most important instruments are discussed in this chapter.

Cultural Landscape Protection and Management – the European Perspective

What is a European cultural landscape?

Above all, there is the question of whether something such as the European cultural landscape exists, and, if so, what are its characteristics? First of all, those cultural landscapes have to be located within European territory, which should be easy to identify; but in a more restricted sense, only landscapes of pan-European value are accepted as European cultural landscapes. Landscapes have a highly normative aspect, and regarding approaches dealing with
cultural landscape management includes a discussion of the value of different types of, or individual, landscapes. How can one assess the value of landscapes, which criteria can be used and where have benchmarks to be set when measuring those criteria? Those questions cannot be answered easily and sometimes not in an objective way. During a European-wide conference in Strasbourg, participants could only agree on two cultural landscapes of European value: Auschwitz and Tschernobyl. In fact, there should be more cultural landscapes that are worth being protected than those two. Other questions about the value of landscapes and the need for their protection remain open (Table 13.1).

The more valuable a cultural landscape, the more protection it deserves, but, as mentioned above, the question of how the value can be assessed in an objective way proves to be difficult. The answer depends on the objectives, which are followed by protection measures: to preserve the cultural landscape in its actual state, or to permit further development.

Generally important characteristics of cultural landscapes are diversity, character and rarity. Time determines the value, often indirectly by determining rarity: the older a cultural landscape and the elements within, the more rarely this type of landscape is likely to be found. On the other hand, the diversity of Europe’s landscapes could only develop through the activities of man. If somebody had decided in the 17th or 18th century to stop landscapes from further development, today’s diversity could not ever have been developed. This is why transformation of cultural landscapes is interpreted in different ways, namely as endangerment on the one hand, and as desired further development on the other.

One single arrangement or solution that fits all the different cases and regional specifications will not be found, but two questions are interesting:

- Who decides which cultural landscapes are valuable and which are not?
- Who decides which objectives cultural landscape management is following?

Different actors appear within the cultural landscape protection arena: tourists, farmers, politicians, planners, scientists and others. They can be grouped into the categories ‘Landschaftsbewahre’ (landscape preservers), ‘Landschaftsverwerter’ (landscape exploiters), ‘landbearbeitende Bevölkerung’ (land-labouring population) and ‘Landschaftsnutzer’ (landscape users) (Schenk, 2001).

The institutions and organizations that develop and realize the different management approaches play a crucial role. They act on different spatial levels, within different thematic fields (e.g. heritage protection, nature protection, spatial planning), have a differing legal status and organizational form (e.g. governments, NGOs, foundations, research institutes) and they follow more or less obligatory concepts.

Concerning the spatial level of the institutions and their instruments, a differentiation has to be made: there are explicit European and EU institutions as well as institutions which act on other spatial levels, but nevertheless deal with European cultural landscapes. In other words, national policies or international organizations also influence the European cultural landscapes (see Weizenegger, 2000 and Fig. 13.1). Naturally, those approaches with a broader spatial context (global, Europe-wide) are less detailed than the ones applied to smaller areas (national, regional or local). Local and regional measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are only ...</th>
<th>Or also ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extraordinary, unique or very special cultural landscapes</td>
<td>‘everyday-landscapes’ (i.e. all landscapes)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetically beautiful worth being protected?</td>
<td>less beautiful ones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rare</td>
<td>ones that can frequently be found?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>urban-industrial ones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic</td>
<td>contemporary ones?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13.2. Synopsis of major approaches for conservation and management of European cultural landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Typology after European Landscape Convention (ELC)</th>
<th>European Recommendation (95)</th>
<th>Landscape Award</th>
<th>European Diploma</th>
<th>ESDP and UNESCO World Heritage</th>
<th>PEBLS</th>
<th>UNESCO World Heritage Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/ responsible organization</td>
<td>Council of Europe, process enhanced by Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
<td>Europe Commission on Spatial Development</td>
<td>European Centre for Nature Conservation (initiative of Council of Europe and others)</td>
<td>UNESCO World Heritage Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial level and extent of approach</td>
<td>Europe; 18 signatures, 17 ratifications</td>
<td>Addressed to all Council of Europe member states</td>
<td>Addressed to all Council of Europe member states</td>
<td>65 diplomas in 25 Council of Europe member states plus Belarus</td>
<td>European Union (15 member states), in ESPON 2006 also candidate countries (EU 25)</td>
<td>54 states contribute to realization</td>
<td>Global; 37 sites worldwide, of which 23 are located in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Development of a typology</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Awards to local or regional authorities and NGOs</td>
<td>Awards to selected areas</td>
<td>ESDP: Policy options for spatial planning, SPESP: operationalization</td>
<td>Reduction of threats to landscapes</td>
<td>Protection of cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape concept</td>
<td>Ecologic and economic characteristics, settlement patterns, landscape aesthetics</td>
<td>All landscapes (i.e. also everyday, urban, industrial landscapes)</td>
<td>Focus on endangered landscapes</td>
<td>Focus on natural landscapes or features</td>
<td>Broad concept, depending on approach regarded</td>
<td>Different perspectives: uniqueness and diversity, European/ special value</td>
<td>Landscapes of outstanding universal value; three categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak points</td>
<td>Problem with scale of landscapes, many cultural features neglected</td>
<td>Cursorily formulated</td>
<td>Non-obligatory</td>
<td>No critical mass reached</td>
<td>Probably no critical mass reached</td>
<td>Difficult data situation</td>
<td>Focus on natural aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rarely radiate on the European level, but in certain cases, they can serve as best-practice studies. National approaches can more easily be scaled up on a European level (see the section ‘Cultural landscape protection and management – the German perspective’ later in this chapter).

The range of European cultural landscape protection and management approaches stretches from the unbinding Council of Europe Recommendation (95) 9 and the cursorily formulated European Landscape Convention to very tangible designation of areas with a certain status of protection, such as, for example, the UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Although also Categories V and VI of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) protected area classification or UNESCO Biosphere Reserves could be included in the latter group, those approaches are not dealt with in this chapter because they aim at cultural landscapes in a rather indirect way. Awards are assigned (European Diploma, Landscape Award), strategies developed (PEBLS – Pan-European Biological and Landscape Strategy) and planning concepts designed (ESDP – European Spatial Development Perspective). Research is involved in so far as it delivers the basics for the realization of the concepts and approaches. A synopsis of the approaches regarded in this chapter is given in Table 13.2.

Basics from the research community: Meeus’ (1995) typology of European landscapes

Probably the most frequently cited approach of a European landscape typology is the one carried out by Meeus (1995) on the basis of Meeus et al. (1990). It is taken over by Stanners and Bourdeau (1995) in the ‘Dobriˇs Assessment on Europe’s Environment’, edited on behalf of the European Environment Agency (EEA), a document which provides an overall view on the environmental situation in Europe and highlights 12 prominent European environmental problems.

For identifying the most important landscape types, Meeus (1995) applies six selection criteria:

1. Main land forms that characterize the geological and climatic zones.
2. Economic potential of land use and landscape.
3. Landscapes that are characterized by a combination of ecologically sound processes and sustainable use of natural resources.
4. Extensively managed areas (as substitute for the true wilderness areas, which are absent in most parts of Europe).
5. Regionally specific settlement patterns, ancient field systems, old trees, terraces and vernacular architecture.
6. Scenic quality and visual characteristics.
Through findings deriving from analysis of reports, publications, cartographic studies and planning proposals, a statistical analysis based on EUROSTAT data, a visual analysis of case studies and through interviews and discussions with experts all over Europe (see Meeus et al., 1990) combined with the above listed selection criteria, Meeus (1995) defines 30 pan-European landscapes, which Stanners and Bourdeau (1995) group into eight distinctive landscape types in the ‘Dobríš Assessment on Europe’s Environment’. These landscape types are shown in Table 13.3.2

Meeus’ landscape typology is not only the most cited, but probably also the most criticized approach within the circle of experts (see, for example, Schenk, 1997a, b; J. Vervloet and T. Spek, 1998, unpublished material; W. Vos, 1999, unpublished material). They express disapproval of the fact that the characterization is dominated by natural aspects, whereas influences by man are, if at all, of secondary importance. The only ‘artificial’ landscapes are polders, some deltas and the Spanish Huertas, while towns and cities, for example, are regarded as landscape-deteriorating instead of seeing them as a part of landscape. Trade and traffic landscapes, mining and industrial landscapes as well as urban cultural landscapes are not mentioned at all.

This imbalance between natural and anthropic criteria does not only become obvious in the classification, but also in the choice of terminology: in northern Europe,

Table 13.3. Meeus’ pan-European landscape types and distinctive landscape types in the ‘Dobríš Assessment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinctive landscape types (Dobríš Assessment, Stanners and Bourdeau, 1995)</th>
<th>Landscape types (Meeus, 1995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Tundra</td>
<td>1 Arctic tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Taiga</td>
<td>2 Forest tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Boreal swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Northern taiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Central taiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Southern taiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Subtaiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Uplands</td>
<td>8 Nordic highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Bocage</td>
<td>9 Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Atlantic bocage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Atlantic semi-bocage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Mediterranean semi-bocage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Open fields</td>
<td>13 Atlantic open fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Continental open fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Aquitaine open fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Former open fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Collective open fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Mediterranean open land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Regional landscape</td>
<td>19 Coltura promiscua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Artificial landscape</td>
<td>20 Montados/dehesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Huerta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Polder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Regional landscape</td>
<td>24 Kampen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Steppic and arid landscapes</td>
<td>25 Poland’s strip fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Puszta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Steppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Semi-desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Sandy desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do not appear</td>
<td>30 Terraces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mainly natural criteria are used and types are named ‘tundra’ and ‘taiga’, while in central and southern Europe the land-use type, formal shaping or the like are regarded, which results in types named ‘open fields’ or ‘bocage’. This leads to another point of critique: Meeus’ classification is not consistent. Heather landscapes are classified in landscape type number 8 ‘Nordic highlands’ by Meeus, whereas one can find them also in lowland areas of central Europe (but with a different degree of human influence and history), for example, Lüneburger Heide in northern Germany. Landscapes that fit in neither one of the other categories are called ‘regional landscapes’.

‘Terraces’ – Meeus’ (1995) landscape type number 30 – do not appear as a proper type in the Dobříš Assessment, although they can be considered as an important element of the European cultural heritage, not to mention that there are also different (sub-)types of terraces. This lack is due to the scale of the examination. Social and historical aspects influence cultural landscapes on an often very small dimension, which is not even roughly represented in the chosen presentation scales of about 1:35 million. Moreover it could be counterproductive to the original intention, if the responsible planners and policy-makers conceive that Meeus’ 30 types and eight types in the Dobříš Assessment (which are politically relevant) represent the real diversity of European cultural landscapes. The same is true for the illustrations and descriptions, which represent stereotypes rather than reality. Landscapes are romanticized and idealized. Landscape values and functions are seen as described too positively, although negative performance is one part of history which resulted in the actual landscape as well.

The conclusion of this discussion ought to be to concern ‘landscapes’ not as entities but as spatial constructions for a specific purpose mostly at a regional scale; and in the German-speaking countries it is better to speak of ‘Kulturlandschaften’ (cultural landscapes), if you would like to signal that you are mainly interested in the cultural aspects of regions, especially in any kind of spatial cultural heritage (Schenk, 2002).

**European Landscape Convention**

One milestone in European cultural landscape management has been set by the European Landscape Convention. It is based on the ‘Carta del paisaje mediterráneo’, which was signed in 1993 in Siena (Italy) by the regions Andalusia (Spain), Languedoc-Roussillon (France) and Veneto (Italy). About the same time, the Dobříš Assessment (Stanners and Bourdeau, 1995) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN, 1993) in its publication *Parks for Life: Actions for Protected Areas in Europe* recommend drawing up a ‘European Convention on Landscapes’, which would involve the Council of Europe. After having set up an ad hoc working group composed of members of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) and other international, national and regional bodies, the draft European Landscape Convention is introduced by the CLRAE. Its main objective is that ‘public authority concern for landscapes will become a political priority issue, since landscape quality is a key factor in the well-being of European citizens and the strengthening of a European sense of identity’ (Council of Europe and Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, 1998).

On 20 October 2000 the European Landscape Convention was signed in Florence by 18 countries, and entered into force on 1 March 2004. Seventeen countries have ratified the Convention so far (as of April 2005: Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ireland, Lithuania, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey).

The convention’s objective is to enhance landscape protection, management and planning and to organize a European cooperation on landscape issues. Measures to be realized on national levels are:
awareness-raising;
training and education;
identification and assessment of landscapes;
identification of landscape quality objectives; and
implementation.

The Landscape Award (see below) has been included in the convention. The European Landscape Convention shares a broad definition of landscapes by, in its Article 2, referring to ‘natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas ... land, inland water and marine areas’. Besides, it ‘concerns landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes’ (Council of Europe, 2000).

The Convention is supposed to be put into practice by the citizens of Europe, and not just something ‘to dream of as a theoretical possibility in front of a computer screen’ (Council of Europe and Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, 1998). Nevertheless, it is held in quite general terms in order to take into account individual states’ traditions, organizations and practice in the field.

Council of Europe Activities:
Recommendation (95) 9, Landscape Award and European Diploma

Recommendation No. R (95) 9 of the Committee of the Ministers to member states on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas as part of landscape policies sets out principles for cultural landscape area conservation and managed evolution within the context of general landscape policy. The recommendations refer in particular to areas susceptible to damage, destruction and transformations harmful to the balance of the environment and ‘especially concern the conservation of cultural landscape areas’ (Council of Europe, 1995). It proposes an integrated approach, ‘reflecting all the cultural, historical, archaeological, ethnological, ecological, aesthetic, economic and social interests of the territory concerned’ and concerted action by all the concerned parties. Article 4 describes the process of identifying and appraising cultural landscape areas. One condition is that a multidisciplinary approach should be adopted. The member states themselves determine the level at which the identification process should be carried out, and operations should be conducted by competent authorities with assistance of appropriate, independent experts and with the participation of the local communities. The same multidisciplinary approach is proposed for strategies for action. National governments are responsible for making the necessary institutional provision and for providing an adequate legal or regulatory framework. All policies should draw on the principles of sustainable development. Strategies should be devised at the administrative level consistent with the landscape identification and appraisal procedures.

In 1965, the Committee of Ministers or the Council of Europe institutionalized the European Diploma for different types of landscapes, reserves and natural monuments. Those need to be of exceptional European interest from the biological, geological or landscape diversity point of view. Although the focus lies on natural aspects, cultural qualities are included as well. Proposals are handed in as priority lists by the member states of the Council of Europe. They are reviewed by an ad hoc group of specialists, and an independent expert carries out an on-the-spot appraisal. The final decision about the award is taken by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. The diploma is awarded for 5 years and can then be renewed. When a site is undergoing degradation, the diploma may be withdrawn, which happened in one case, the French Pyrenees National Park, in which the situation degraded dramatically with the expansion of tourism. Currently 65 diplomas in 25 Council of Europe member states and Belarus are awarded, to among others the Swiss National Park and the German–Luxemburg Nature Park. For 2005 the applications of Gran Paradiso National Park in Italy and Piatra Craiului National Park in Romania were being examined for admission to the network (see Council of Europe, 2005).
Originally being focused on strict and often static conservation policies, the approach today is dynamic. In the vast majority of the sites in Western Europe that have been awarded the diploma, a (sometimes significant) human influence exists (Ribaut, 1998). Hacourt (1993) describes primarily positive effects deriving from the diploma, like the creation of jobs, measures concerning aesthetics and the environment and the extension of scientific research and information politics. Another positive aspect he mentions is that both the award and extension of the diploma contain recommendations or conditions to be followed by the responsible management agency. On the other hand, tourist numbers increase, which is considered to be a threat to the protected zone.

The Council of Europe Landscape Award is dedicated to local and regional authorities as well as NGOs which have taken initiatives for the conservation, management and/or development of landscape quality. The initiatives have to fall into one of the following categories:

- awareness, education and participation;
- scientific and technical activities; and
- protection, management and planning.

A process is to be stimulated, in which high-quality landscape management is initiated, enhanced and recognized (Council of Europe, 2003).

The Landscape Award was introduced in 1997 under the ‘Europe – a common heritage’ campaign. With the European Landscape Convention entering into force, its Article 11 is regulating the award process. A committee of experts is identifying the necessary criteria.

Cultural landscapes in European spatial planning

The overall framework for European spatial planning is, although without obligation, set by the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). The ESDP is the result of a process, lasting several years, of intense discussion among the member states of the European Union (EU-15) and with the Commission on Spatial Development (CSD) in the EU. Starting from 1993 the main principles and important analyses were developed until in 1997 the Dutch presidency presented a first official draft, referred to as the ‘Noordwijk Paper’. This draft was revised in Glasgow in 1998 and finally adopted in 1999 in Potsdam (see BMBau, 1995; European Commission, 1997, 1998; Council of Europe, 1999).

In the beginning of the process three operational objectives for spatial development are identified for an ESDP: development, balance and protection. The protection objective aims at – among others – preserving ‘…cultural identity, the heritage of European rural and urban settlements, and the diversity of landscape’ (BMBau, 1995). As one sphere of activity the ‘wise management and sustainable development of Europe’s natural and cultural heritage’ is suggested. This section of the paper proposes to set up an inventory of the European heritages on the basis of consistent criteria taking into account the diversity of national and regional context. It is stressed that ‘at the same time, special attention has to be paid to the preservation of “cultural landscapes”, which form an important part of regional cultural identity in Europe.’ Describing policy aims and options for the EU territory, one subchapter of the ESDP is dedicated to the ‘creative management of cultural landscapes’ (Council of Europe, 1999). The way in which agriculture is practised is seen as a major threat to the cultural landscapes, and the increasing uniformity in landscapes and the loss of biodiversity is considered. Therefore, the ESDP suggests putting a small number of places under protection as ‘unique examples of historical cultural landscapes’. The following policy options are suggested for cultural landscapes. Naturally, those policy options are kept in general terms.

- ‘Preservation and creative development of cultural landscapes with special historical, aesthetical and ecological importance.'
Enhancement of the value of cultural landscapes within the framework of integrated spatial development strategies.

Improved co-ordination of development measures which have an impact on landscapes.

Creative restoration of landscapes which have suffered through human intervention, including recultivation measures.

Also within the ESDP process, in 1997 a concept for a Study Programme on European Spatial Planning (SPESP) was developed in order to set up a European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON) (Ministerium für Raumordnung Luxemburg, 1997). In one of three programme sections indicators that reflect European spatial differentiation were to be developed. One of the seven working groups within this section worked on cultural assets, which included cultural landscapes. Parallel to the development of indicators the question of the assessment of landscapes was treated.

Concerning indicators, in a first step a distinction between ‘significance degree indicators’ and ‘endangering degree indicators’ is made. Significance indicators stand for all the intrinsic properties of single cultural elements and of their context, as well as objects, activities and facilities that make them considerable and culturally significant. Endangering degree indicators represent all those conditions and activities, as well as objects and facilities whose existence, absence or inadequacy determine a condition of imbalance leading to situations of degradation and refer mainly to probable future development of the cultural landscape. Then five categories of indicators are identified:

- **Category I:** Physical Geographical Features
- **Category II:** Human Geographical respectively Economic Functional Features
- **Category III:** Special Agricultural Features
- **Category IV:** Special Legislation Instruments
- **Category V:** Cultural Significance Values.

For the description of cultural landscapes, two alternative ways are followed: a direct one by making use of remote sensing data, in which above all physiognomy of the landscapes is regarded, and a rather indirect one making use of statistical data, which are collected within administrative borders. One problem lies in the availability of the data which are relevant for cultural landscapes. Those data collected by EUROSTAT often are not detailed enough. Data collected on local and regional levels are not comparable. This is why the selection of criteria has to follow a pragmatic way: included are indicators such as agricultural production, landscape dissection by traffic or population growth. Another problem of the statistical approach is the fact that cultural landscapes do not necessarily coincide with administrative borders. As discussed above, there remains the problem of illustrating the complex structure on a European scale, where a huge amount of simplification is necessary.

Within the successor ESPON 2006, which is carried out within the framework of the Interreg-III-Programme, cultural landscapes serve as frame-giving topics within the working group which deals with the role and spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity. This project was launched in October 2004.

Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy

The Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy was set up for a period of 20 years (1996–2016) and focuses on contributing to the realization of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In four 5-year action plans the ambitious objectives are formulated in the form of Action Themes. All actions are coordinated by the European Centre for Nature Conservation (ECNC). Action Theme 4 aims at the conservation of landscapes by treating the following issues (ECNC, 1997): development of landscape indicators, links with corresponding topics, priorities for landscape management, strategies to solve conflicts, information policies, and proposals for integrated actions.
Special attention is paid to ‘soft’ measures such as cross-sector participation, specification of communication mechanisms or learning and exchange of information. The landscape concept is interpreted in multiple ways.

Cultural landscapes within UNESCO World Heritage

Within UNESCO World Heritage, cultural landscapes receive special attention: two decades after the World Heritage Convention entered into force in 1972, in 1992 the operational guidelines were adapted in so far as cultural landscapes of outstanding universal value can be included in the World Heritage List. Three categories of cultural landscapes are distinguished (UNESCO, 2003):

1. Cultural landscapes designed and created intentionally by man.
2. Organically evolved cultural landscapes (these fall into the two subcategories relict/fossil landscape and continuing cultural landscapes).
3. Associative cultural landscapes.

The Sintra (Portugal) was included in the list in 1995 as the first European cultural landscape. One year later, in Vienna an expert meeting took place, which worked explicitly on European cultural landscapes. Meanwhile at least 35 cultural landscapes are inscribed in the World Heritage List, of which 22 are located in Europe (as of April 2004; the new design of the World Heritage Centre website does not allow search by heritage types any longer. For detailed discussion of the problems of identification of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List refer to Weizenegger, 2000).

Cultural Landscape Protection and Management – the German Perspective

The legal and institutional frame of cultural landscape conservation in Germany

The legislature of the Federal Republic of Germany demands explicitly or implicitly in a number of laws and decrees that planning should deal with the historical heritage of our landscapes, particularly in the sectors of building conservation, nature protection and spatial planning. In practice, a complex network of institutions and activities for ‘historical cultural landscapes’ has developed, which can hardly be seen through. In this chapter the specific contributions of nature protection and building conservation as well as spatial planning towards the conservation of the assets of cultural landscapes will be presented.

Historical landscapes and nature protection

For a long time since its first publication in 1968 the law of nature protection had been the only one which explicitly demanded the protection of historical landscapes. In the present edition, that of 2002, the text reads as follows:

Historical landscapes and parts of them with a specific character ought to be conserved. This includes landscapes or parts of landscapes with particular significance for the character or beauty of cultural monuments, historical buildings or archaeological sites which are under protection or considered to be protected.

(Historische Kulturlandschaften und -landschaftsteile von besonderer Eigenart, einschließlich solcher von besonderer Bedeutung für die Eigenart oder Schönheit geschützter oder schützenswerter Kultur-, Bau- und Bodendenkmäler, sind zu erhalten.)

However, the legislator omitted to install a specific category of protected landscape areas comparable to ‘nature protection areas’. That is the reason why this passage had been rather unknown, especially in the lower levels of nature protection administrations, for a long time.

Nowadays the situation has changed radically. In fact, nature protection movements are just and once again exploring the ‘cultural landscape’ for two reasons:
1. The acceptance of ‘classic’ strategies of single-species protection is declining in the arena of politics as well as in the public. So the involved institutions are looking for new fields of activity, and one area is the ‘historical landscape’.

2. There is a general return to the roots of nature protection which are based on the holistic movement of the ‘Heimatschutz’ concept (the protection of the homeland) of the late 19th and early 20th century. This approach includes nature, landscape and monument protection. Although it was widely misused at the time of National Socialism (and there is no doubt that a lot of leading members of the German nature protection movement in the first half of the 20th century had been very familiar with the ideas of National Socialism), it can now be seen as an appropriate answer to the complex influences on modern landscapes.

As a result, an increasing number of projects initiated by nature protection administrations are dealing with ‘cultural landscapes’.

**Historical landscapes and monument conservation**

There is no doubt that the main task of the monument administration is to take care of the built cultural heritage. Nevertheless, landscapes created by past generations should also be a part of the administration’s tasks of conservation. Unfortunately, most colleagues working in this area are educated in the arts – and the subject ‘landscape’ is rather out of their minds. In spite of this, a common paper of the German Denkmalschützer on the relations of monument preservation and cultural landscape was published in 2000 (Gunzelmann, 2001). However, this paper is hardly accepted in some parts of Germany. Due to the federal structure of Germany, every federal state has its own laws and practice in monument protection. Thus, landscape protection is often a matter of a single person’s engagement in monument protection. Especially in Bavaria and in Baden-Württemberg, two historical geographers succeeded in ‘infiltrating’ these administrations. They were able to put the ideas of historical landscape preservation into practice by a broad interpretation of formulas in federal laws talking of ‘ensembles’ and similar terms. In Bavaria you can find some examples of so-called ‘Denkmallandschaften’ (‘landscapes with important historical landscape elements and structures’), like historical vineyards, channels or railways, and the ‘Denkmalpflegerische Erhebungsbo gen’ (a standardized questionnaire concerning historical sites) is nowadays a common instrument for pre-investigations of historical structures at the beginning of village renewal programmes. However, in comparison to the general practice of German monument conservation there are only a small number of projects dealing with cultural landscapes – but it is a growing number none the less.

**Historical landscapes and regional planning**

In the amendment of the Federal Spatial Planning Act (‘Raumordnungsgesetz’) from 1 January 1998 it is said that (in principle 13) ‘grown landscapes’ (‘gewachsene Kulturlandschaften’) should be protected in their characteristic features including the monuments of nature and culture close to them (‘Die gewachsenen Kulturlandschaften in ihren prägenden Merkmalen sowie mit ihren Kultur- und Naturdenkmälern sind zu erhalten’). This article relates to the ideas of the EU of the cultural and natural heritage as an important value for regional development; its first implementation in Germany took place in the so-called ‘UVPG’ (Gesetz zur Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung; law on environmental impact assessment) in the early 1990s. However, a large conference in 2000 concerned with the term ‘cultural landscapes’ showed that the majority of German spatial planners were not familiar with the idea of protecting historical structures in processes of regional planning. Nobody actually knows how to deal with historical
Landscapes in this context. This is why a working group of the ‘Akademie für Raumordnung und Landschaftsplanung’ (ARL; Academy for Spatial Research and Planning, Hannover) is looking for ways of implementation.

**The concept of historical geography**

It has been shown that the dilemma of historical landscape preservation is that it sits on the fence in terms of legal regulation in Germany. For this reason, it is indicated to show paths (including the approaches of the UNESCO and the EU) towards common strategies according to the concept of cultural landscape care (CLC). In this context, landscape conservation is understood as an interdisciplinary concept for the spatial management of the historical cultural heritage. In general, landscapes should be seen as archives of nature and human history and as an important basis for sustainable regional development.

**Cultural landscape conservation** can be understood as a concept overwhelming the different approaches of planning and handling the cultural heritage in our landscapes. It is based on reflections on what is important in historical landscapes for the present and future societies. Figure 13.2 shows the process of CLC.

First of all, an overview of the present historical structures and elements in our modern landscapes is needed. In Germany we are talking about ‘Landschaftskataster’, cadastral inventories of historical elements and structures in catalogues combined with texts, photos and maps. In the Rheinlande (the western part of Nordrhein-Westfalen) the historical geographers in Bonn (Burggraaff and Kleefeld, 1998) are involved in building up a huge inventory based on a geographical information system (GIS), the so called KulaDIG.

Second, a broad discussion on the values of these structures and elements is necessary. That demands measures of values. The most important values in the

![Fig. 13.2. The concept of cultural landscape care (CLC) as a circle of discussions. Source: W. Schenk 2002 after H.-R. Egli, 1996 (see Schenk et al., 1997).](image-url)
concept of CLC are the age of landscape elements or structures, their specificity and rarity relating to the regional context, their aesthetic quality and their importance for the regional identity. These criteria are a mixture of nature and monument conservation issues as well as regional planning concerns. In the federal state of Saarland this approach has been applied very successfully in a model project.

The third step is to bring together all the related institutions, societies and persons to discuss strategies of landscape management. Once again, the main idea is to use the heritage in our landscapes for regional development – not to put the landscape under a ‘cheese cover’. It is very important to stress that cultural landscape care expressly accepts the evolution of landscapes, if historical assets, considered as potential for future development, are not destroyed.

**Conclusion**

There are many examples of the realization of the concept of cultural landscape care (Schenk *et al.*, 1997; Schenk, 2003). However, some of these examples revealed a general problem of CLC: a lot of people do not know about the value of historical landscapes, so you need a basic education about that. Effective ways to inform the public about the assets of their cultural landscape heritage include writing ‘landscape guides’ in the form of booklets or information sheets, installing ‘landscape museums’, producing films about booklets or information sheets, or to offer field trips guided by local experts, in some cases educated in special seminars. If you are able to explain the landscape as a matter of our own, it is very impressive to feel the warm interest of people in the history and values of their landscapes.

**Notes**

2. In the 1998 edition of *Europe’s Environment* (EEA, 1998), the chapter on landscapes is no longer included.
3. The results are published in German and English (BBR, 2001a, b).
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