Historic England

Landscape – Place – People: the values of spatial terminology in heritage and beyond

Jonathan Last

LANDSCAPE – PLACE – PEOPLE: THE VALUES OF SPATIAL TERMINOLOGY IN HERITAGE AND BEYOND

Jonathan Last

© Historic England

SUMMARY
The document offers a discussion of relevant terms used to describe and explain selected spatial concepts and phenomena relevant to the historic environment. Structured around two principal keywords, 'landscape' and 'place', it considers how their use and meaning influence our practice, in terms of both heritage management and research. It is argued that reflecting on some of the language used in heritage discourse could aid clarity of thinking and help inform both internal discussions about Historic England's corporate priorities, such as place-making, and conversations with partners, whether within the heritage sector or in other environmental disciplines, who may use these terms in subtly different ways. It might also open up new directions for research, and the document concludes with some recommendations in this area.

CONTACT DETAILS
Dr. Jonathan Last
Landscape Strategy Adviser
Archaeological Investigation
Historic England
Fort Cumberland
Portsmouth
PO4 9LD

jonathan.last@historicengland.org.uk

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

Numerous terms are used in the heritage sector to talk about areas of greater scope than an individual building or monument: some have very specific definitions while others are used more broadly or interchangeably but can connote very different underlying concepts and approaches. So does a plethora of terms aid or confuse our thinking about higher levels of spatial scale? And how do they relate to the ways in which heritage spaces (historic places and landscapes) are experienced, particularly in terms of well-being and enjoyment?

The focus of this report is on the work of Historic England (HE) from the viewpoint of the Archaeological Investigation team, but the author hopes it will also be of wider relevance in reflecting on HE's statutory purposes to champion historic places and promote people's enjoyment of them. It offers a discussion of keywords which seeks to expose how the language we use to describe and explain spatial concepts and phenomena in the historic environment influences both how we think about them and our practice, whether in research or heritage management. Such reflections could have practical benefits as an aid to clarity in discussion (or at least recognition of the complexities of these terms), not only within HE, for example in the context of its place-making strategy (Historic England 2018), but also across the heritage sector and with partners in other environmental disciplines.

Twenty years ago the philosopher Jeff Malpas (1999, 20) wrote that 'very little has been done in the way of any detailed analysis … of the relations among various spatial concepts', and although much has been written since, there still appears to be a need for clarity: as the European Science Foundation (ESF) puts it in relation to one of the keywords discussed below, 'the many disciplines that use landscape as a perspective, a conceptual frame, an analytical tool or an object of study still need to develop a common ground of objectives, approaches and terminology' (ESF/COST 2010, 6). But as with any attempt to summarise a vast, diverse and sometimes contradictory literature, what follows is a partial selection and a personal view of terms that seemed relevant to the overall argument; a starting point for discussion, not a policy document.

Heritage

The underlying concepts of 'heritage' and the 'historic environment' are, of course, just as complex as any of the terms discussed in detail below, and also require brief discussion. Although in practice these terms are often used inconsistently and interchangeably (Waterton 2010, 158ff), they carry rather different meanings. According to HE's Conservation Principles (English Heritage 2008) heritage comprises 'All inherited resources which people value for reasons beyond mere utility' (though since 'resources' are by definition useful we could discuss whether that is the right word here); within that, 'cultural heritage' is the 'Inherited assets which people identify and value as a reflection and expression of their evolving knowledge, beliefs and traditions, and of their understanding of the beliefs and traditions of others'. Meanwhile

the historic environment is 'all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora' (MHCLG 2018, 67) (which also raises questions of detail: why flora but not fauna?). These definitions suggest that 'cultural heritage' comprises only what is already known while the 'historic environment' also includes currently unknown remains, a potentially important distinction. And since objects only become heritage when identified and valued as such, this term can thus be conceived as a *process* of recognition (cf Harvey 2008).

Place and landscape

In looking at heritage through a spatial lens, we can identify two groups of terms that relate to somewhat different, though strongly overlapping, discourses. These concern 'place' and 'landscape'. The argument developed here is that while the discourse of place currently dominates heritage policy, landscape provides an essential, complementary way of thinking about the historic environment. Indeed it is the consideration of place and landscape together that opens up new ways of thinking about each.

The European Landscape Convention (ELC), to the implementation of which HE's work contributes[1], defines landscape as '*an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors*' (Council of Europe 2000); while Conservation Principles defines place as '*any part of the historic environment, of any scale, that has a distinctive identity perceived by people*' (English Heritage 2008). Although HE works with these succinct and useful definitions there is a much wider literature on each term across archaeology, anthropology, philosophy, geography, ecology and beyond, and the present discussion is premised on the assertion that there is much to be learnt from exploring their different, interdisciplinary connotations.

Perception

A key point in relation to the definitions used by HE is that perception and subjectivity are central to the formulation of both terms. In this sense Graham Fairclough's (2010, 129) assertion that 'there is no landscape without people (which is not to say uninhabited areas are not landscape – they are made into landscape by our perceptions)' resonates with Edward Casey's (1996, 18) statement that 'There is no knowing or sensing a place except by being in that place, and to be in a place is to be in a position to perceive it'. However, while place is known primarily through the experience of being there, for reasons outlined below landscape often carries a sense of the perceiver as (external) observer. This is an important if unhelpful difference that goes to the heart of

---

[1] https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/landscape-and-areas/

philosophical discussions of perception, which became central to 20th-century phenomenology, exemplified by the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Phenomenological approaches sought to counter the Cartesian separation of mind and body that is often invoked in the process of perceiving one's environment; instead perception (and cognition) are embedded 'within the practical contexts of people's ongoing engagement with their environments' (Ingold 2000, 167), which brings to the fore not the observing mind processing sensory inputs, but the moving body directly engaged in the world. Julian Thomas (2001, 171–2) goes further in rejecting the use of the term perception altogether, 'on the grounds that it inevitably carries a sense of subsidiarity or supplementarity', preferring instead 'to talk of "disclosure" or "experience", which do not imply that our understanding of the world is somehow a failed attempt to come to terms with things as they really are'. Instead, thinking 'is part of our bodily immersion in the world'.

Embodiment

For place and landscape to be meaningfully perceived, therefore, they must also be embodied: as Setha Low (2017, 95) puts it, embodied space is 'the location where human experience, consciousness and political subjectivity take on material and spatial form' and a 'model for understanding the creation of space and place through trajectories, movements and actions'. Indeed Tim Ingold sees landscape itself as emergent through a process of embodiment, in the sense that 'If the body is the form in which a creature is present as a being-in-the-world, then the world of its being-in presents itself in the form of the landscape'; each term – body and landscape – implies the other (Ingold 2000, 193). Similarly for Margaret Rodman (1992, 652), because 'places represent people' therefore 'people embody places', while Casey (1996, 22) states that 'place integrates with body as much as body with place'. We can also think about the spatial aspect of embodiment as a process of 'emplacement': Sarah Pink (2009, 28) quotes David Howes' suggestion that 'While the paradigm of "embodiment" implies an integration of mind and body, the emergent paradigm of emplacement suggests the sensuous interrelationship of body–mind–environment'.

Affect

Attending to the multi-sensual (not simply visual) nature of embodied (or emplaced) perception opens up the emotional dimensions of landscape and place, and links to HE's statutory purpose of promoting enjoyment, particularly through the idea of well-being (see below) and the more academic concept of affect. As Wetherell *et al* (2018, 2) put it, 'attention to emotion and affect allows us to deepen our understanding of how people develop attachments and commitments to the past, things, beliefs, places, traditions and institutions', while Crouch (2015, 188) argues that attending to affect opens up more contingent and fluid notions of heritage: what we 'bring to our participation in heritage … is related to our affective experience, our emotion and feeling'.

Low (2017, ch 7) describes a number of ethnographic studies in urban settings which 'illustrate how emotion and affect constitute and are constituted by space and place'; most of these relate to contemporary places (eg American gated communities), just as studies of affective heritage tend to focus on more recent history (Wetherell *et al* 2018). However, there can be a deeper historical dimension to these processes, for instance in the link between ruins and 'spatial melancholy' (Low 2017, 153), which shows the importance of what we might call 'affective atmosphere', the 'spatially located feelings that suffuse an event, place or environment' (Low 2017, 156−8). Owain Jones (2015) makes the point that absence and memory are just as essential aspects of landscape and place as presence, so it is clear that when we talk about perception as a key aspect of either concept this goes beyond the directly tangible to include historical resonances, whether of a personal nature, as in Jones's case study of the Severn bridges, or in terms of much deeper histories, including our ability as archaeologists to conceive of past landscapes of different character.

While affect and emotion are often discussed together, as the quotations above show, there is a difference in that while emotion is more personal, affect is usually conceived as relational and transcorporal, both 'resolving the conceptual limitations of emotion as an individual and personal experience and feeling' (Low 2017, 152) and showing it 'is not just that the built environment produces affect and feeling but also that affect in part produces the built environment' (ibid, 154). This sociological dimension serves to differentiate affect theory from more psychological analyses, such as ideas of 'place attachment', or at least to help focus on the place (and its materiality) as much as on the person (ibid, 27).

Temporality

Although the terms under consideration here are primarily spatial, the temporal dimension of heritage means we might better conceive historic landscape and place in terms of 'timespace', which in geography conveys a framework 'in which space and time are basic dimensions of the analysis of dynamic processes' (Wikipedia). This relates to Heidegger's concept of *Zeitraum*, which is not a 'composite of time and space as separately understood and represented, but rather ... a single mode of dimensionality that is both temporal and spatial' (Malpas 2015, 35), different therefore from multi-dimensional space-time, as used in physics. As Malpas (2015, 25) puts it, there is 'no spatiality that does not bring temporality also' and that relationship is, of course, fundamental to understanding the historic environment. The idea that temporality (especially in terms of understanding change) is inseparable from spatial analysis implies we cannot talk meaningfully about any place or landscape in the present without understanding its history. For Edward Relph (2018, 7) places are 'the expressions of past actions, repeated experiences and hopes they will endure into the future', while Barbara Bender (2002, S103) states that 'Landscape is time materializing' and shows how the varied definitions of landscape 'all incorporate the notion of "time passing"'. The heritage sector is uniquely placed to provide an understanding of the temporal dimension of place and landscape.

As Malpas (2019) puts it, 'In as much as history is concerned with time ... then it is with time *as an aspect of place*' [original emphasis].

Structure of the report

In setting out some of the context for the discussion below place and landscape have so far been considered together. But although they are indeed closely related they are not the same thing. One means of distinguishing them may be the kinds of relationship implied in each term. Although neither has an inherent scale, as discussed below, they nevertheless seem to draw us in different directions. The concept of 'landscape' reaches outwards into ideas of nature – character, environment and ecosystem – and our relationship to the world; whereas 'place' draws us inwards to our interactions with one another, through identity, distinctiveness and status ('a sense of place'; 'knowing your place'). However, we always need to bear in mind the points of intersection and overlap: identity also flows from landscape just as places have character (often conceived in terms of 'distinctiveness'), even though these aspects may be less fundamental to their definition.

In sum, the relationship between place and landscape, and the ways they are experienced, represents nothing less than our being-in-the-world –a term taken from Heidegger, whose influence on philosophical inquiry in this area is discussed by Malpas (2006). The historical dimension of this relationship is key to the work of Historic England; accordingly, any strategy for the historic environment needs to attend to both concepts. Although slippery and overlapping, they nevertheless help us draw together and reflect on the meanings and values attached to the areas we investigate by those who have dwelt there, today or in the past. The selected terms set out below (Sections 2–3) are therefore broadly split between these two entangled categories of 'place-identity' and 'landscape-environment'.

2   PLACE-IDENTITY TERMS

Place

> 'any part of the historic environment, of any scale, that has a distinctive identity perceived by people' (English Heritage 2008, 72)

In the 1980s Casey (1983, 86) wrote that 'Despite its primordiality in human experience, place has been conspicuously neglected by philosophers'. That is no longer true, especially if we consider broader realms of social theory beyond pure philosophy. Useful though the brief definition above may be, the volume of recent scholarship on the subject of 'place' makes it clear that a single definition cannot capture every aspect of the term. Tim Cresswell sums this up by describing place as 'a word wrapped in common sense' (Cresswell 2004) and places as 'in the broadest sense, locations imbued with meaning that are sites of everyday practice. Beyond that simple definition there is considerable debate about the nature of place' (Cresswell 2009).

This debate is exemplified in the different ways that the relationship between 'place' and 'space' is conceived, characterised by Low (2017, 12) as 'considerable semantic confusion ... about the conceptual relationship of space and place' and previously diagnosed by Malpas (1999, 20) as reflecting a lack of 'detailed analysis of the concept of place itself, of the relations between place and concepts of space, or, indeed of the relations among various spatial concepts themselves'. Whereas geographers like Yi-Fu Tuan and philosophers like Casey contrast meaningful place with unstructured space (place is 'humanized space': Tuan 1977, 54), this is inverted in the work of post-structuralist theorists such as Michel de Certeau, who sees space not as neutral background but as a dynamic counterpoint to a passive or static place (Conley 2012, 2). The openness of space, as articulated in particular by Deleuze and Guattari, may also make it 'more useful than the notion of "place" in explaining the feeling of heritage' (Crouch 2015, 187). Low (2017, 12–15) provides a good summary of the different ways this relationship has been conceived within social theory. It may be fruitful to hold on to the idea that place is both a particular form of lived (meaningful) space and at the same time precedes modern Cartesian or Newtonian ideas of measurable space, allowing the latter too to be seen as something that is socially produced and relational.

The Conservation Principles definition conveys the significance of identity and perception in the formulation of place, but the term can be unpacked in a number of other directions, involving concepts such as meaning (Tuan 1977) and action (Casey 2001, 683). Importantly from a heritage standpoint, Leitner *et al* (2007, 161) emphasise that places are 'more than just sites where dense social relations ... join up. They have a distinct materiality, a material environment that is historically constructed... This materiality regulates and mediates social relations and daily routines within a place, and is thus imbued with power'. The way that the historical materiality of places shapes social and political interactions has been demonstrated only too well by recent debates about the presence of statues in the public realm: as Dittmer and Waterton

(2017, 52) put it, 'People contest memorials, but equally memorials enable new spaces and politics to emerge'.

Some authors have tried to break down the concept of place into different components, such as 'location, locale and sense of place', 'materiality, meaning and practice' or physical setting, activities and meanings (Agnew 2011; Cresswell 2009; Relph 1976), while others have sought a more holistic formulation. In particular, Malpas (1999, 32) critiques the idea that place is simply a matter of human response to physical surroundings. Instead, 'place is integral to the very structure and possibility of experience'; in other words, place is not *merely* a social construction (though it is elaborated by means of the social) since the social does not exist prior to place: 'It is within the structure of place that the very possibility of the social arises' (Malpas 1999, 36). This appears similar to Ingold's (2000, 168) 'dwelling perspective', in which 'meaning is immanent in the relational contexts of people's practical engagement with their lived-in environments'. The concept of identity in relation to place therefore has a dual aspect: it is not just that people perceive places to have identity but also that places are critical to people's identities.

This point speaks as well to the historical dimension of place (as opposed to the history of individual places), in particular to possible differences between the nature of place in the modern world and in earlier times. One issue concerns distanciation: for example, Anthony Giddens (1990, 18–19) has written that 'The advent of modernity increasingly tears space away from place by fostering relations between "absent" others, locationally distant from any given situation of face-to-face interaction'. Another is the idea that in parts of the contemporary world, there is an absence or loss of the significance or meaning of place. This is conveyed in slightly different ways by Relph's (2018, 15) notion of 'placelessness', primarily related to 'a non-place realm of internationally similar modern landscapes', and Marc Augé's (1995) idea of the 'non-place', locations such as airports (or more pertinently for heritage, 'clone towns') where historically embedded social relations are replaced by contractual relations between solitary individuals, and which do not integrate past places. Such places are not empty of people, of course: modern places designed 'to serve functional human needs' are paradoxically seen as 'dehumanizing precisely because they are excessively humanized' (Liu and Freestone 2016, 3). However, Gammon (2017, 93) argues that for Relph, far more than Augé, placelessness represents a threat to place, because it also indicates an 'underlying attitude which does not acknowledge significance in place'.

While we might see heritage as a way of countering placelessness in this sense, it can also be complicit in the elision of history: for example, Relph talks about 'museumisation', places which 'simplify history … and are fenced off from the real world', while Augé (1995, 73) discusses how in France 'our towns have been turning into museums (restored, exposed and floodlit monuments, listed areas, pedestrian precincts) while at the same time bypasses, motorways, high-speed trains and one-way systems have made it unnecessary for us to linger in them'. The relationship between 'modernity' and 'authenticity' may of course be perceived differently between different social groups and generations, and the

successful management of historic places in the future depends on understanding these perceptions.

Another possible response to the risk of placelessness is to explore ethnographic approaches that open up the idea of place to other ways of thinking and experience. This might lead to very different ways of conceptualising the relationship between people and places, or the nature of place itself. For example, in New Ireland the people of the Lelet peninsula give meaning to places through *larada*, 'powerful tutelary spirit beings rooting or locating particular clans in bounded locales and giving them an abiding attachment to that land and place' (Eves 2006, 179); while places in Vanuatu include 'rocks that grow, people turned to stone, spirits, ancestors, and memories piled upon memories with scarcely a visible mark on the landscape to show that people lived there' (Rodman 1992, 651); and in Australia 'It now seems evident that ancient places are organized like the mobile, centered fields of actors, as spaces stretching out from a reference point to vague peripheries' (Munn 1996, 454).

Such perspectives emphasise that places are not just the material, built environment – they have imaginative and affective dimensions, and also performative ones: in all kinds of ways people 'are forever performing acts that reproduce and express their own sense of place' (Basso 1996, 57). While these ethnographic places may appear particularly relevant to pre-modern periods of (pre)history, it is important to remember that they are not timeless and unchanging historical analogues but equally affected by contemporary processes of (de)colonisation, conflict and climate change, from which there is much to be learnt and shared (eg Lipset 2014).

Place-making
> '…the process by which we work in partnership to shape existing cities, towns and villages, and the landscapes in which they sit and which form their setting. Rooted in community-based participation … place making is multi-disciplinary in nature. Place making brings together diverse interests to improve a community's economic, social and environmental wellbeing.' (Historic England 2018, 5)

Arif Dirlik (1999, 151) emphasises that places are not given but produced by human activity, which not only 'implies that how we imagine and conceive places is a historical problem', as discussed above, but also brings us to 'place-making', a term which is equated by Low (2017, ch 4) with the 'social construction of space', but today is primarily used in a practical sense within planning and policy, where it can be defined in terms of 'a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces' (Project for Public Spaces 2008). As the definition suggests, it is closely linked to the notion of **community**, which itself could be seen as a key spatial term. As Schröder (2007, 78–9) puts it, 'The idea of community as a spatially and socially bounded unit was … fundamental to the classical ethnographic studies of functionalist anthropology' but more recent definitions signal 'a move away from the idea of community as something that is fixed in space toward a concept of community

as something based on a shared ideology and practice'. However, the spatial meaning seems to resurface in the context of place-making where 'community' usually refers to local residents rather than a group sharing common values of some kind, wherever they may physically be located.

Relph[2] has recently demonstrated the 'daunting' growth in the number of publications that refer to 'place-making' since the turn of the millennium, but also notes that despite the diversity of early approaches, including archaeological ones, it has become a rather specific term that now 'usually seems to refer to community-based design of small urban spaces'. He sounds a cautionary note by reminding us that 'all placemaking is a process of creative place destruction, replacing an existing place with one that is thought to be an improvement', though that opinion may not be universally shared, particularly if place-making merely becomes a synonym for 'gentrification'. For Relph (2018, 15), place-making can be considered authentic 'when there is sensitivity to the significance of place in everyday life and landscape' and it can 'challenge the forces of placelessness' if it identifies and responds to 'the ways in which each place is different and meaningful for those who experience it most intensely as insiders' (ibid, 25).

It is clear that 'the historic environment contributes towards a distinctive sense of place' (Graham *et al* 2009, 5; see below) and a focus on heritage offers an obvious anchor point that could temper potentially disruptive processes of change in particular places, or at least provide a focus for discussion with and within a community. However, the role of heritage in contemporary place-making is often conceived simply in terms of 'sympathetic' or 'vibrant' restoration of historic buildings within new development, and this raises various questions about the role of regulation and the state, potential conflicts between preservation and redevelopment or economic regeneration (Pendlebury 2002; Low 2017, 88–92), and the often complex political role of heritage in many places, since regeneration can be used to manipulate a place's identity, particularly where 'intervention has been top down' (Pendlebury and Porfyriou 2017, 431). Certainly the contribution of heritage to place-making needs to avoid Relph's (2018, 25) 'museumisation' by recognising that the 'revival of a sense of place ... cannot be solely by the preservation of old places'.

As place-making has become a more practical term, there is a question about how it connects to the theoretical concept of place; especially if, following Malpas and others, we consider that places make people just as much as people make places. This is acknowledged by policymakers, for example in a study quoted by Reilly *et al* (2018, 47) which states that 'The look and feel of a place is very important to how people feel about themselves'. But we are not simply talking about individuals; this is also a political process. For Pierce *et al* (2011, 54) 'Place-making is an inherently networked process', although so far 'the mutual integration of network concepts, political theorisations and place conceptualisations has been relatively weak'. Reintroducing the richness of

---

[2] https://www.placeness.com/placemaking-and-the-production-of-places-origins-and-early-development/

place to broaden the idea of place-making could help it to be seen not just as something *for* a community (and certainly not as something imposed from above) but as constitutive *of* community (and co-created). How we go about doing this might involve ethnographic as much as architectural practice (Graham *et al* 2009, 30); for example, Sarah Pink (2008, 191) argues that 'by theorizing collaborative ethnographic methods as place-making practices we can generate understandings of both how people constitute urban environments through embodied and imaginative practices and how researchers constitute ethnographic places'.

In terms of heritage this opens the possibility of including the intangible and the hidden (archaeology) in place-making alongside the built environment. The heritage sector is well placed not only to inform and support place-making in the official sense, but also to build on much existing research in order to reflect on the myriad types of place that existed in the past and how the nature of place itself has changed throughout history (and prehistory); thinking of Augé's (1995, 94) contrast between the 'non-places' of modernity and the 'anthropological places' of indigenous people that 'create the organically social'. As well as helping to make new or better places, in other words, the heritage sector is also able to critique and challenge the nature of contemporary places through historical understanding.

Conservation

> 'the process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values' (English Heritage 2008, 71)

Perhaps the key lesson for heritage managers from the discussion above is that if place is subjective, active, relational and meaningful, then change is both inevitable and largely uncontrollable. The material components of places, especially in the form of individual sites and buildings, where heritage-based interventions are usually directed, are potentially manageable in consultation with local communities. However, since they are bound up with the other dimensions of place in very complex ways conservation needs to proceed from an understanding of the connections between places, people and things and how processes of change arise within those, linked perhaps to the 'ethnographic place-making' referred to above.

However, there is also a second meaning of 'conservation', as used in the natural environment sector, which means the term is understood differently by ecologists (Fluck and Holyoak 2017, 10), and probably by much of the public (a Google search reveals four times as many results for 'nature conservation' as for 'heritage conservation'). Linked more closely to the landscape group of terms (see below), 'nature conservation' is 'the preservation of wild fauna and flora and natural habitats and ecosystems, especially from the effects of human exploitation, industrialization, etc'[3]. While no-one would disagree with the aspiration, this form of conservation is therefore primarily defined in terms of

---

[3] https://www.lexico.com/definition/nature_conservation

protecting 'nature' from 'culture', a dualism that sits uneasily with most social theory and does not accurately reflect the hybrid status of virtually all 'natural' environments in the UK, which therefore also have a cultural heritage conservation interest (see discussion of 'nature' below).

The dissimilarity of approaches to the conservation of nature and culture has occasionally been discussed, with historical contrasts drawn out, for example, between nature conservation's focus on groups (species or ecosystems) and heritage protection's on discrete relics (Lowenthal 2005, 87) – though the latter seems to relate more to conservation in the older sense of 'preservation'. Today there is growing recognition of the need to better integrate the conservation of nature and of cultural heritage (particularly now the latter term has been widened to include historic landscapes and intangible heritage such as traditional farming practices), aided by revised definitions of nature conservation in terms that are closer to the heritage definition above: 'The best approximation to a definition of conservation is "creating conditions that allow ecosystems to change, with the least species loss and the least damage to ecosystem processes"' (Catsadorakis 2007, 309). Nevertheless interdisciplinary working would no doubt be strengthened by further discussion of what this term means in different contexts of policy and practice.

Distinctiveness

'the unique physical, social and economic characteristics of a place and the interaction of people with those characteristics; that which makes a place special, differentiating it from anywhere else' (Willie Miller Urban Design[4])

The charity Common Ground provides a more fulsome definition: 'Distinctiveness is about particularity in the buildings and land shapes, the brooks and birds, trees and cheeses, places of worship and pieces of literature. It is about history and nature jostling with each other, layers and fragments, old and new. The ephemeral and invisible are important too: customs, dialects, celebrations, names, recipes, spoken history, myths, legends and symbols' (Common Ground[5])

On this basis of course, all places (and landscapes) have distinctiveness; indeed, as discussed above, that is part of the basic definition of a historic place. The difference between distinctiveness and similar terms like '**sense of place**' (see Graham *et al* 2009, 14) may be that the former is somehow quantifiable, at least in theory. Hence it is often attached to economic or political agendas. For example, the section of the Rural Tourism Business Toolkit on Local Distinctiveness recommends producing lists of products, features, highlights etc, while the Cornwall Deal includes a 'Local Distinctiveness Project'.

---

[4] https://www.williemiller.com/retaining-local-distinctiveness.htm

[5] https://www.commonground.org.uk/local-distinctiveness/

The term is less prominent in discussions of place by geographers and social theorists, though those interested in the relational quality of places may play down the importance of distinctiveness: 'They emphasise how places are heterogeneously constituted through the polyvalent inter-connectivities linking them, rather than as having distinctive essential characteristics that emerge behind the boundaries separating them from the rest of the world' (Leitner *et al* 2007, 161). 'Sense of place' is more frequently discussed: as Convery *et al* (2012, 1–5) point out, this term resists precise definition but is used in two broad ways: firstly as local distinctiveness or character, and secondly as how people experience place: 'sense of place is perhaps most simply considered as an overarching concept which subsumes other concepts describing relationships between human beings and spatial settings... It is an important source of individual and community identity'.

Although clearly a positive attribute of place, the idea of distinctiveness raises questions about the relationship between the local and the global and therefore needs contextualising to avoid privileging what is unique over what is shared, since the significance of places also depends on connections, similarities and patterns. Relph (2018, 9) reminds us that identity 'refers both to individual distinctiveness ... and to shared characteristics'; it is argued below that a focus on landscape helps to conceptualise that shared dimension of identity alongside what is locally distinctive. In part this is what Historic Landscape Characterisation does by showing how recurrent land character types have combined in unique ways over time to form distinctive character areas (see below).

Heritage values

Heritage values are 'aspects of the worth or importance attached by people to qualities of places', categorised in four groups:
- 'Evidential value: the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical value: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present – it tends to be illustrative or associative.
- Aesthetic value: the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- Communal value: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory' (English Heritage 2008, 7).

These values and their definitions, as set out in Conservation Principles, have been discussed in terms of an 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' (AHD) by Emma Waterton (2010) and John Pendlebury (2013). For Waterton (2010, 156–7) the Conservation Principles document was both a rebranding exercise in the New Labour model and an attempt to sustain 'a particular ideological understanding of "the past"'. In terms of the values themselves she notes that communal value is discussed far less than the others, suggesting an ongoing gap between public values and those 'previously privileged as important' which ultimately allows

experts to shape what the public wants (ibid, 166). Similarly, Pendlebury (2013) argues that the values omit any reference to the 'wider social and economic instrumental benefits that may flow from heritage protection'.

As with any categorisation, the relationships between the different values also deserves scrutiny; indeed it is where things overlap or potentially clash that they become most interesting. In particular, evidential value could be seen as fundamental to the others, which all depend on knowledge in some form; it then becomes a case of distinguishing evidence already disclosed from that which remains hidden, or potentially so (cf the difference between heritage and historic environment mentioned above). This points to the archaeological dilemma in heritage management, certainly when it comes to excavation: do we reveal evidence that unlocks the other values of a place at the expense of destroying that 'evidential value', or at least removing it from its spatial context (cf Carver 1996)? If we think in terms of place-making and distinctiveness, revealing historical evidence seems like a key part of the process but successful conservation may require a finer balancing of potentially contradictory objectives. While Conservation Principles does address the dilemmas inherent in 'Intervention to increase knowledge of the past' (English Heritage 2008, 54) this is only in the narrow terms of knowledge gain versus impact, where 'place' is essentially synonymous with 'archaeological site' ('the evidential value of the primary archive – the place itself...'). HE's Places Strategy (Historic England 2018) makes no detailed reference to these heritage values and the issues around them, which could be an area for further work.

Historic area

While the dictionary defines an 'area' as 'a region or part of a town, a country, or the world'[6], a historic area is defined as 'a place, settlement, neighbourhood or landscape, whether designated or non-designated. It can be enclosed by physical, administrative or property boundaries (existing or historic) or defined simply for the purposes of study' (Historic England 2017a, 1).

'Area', as the definition shows, is one of those terms that could be applied equally to a place or a landscape. The difference from either, perhaps, is that area is a more neutral term, having certain spatial characteristics without the connotations of perception and meaning that underpin 'place' and 'landscape'. However, if an area is 'viewed from a historical [or any other] standpoint' (ie it is perceived) then it should immediately have the characteristics of a place or a landscape. Perhaps the definition of 'historic area' has not been much scrutinised because it is specifically related to the process of Historic Area Assessment (HAA), 'a practical tool to understand and explain the heritage interest of an area ... developed to help determine the character of an area, explain its significance and highlight issues that have the potential to change this character' (Historic England 2017a, 1). In other words, one might infer, helping make an area into a place. HAA differs from some forms of historic

---

[6] https://www.lexico.com/definition/area

characterisation (see below) in terms of its focus on the built environment, as well as 'the weight accorded to field evidence and an emphasis on observed character' (Historic England 2017a, 3). In practice it is generally applied in greater detail over smaller areas than other forms of historic characterisation (D Hooley, pers comm) and is therefore grouped here with the 'place' terms.

Localism

Localism links to a group of related terms including 'local', 'locale', 'locality' and 'location', which are also attributes of place (see above). In general, localism refers to 'attachment to a locality' (Davoudi and Madanipour 2015). However, it has also come to refer to 'a range of political philosophies which prioritise the local' (Wikipedia), where 'local' is defined as 'relating or restricted to a particular area or one's neighbourhood'[7].

Differences in conceptions of the 'local' can perhaps be exemplified by the distinction between Nadia Lovell's (1998, 1) ethnographic approach which links 'locality' to belonging – indeed, she defines belonging in terms of 'a phenomenology of locality which serves to create, mould and reflect perceived ideals surrounding place' – and geographical approaches where 'locale' refers to the settings of social life in an action-related way; for example, Benno Werlen (2009) defines a locale as 'A spatial context or setting for action comprised of material elements as well as of sets of social norms and culturally shared values'.

In Britain 'localism' has become a contentious term because of its recruitment by politicians over the last decade: Tait and Inch (2016) outline how political localism in the UK can frequently be characterised as rural, conservative and nostalgic. This is a risk wherever we invoke the local because as Lovell (1998, 5) notes, the construction of locality requires the creation of 'an "other" who is as different from ourselves as possible'. As Nicholas Entrikin (1999, 279) puts it, 'Stable democratic political community would appear to require places that are dynamic, malleable, open to a world beyond the local, and conducive to practices supportive of the universalistic ideals of a common humanity'.

In the broader environmental planning context set out by Davoudi and Madanipour (2015), 'localism' has economic (in opposition to globalisation), social (community) and spatial (neighbourhood) connotations. A key issue for a localist approach to heritage is understanding the articulation with wider significance, such as 'national importance', and with higher levels of scale. As Eric Sheppard (2002, 310) notes in the context of a discussion of globalisation, 'local trajectories depend on how places are embedded in a range of territorial scales, from the local to the global'. There is also an issue with the role of professional expertise, which can be seen as globalising or generalising, and potentially clashes with local knowledge and perceptions (Waterton 2005). Local erudition may itself be a subject of study and is often framed in terms of

---

[7] https://www.lexico.com/definition/local

intangible heritage, such as folklore (Torre 2008), something of growing interest to mainstream heritage policy.

The 'locality debate' in geography has acted as a stimulus to the development of relational thinking about space and place (Meegan 2017). Arjun Appadurai (1996, 178) views 'locality as primarily relational and contextual rather than as scalar or spatial … constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts'. A more recent approach focusses on 'coherence' as a key property of localities, which can be defined in dual terms: 'material coherence' refers to the 'structures and practices that are uniquely configured around a place', while 'imagined coherence' refers to the sense of identity that residents have for both the place and each other, and that 'makes a locality meaningful as a space of collective action' (Jones and Woods 2013, 36). There may be merit in exploring these approaches as a supplement to the current emphasis in heritage on local distinctiveness.

Neighbourhood

According to the Young Foundation (2010), neighbourhoods are 'ultra-local communities of place', which can be based on top-down administrative geography or on mental maps and subjective identifications. They have connotations of neighbourliness (friendly, helpful), while neighbourhood is also a compelling metaphor, often used to domesticate the unfamiliar (eg 'galactic neighbourhood').

Thus neighbourhood emphasises the scalability of place: there is local and then there is 'ultra-local'. 'Neighbourhood planning' is a key term in heritage discourse, implying bottom-up decision making about changes to places (albeit with a bias towards the flawed idea of a 'natural' rural community embodied in the parish council: Tait and Inch 2016, 185). As with localities, key questions in practice revolve around how neighbourhoods are defined (through practices of belonging or through external recognition) as well as the role and availability of heritage expertise at the community level.

Appadurai (1996, 178–9) contrasts locality as 'an aspect of social life' (see above) with neighbourhood as 'a substantive social form'. In his definition neighbourhoods are 'the actually existing social forms in which locality, as a dimension or value, is variably realized… Neighborhoods, in this usage, are situated communities'. The implication is that locality emerges from 'the practices of local subjects in specific neighborhoods' (ibid, 198), though this can be at odds with the demands of other social formations such as the nation-state.

Region

Typically, regions are thought of as 'areas exhibiting uniformity with respect to one or more characteristics' (Agnew 2013, 12).

Despite this simple definition, the term 'region' has been subject to considerable debate within geography. Although some sense of topographical and historical fixity is often implied (Schröder 2007, 86), increasingly the idea of relationality is to the fore, with the need both for a plurality of approaches (Agnew 2013) and for regions, like places, to be viewed as a 'series of open and discontinuous spaces connected by the networked social relationships that variously stretch across them' (Meegan 2017). In heritage management terms, regions are generally just (large-scale) administrative divisions (eg for the development of regional archaeological research frameworks) but we could think further about their coherence and relationships, especially as a concept bridging national and local concerns. The idea of 'distinctive regional *communities* which can share identities' may be useful in understanding the historical 'persistence of socio-political traits' (Agnew 2013, 15; original emphasis) but the regional scale is always tricky to grasp as something both coherent and diverse at the same time.

Setting

> 'The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.' (Historic England 2017b, 2)

Rather like the conventional idea of landscape (see below), to which the concept is connected, the experience of a place in terms of its setting is traditionally related primarily to views and the visible, rather than buried remains or other aspects of sensory experience. However, although consideration of setting will still 'almost always include the consideration of views' (Historic England 2017b, 1), the concept has evolved more recently to be 'also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places' (ibid, 2). Moreover, the asset itself does not need to be visible to have a setting: 'Buried archaeological remains may also be appreciated in historic street or boundary patterns, in relation to their surrounding topography or other heritage assets or through the long-term continuity in the use of the land that surrounds them' (ibid, 5). Setting is also explicitly multi-scalar: 'Extensive heritage assets, such as … landscapes and townscapes, can include many heritage assets … and their nested and overlapping settings, as well as having a setting of their own' (ibid, 3).

However, it is unclear if the practical and theoretical implications of such a multi-dimensional approach have been explored in any detail. As something defined and set out in planning policy, setting is clearly part of the 'AHD' discussed above but does not appear to have been critically assessed in academic terms. Moreover, although, as MacGregor (2016, 24) has stated, the concept of setting has been important in 'conceptually extending the scope of archaeology from solely "bounded" sites and monuments to places that articulate with the wider landscape', it is notable that the current definition rather detracts from that by focussing on the contribution of setting to the significance of the asset rather than on an asset's role in the wider landscape (D Hooley, pers comm) – which justifies including it as part of the terminology

around 'place'. Indeed current guidance makes it clear that 'Setting is not itself a heritage asset' (Historic England 2017b, 4) and 'While landscapes include everything within them, the entirety of very extensive settings may not contribute equally to the significance of a heritage asset, if at all' (ibid, 7).

Significance

> 'the sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place' (English Heritage 2008); 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic' (MHCLG 2018, 71). 'A significant place is a place which has heritage value(s)' (English Heritage 2008).

Although we can often agree whether a historic place is significant or not, defining in general terms what comprises significance is far more difficult. The government's definition in relation to ancient monuments is based on concepts of 'archaeological, architectural, artistic, historic or traditional interest' (DCMS 2013, 10), but particularly their archaeological and historic interest, which prioritises the first two heritage values, as outlined above. Communal values in relation to significance are downplayed in government policy, which raises questions about whom places have significance to, and how that should be recorded. Related statutory terms of similar meaning seem equally vague. For example, **areas of special interest** are defined simply as those areas 'the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).

Another key point for the present discussion is that unlike distinctiveness, which starts with the character of a specific place, significance (in the official sense) is based on comparison with other places and asks us to consider why a particular place matters in broader terms: 'Significance is to be judged in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate' (CifA 2014, 4). This does not necessarily imply a scale of importance, but in practice that is often the case: hence while distinctiveness privileges the local, significance frequently does the opposite; if something is 'only' of local significance or importance this may be a means of justifying a lack of expert interest.

How this relates to the localism agenda and the ELC's focus on everyday landscapes (see below) remains to be explored. As mentioned, it is notable that Relph's (2018, 24) definition of placelessness refers to 'the underlying attitudes that do not acknowledge significance in places'. Significance in the official heritage sense perhaps requires excavating from the AHD in order to be seen in more relational, less hierarchical terms.

3   LANDSCAPE-ENVIRONMENT TERMS

Landscape
> 'an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors' (Council of Europe 2000)

As with place, the neat ELC definition of 'landscape' can be unpacked in various directions, and many writers have emphasised the inherent plurality and complexity of the term. As Marc Antrop (2013, 13) puts it, 'Most interest groups dealing with the same territory of land see different landscapes', though Tilley and Cameron-Daum (2017, 1) argue that 'the diversity of approaches and perspectives … is precisely that which makes the study of landscape so interesting and valuable'. Meanwhile Bernard Debarbieux (2010) states that: 'In recent decades, academic works on landscape have often insisted, and rightly so, on the complexity of the notion of landscape: landscape is simultaneously material (matter) and representation, construction, and experience'. For example, John Wylie (2007, 2) has described landscape as 'a constantly emergent perceptual and material milieu' and as 'the creative tension of self and world' (ibid, 217).

The broad concept of landscape is sometimes tempered by qualifying adjectives, such as 'natural' and 'cultural' (Roe and Taylor 2014), but it is arguable whether these are useful distinctions or oxymorons, since the ELC definition implies that a cultural landscape is always also natural and *vice versa*; indeed landscape emerges from the interaction of the cultural/human and the natural. For Val Plumwood (2006, 140–1) 'the concept of a cultural landscape … invites us to downplay or hide nonhuman agency and to present humans as having a monopoly of creativity… We do not usually go on to insist on putting 'cultural' before everything we speak of… So why must we insist on doing this in relation to the land?' Or as Bender (2002, S106) puts it, 'Landscapes refuse to be disciplined; they make a mockery of the oppositions that we create between … nature (science) and culture (anthropology)'. More pragmatically, 'because landscape embraces both cultural and natural (ecological) heritage, and their relationship with the physical environment, it also helps to integrate environmental concerns that might otherwise be isolated' (Fairclough 2010, 131).

Nevertheless, different disciplinary perspectives can be recognised and Antrop (2005, 40–1) distinguishes those of the natural sciences ('where landscape ecology has a leading role', along with attempts 'to describe the holistic meta-reality of landscape as a complex system'), the human sciences (where 'historical geography and historical ecology are most closely related to the approach of natural sciences' while 'psychological, humanistic and semiotic approaches to the landscape focus upon the perception and experience of landscape and its existential meaning') and the applied sciences, such as landscape architecture and spatial planning, which attempt to utilise creative design 'to remodel and shape landscapes for the future'. David Lowenthal (2013, 4) argues that 'the

word landscape subsumes three vital concepts: *nature* as fundamental heritage in its own right; *environment* as the setting of human action; and *sense of place* as awareness of local difference' [original emphasis].

Attempts to understand how this complex idea of landscape has developed have often turned to etymology. The word 'landscape' originated in the sense of a representation of 'the process by which the land is shaped as a social and material phenomenon' (Olwig 2005, 21), though the origins of the modern English term in relation to painting, scenery and the production of images mean that landscape is often reduced to an external aesthetic gaze, akin to viewing a painting. In this sense it may be contrasted with the idea of place as 'a portion of land/town/cityscape seen from the inside'; landscape then being 'place at a distance' (Lippard 1997, 7–8).

The artistic connotations also mean that the ambiguity, even duplicity, of landscape has long been recognised. In the mid-17th century Edward Norgate wrote that 'Lanscape is nothing but Deceptive visions, a kind of cousning or cheating your owne Eyes, by our owne consent and assistance, and by a plot of your owne contriving' (quoted in Herring 2013, 166). Accordingly the work of broadly Marxist geographers like Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels in the 1980s and 1990s emphasised landscape as a particular (and deceptive) way of seeing, linked to the expression of bourgeois power and offering an aesthetic and transcendent vision that conceals both real material conditions and our distancing from the natural world, veiling social inequalities behind the aesthetic appearance of nature (Cosgrove 1998; Wylie 2007, 67).

But landscape in this limited, visual sense is clearly inadequate for our purposes, and explains why some scholars reject the term: as Plumwood (2006, 123) puts it, 'To describe the land as a "landscape" is to privilege the visual over other, more rounded and embodied ways of knowing the land'. For Anna Tsing (2019, 37), Olwig's work aside, the 'argument about landscape's genealogy has stifled the term *landscape*'s potential in anthropology' [original emphasis].

While 'the tension between eye and land has been most clearly evident through persistent anxieties over the issue of the *materiality* of landscape' (Wylie 2007, 8; original emphasis), this dominance of the visual and aesthetic remains a key aspect of the public perception of landscape (Swanwick and Fairclough 2018, 22) and of landscape policy, which still reflects an emphasis on 'natural beauty' (see below) in special (designated) landscapes (Glover 2019) as well as, on occasion, the narrow definition of a historic landscape as something that is designed and ornamental (Fairclough 2008). It is important to note that the argument advanced here about the breadth of the concept of landscape is by no means intended to downplay the significance of 'landscapes designed purely for aesthetic effect and pleasure' (Historic England 2017c, 2) which in the form of parks and gardens are a key part of HE's statutory responsibilities.

However, it is notable that in contrast to these traditional approaches the ELC does not privilege the visual aspect of perception, nor the 'outstanding' over everyday or degraded landscapes: 'Landscape is thus recognised irrespective of

its exceptional value' (Déjeant-Pons 2006, 367). Similarly Roe and Taylor (2014, 8) use the idea that all landscapes matter and that what is important should therefore be considered in terms of plural '*qualities* (rather than quality) of landscape' [original emphasis].

To the extent that landscape in its wider sense retains connotations of painting and the picturesque, it needs to be remedied by an emphasis on other modes of perception. Wylie (2007, 166) points out that 'An especially notable feature of recent [academic] landscape work has been the increased attention paid to tactile, as opposed to visual, landscape experiences' while Waterton (2013) has described how 'non-representational' approaches to landscape, including considerations of affect, embodiment and performance, have developed as a corrective to the idea of landscapes as simply visual backdrops. There is certainly scope for thinking about multi-sensory approaches to the historic landscape.

However, Wylie (2017, 20) sees some merit in the fact that 'landscape, with all its varied associations with the visual, aerial and topographic, is historically the spatial grammar in which the distant is most emphasised'; despite the negative perception of the aloof observer, 'detached from the life of the land', there is also a positive aspect in that a certain distance is a necessary 'basis of our capacity to conceive and relate to' the world. Similarly, for Lund and Benediktsson (2016, 6–8) 'The concept of the *horizon* … allows for an appreciation of the differences between place and landscape', its 'implication of movement' taking 'landscape away from the often romantic and rather static association with place' [original emphasis].

Moreover, the visual metaphor remains useful on occasions, for example in terms of understanding how landscape is experienced through different 'perceptual lenses' (Howard 2013), which include nationality, culture and religion (especially in a post-colonial context), social status, rurality and gender; one 'lens' of particular relevance to the heritage sector, and probably worthy of more study, is 'profession', that is distinctive ways of perceiving landscape either within particular professions or shared by all experts (ibid, 48). Although Howard does not mention heritage in the examples of clashes between expert and local or community perceptions, it is a reminder that the influence of the 'professional lens' always needs to be borne in mind when working with communities.

Another potentially useful landscape metaphor within the heritage sector is that of 'biography', which was particularly taken up by Dutch archaeologists in the 1990s in order to study landscape as material culture (Kolen and Renes 2015; for a critique see Aldred 2016). But perhaps we could also consider landscape as an assemblage (of people, animals, plants and things), which would link it to the recent 'material turn' in archaeological theory; Harris and Cipolla (2017, 164) see this as 'a way of thinking about the world as an ecosystem (see below), but one that does not require the concept of nature to operate', which parallels Timothy Morton's (2007) idea of an 'ecology without nature' that will allow us

to better understand the interconnectedness of things. Similarly Tsing (2019, 37) sees landscape as encompassing 'multispecies gatherings in the making'.

A third metaphor, and the classic description of the historic landscape, is the idea of 'palimpsest' (Crawford quoted in Bowden 2001, 42) but this word implies a lack of connection between its different 'layers' which may perhaps be misleading; Susan Oosthuizen (2006, 153) prefers the term 'kaleidoscope', a 'constantly moving pattern' in which 'elements of the old are preserved and contribute to the development of the new'. In a more political context the 'palimpsest' has also been critiqued by Massey (2011) as 'perhaps too horizontal (just layer upon layer); and perhaps again too easy (it allows "us" to criticise "them" for erasure, but it doesn't really challenge us, now)'; instead she prefers 'an insistence on the contemporaneous multiplicity of stories … and a refusal to reorder contemporaneous difference into temporal sequence'.

The palimpsest and kaleidoscope can usefully be supplemented by Ingold's (2007, ch 3) idea of the 'meshwork', in which places emerge from 'the lines along which life is lived'. In this scenario 'wayfaring is place-making' and the environment (or landscape) is 'the zone in which places are entangled'. Following Wylie (2007, 215), landscape can then be described holistically in terms of the entwined materialities and sensibilities with which we act and sense. The metaphors of meshwork and wayfaring also point to a recent turn to ideas of mobility in landscape studies, which contest 'the familiar emphasis upon the habitual and situated character of landscape' (Crouch 2010, 5). Tsing (2019, 37), as mentioned, adds 'gathering' to the list: 'My landscapes are moots in which many living beings – and non-vital things as well, such as rocks and water – take part. They come together to negotiate collaborative survival…'. It is notable that Casey (1996, 24–5) uses the same term to denote an 'essential trait' of places, which 'gather things in their midst… Places also gather experiences and histories…'. However, Pink (2009, 37) prefers the 'varying intensities of the meshwork' and suggests Casey 'might be seen to endow places themselves with an undue degree of agency to gather'.

The relationship between landscape and scale has been much discussed; Higgins *et al* (2012) provide a detailed discussion of scale as 'a fundamental challenge to knowing more about the complex phenomenon of landscape' while Theano Terkenli (2005, 166) argues that if 'geographical scale is socially constructed', as recent work suggests, then 'The production of scale is integral to the production of landscape in time-space' (ibid, 172). Certainly there is no single 'landscape scale': as Tsing (2019, 38) puts it, 'There are landscapes on a leaf and on a continent'. For her the key is that a landscape encompasses heterogeneity. Others emphasise scalability: Fairclough (2013, 7–8) argues that scale should not be confused with 'scape' – instead landscape helps 'to link different scales of data, and to study activities that have taken place at a variety of scales'. Similarly, Cosgrove (2004) states that 'While consistently focusing attention on local and regional scale, landscape is not inherently territorializing, and can readily be adapted to more relative conceptions of space'. In other words, landscape does not need to be large-scale (see, for example, Garden's

[2006] notion of the 'heritagescape', as applied to specific heritage sites) but the large-scale needs a landscape approach (Gosden 2013).

This leads on to questions of how temporal scale (especially archaeological deep time) is represented in landscape. It is clear that landscape is intimately connected to time and temporality, as discussed by Bender (2002) and set out especially in the work of Ingold (see below on the 'taskscape'). Thomas (2017, 269–70) summarises Ingold's argument as follows: 'landscapes should not be understood as changeless objects of contemplation, but as fundamentally temporal phenomena… Landscapes are continually in motion … [and archaeology] should come to understand itself as the study of the temporality of the landscape'. Cloke and Jones (2001, 652) put it in simpler terms: 'Landscape is where the past and future are copresent with the present – through processes of memory and imagination'. Tsing (2019, 38) argues that landscapes 'allow us to think across a variety of scales [of time] from deep time to current events'. And returning to where we began, time is also implicit in the ELC definition which 'reflects the idea that landscapes evolve through time, as a result of being acted upon by natural forces and human beings' (Déjeant-Pons 2006, 379); in policy terms, 'Taking account of time depth in landscape produces better decisions and actions' (ESF/COST 2010, 6). In other words we cannot adequately look after the landscape without understanding its history.

Character(isation)

'The **historic character** of a place is the group of qualities derived from its past uses that make it distinctive. This may include: its associations with people, now and through time; its visual aspects; and the features, materials, and spaces associated with its history, including its original configuration and subsequent losses and changes. Character is a broad concept, often used in relation to entire historic areas and landscapes, to which heritage assets and their settings may contribute' (Historic England 2017b, 3).

'**Historic Characterisation** involves applying to aspects of landscape … the classifying and interpreting of material through identifying and describing essential or distinguishing patterns, features and qualities, or attributes' (Historic England[8])

'**Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)** … is a method of identification and interpretation of the varying historic character within an area that looks beyond individual heritage assets as it brigades understanding of the whole landscape and townscape into repeating HLC Types' (Historic England[9]).

---

[8] https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation-2/

[9] https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscape-characterisation/

Arguably, character is to landscape what significance is to place; while the 'distinctive identity' of places can be captured through the heritage values which contribute to its significance, landscape (in ELC terms) has a continuous character that can be analysed through a process of characterisation. In formal terms this refers to a family of largely policy-driven approaches covering urban and rural landscapes as well as seascapes, though here the focus is primarily on Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC). HLC prioritises the mapping of standard character types, as defined in a thesaurus (FISH 2015), rather than defining unique character areas like the related approach of Landscape Character Assessment (Swanwick and Fairclough 2018, 26). The strengths of HLC lie especially in emphasising the contribution to character of all parts of the landscape, not just 'significant' features (which is a key element of the ELC), and in its focus on the historic dimension of today's landscape. These make HLC not only a means of giving 'value to landscape beyond protected areas' (ibid, 23) but also an important tool for managing change in the future; indeed the approach is premised on recognition of the inevitability and even desirability of change, since it can lead to historic character, if properly understood, being strengthened or restored.

Much has been written about the perceived strengths and weaknesses of HLC (see eg Rippon 2007 and accompanying papers) with critiques, especially from the academic sector, tending to focus on its tendency towards subjective and simplifying approaches. But while there will always be an element of subjectivity, Swanwick and Fairclough (2018, 26) have emphasised that HLC aims to 'frame it within transparency and repeatability'. Fairclough (2008) also notes the importance of HLC as a framework for integrating public perceptions with expert data, though this dimension still needs development, as does the incorporation of deep time, in the form both of the less visible features of the archaeological landscape and a broader sense of temporality: as Swanwick and Fairclough (2018, 30) put it, 'deeper prehistory tends to be missing', while the ESF-COST initiative on landscapes has suggested 'long-term landscape transformations' (over the past 10,000 years) as a key future research direction (ESF/COST 2010, 9). While Fairclough and Møller (2009, 209) see the lack of time depth as a 'serious fault', others would see this as something separate to HLC, which ought to retain its focus on the visible landscape (D Hooley, pers comm). The temporal dimension has been developed to some extent in the related Scottish approach, **Historic Land-Use Assessment (HLA)**, which is defined slightly differently as 'a systematic and rigorous means of "reading" and recording mappable features that survive from past activities which can be identified in patterns of current land use' (Historic Scotland 2013, 1).

HLC can reasonably be seen as the ELC in action, and therefore a crucial element of HE's landscape work. There remain questions to be asked about why it has not been more fully incorporated into academic approaches to landscape archaeology (see below); for example, it is little mentioned in the *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology* (David and Thomas 2008). Addressing that point, along with developing ways of incorporating community values and building partnerships with other disciplines (Turner 2018, 47), might open up further directions for characterisation approaches in the future.

Countryside
'The land and scenery of a rural area'[10]

While landscape can, of course, be urban, the term is more often used in a rural context and sometimes becomes synonymous with countryside; as Crouch (2010, 6) puts it, 'The "stuff" that is often substituted for what is meant by landscape tends to be more in terms of countryside...'. However, for Fairclough and Sarlöv Herlin (2005, 14) countryside 'is no longer a purely descriptive word; it has developed into a term indicative of a particular perspective... It carries within it not just the meaning of non-urban ... but it also includes concepts such as amenity, access, naturalness and natural beauty, and perhaps a sense of a past rural idyll'. They note that 'the inherently defensive, preservationist and nostalgic aspects of the word as used today' show that the concept, like the place-terms discussed above, 'cannot easily be divorced from identity' (ibid, 15).

Contradictions are certainly evident in this usage, since the Countryside Alliance and similar groups have built on a nostalgic idea of rural England to create an oppositional identity to certain government measures, such as anti-hunting legislation (D Hooley, pers comm), while in other cases the '"countryside" mentality leads to landscape being seen as synonymous with nature conservation' (Fairclough 2008). When we talk about the countryside in terms of heritage we therefore need to be alert to the potential connotations of this term, especially when it comes to engaging more diverse audiences: as Glover (2019, 70) puts it: 'The countryside is seen by both black, Asian and minority ethnic groups and white people as very much a "white" environment'.

Ecology
'the study of the relationships between organisms and the (a)biotic environment' (Van Dyck 2012, 144)

More specifically, **landscape ecology** is variously defined as 'the science of studying and improving relationships between ecological processes in the environment' (Wikipedia), 'the study of the interactions between the temporal and spatial aspects of a landscape and the organisms within it' (Forestry Commission[11]), and 'the study of spatial variation in landscapes at a variety of scales' (International Association of Landscape Ecology[12]). The IALE particularly promotes interdisciplinary landscape research, with a renewed interest in holism, systems theory and dynamics.

We can also identify a **historical ecology**, which 'employs a definition of ecology that includes humans as a component of all ecosystems' (see below),

---

[10] https://www.lexico.com/definition/countryside

[11] https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/research/landscape-ecology/landscape-ecology-the-basics-of-landscape-ecology/

[12] https://www.landscape-ecology.org/about-iale/what-is-landscape-ecology.html

and would therefore seem to have many points of contact with landscape archaeology (Crumley 2018). Péter Szabó (2015) argues it is more of an umbrella term than a discipline as such, a field of study with 'no unified methodology, specialized institutional background and common publication forums' (cf Richard Muir's (2000) argument that the strengths of landscape history lie in its uncentralised, interdisciplinary nature). John Sheail (2007, 327) has also looked at the development of historical ecology approaches, arguing that 'environmental historians... have explored the people/nature relationship... giving as much attention to wild plant and animal life... as to the more immediate preoccupations of humankind'. There are affinities therefore with both 'traditional' environmental archaeology, which has tended to focus on the resources exploited by people, and the 'animal turn' in recent archaeological approaches, which emphasises the agency of non-humans (Harris and Cipolla 2017, ch 9).

There are also links to theories of landscape through Ingold's (2000) 'dwelling perspective' and especially his reading of James Gibson's ecological approach to perception. The ethological term **Umwelt**, defined as 'the world as it is experienced by a particular organism'[13], might provide a conceptual link between ecosystem and landscape through extending a 'dwelling perspective' and environmental perception to non-human organisms, helping us 'avoid a far too human perception on how animals perceive, and hence deal with, their environment' (Van Dyck 2012, 145). In practical terms 'structural units [of vegetation or land use] as perceived by humans do not necessarily reflect the functional units of habitat for other organisms' (ibid, 149). More imaginatively, Charles Foster (2016, xi–xii) has attempted to 'describe the landscape as perceived by a badger, a fox, an otter, a red deer and a common swift' which involves 'a landscape that is mainly olfactory or auditory rather than visual'.

Ecosystem
   'A dynamic complex of plant, animal, and microorganism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit' (UK National Ecosystem Assessment 2014, 92)

   Ecosystem services are: 'The benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as flood and disease control; cultural services such as spiritual, recreational, and cultural benefits; and supporting services such as nutrient cycling that maintain the conditions for life on Earth.' (UK National Ecosystem Assessment 2014, 93)

   The **ecosystem approach** 'makes explicit the link between the status of natural resource systems and ecosystem services that support human well-being' (Wentworth 2011) and is set out in the Convention on Biological Diversity, where it is described as 'a strategy for the integrated

---

[13] https://www.lexico.com/definition/umwelt

management of land, water and living resources to promote conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way' (Fluck and Holyoak 2017, 17).

While ecological approaches in recent social theory focus on assemblages and the interrelatedness of different landscape elements, this is very different to ecosystem services, which seek to break down the natural world into quantifiable categories of benefit to people. The ecosystem approach serves to recognise humans as legitimate users of natural systems rather than merely a cause of disturbances (Hunziker *et al* 2007) but still tends to externalise people rather than viewing them as integral to such systems (as in historical ecology). Fairclough (2010, 137) argues that the ecosystems approach 'is nature conservation or biodiversity by a new name, and its social and cultural contribution to the planning of future sustainable landscapes is weak. It would be useful to have some detailed examinations of whether ecosystem approaches are actually landscape approaches, or not'. More recently, he and Carys Swanwick have suggested that while 'moving in the direction of a landscape approach', simplistic application of the ecosystems approach still 'tends to marginalise human and cultural factors as impacts on natural systems' (Swanwick and Fairclough 2018, 31). Williams and Stewart (1998, 22) argue that ecologists need to better understand sense of place, because people may not 'feel comfortable treating the ecosystem as an abstract set of resources with many potential uses. Instead people tend to focus their concerns on the fate of specific places' and may resent changes to their appearance even if they are helping to restore ecosystems.

The failure of ecosystem services to adequately account for cultural factors extends to the historic dimension, as discussed by Fluck and Holyoak (2017, 7), who state that 'The fact that the natural environment in the UK is the result of millennia of human activity and interaction has not equated to recognition of the historic environment as a "supporting" or "provisioning" service'. Heritage tends to be subsumed within cultural services, which are defined as 'The non-material benefits people obtain from ecosystems' (ibid, table 6). However precisely cultural ecosystem services may be defined (eg Daniel *et al* 2012), this lack of recognition of the broader material contribution of cultural heritage can lead to 'disjointed views of landscape that may hinder, rather than encourage, integrated land management' (Fluck and Holyoak 2017, 6). Similar points about how the ecological value of landscape often depends on unacknowledged cultural-historical features have also been made beyond Britain, for example how irrigated meadows and pasture systems have given rise to valuable flora (Bender and Schumacher 2008), while Bürgi *et al* (2014) sought to better integrate ecosystem services with (recent) landscape history, by comparing historical studies of Alpine agriculture since *c* 1900.

The absence of historic environment terms from the language of ecosystem services means that opportunities for integrated historic and natural environment solutions to managing change could be missed. However, Fluck and Holyoak (2017, 10) also raise the more fundamental question of whether we should be seeking to integrate the historic environment into an approach primarily created to benefit the natural environment sector, which in turn raises

the question of whether and how those aspects of the landscape can reasonably be separated analytically.

Environment

'The surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal, or plant lives or operates… The natural world, as a whole or in a particular geographical area, especially as affected by human activity.'[14]

'Environment' thus has two meanings that are relevant to this discussion. The second part of the dictionary definition refers to the common conception of the environment as nature (see below), particularly in relation to specific 'environmental' issues such as climate change. In this sense the environmental and the social are seen as quite different things, though each impacts on the other. However, the other sense of a being in its surroundings provides a slightly different conceptual space in which the relationship with landscape can be discussed. Fairclough (2008) suggests that landscape is not a component *of* the environment but a way of looking *at* the environment; or alternatively: 'environment is the physical world around us, landscape includes all of that but filtered through human perception' (Fairclough *et al* 2018, 7). Hooley (2017) also distinguishes physical environment from perceived landscape, adding a reflexive sense in that the 'same cognitive cultural understanding that builds landscape perceptions from sensed data is also altered by and responds to that process, influencing the form and character of cultural activity in the environment'.

On the other hand, Ingold (2000, 193) argues against the distinction between environment as something real and landscape as a product of human cognition, which he sees as merely reproducing the nature/culture dichotomy. He prefers to distinguish between environment as function ('what it affords to creatures') and landscape as form, generated 'through the processual unfolding of a total field of relations that cuts across the emergent interface between organism and environment'. It might be interesting to explore whether the relationship between environmental archaeology and landscape archaeology could be conceived in similar terms. Ingold (2007, 103) also rejects the sense of environment as surroundings, arguing that 'the environment does not consist of the surroundings of a bounded place but of a zone in which [inhabitants'] several pathways are thoroughly entangled'.

Investigating some of these issues is the objective of the emerging field of **environmental humanities**, which is premised on the idea that 'human ideas, meanings and values shape and are shaped by, in some important way, the "environment out there"' (Neimanis *et al* 2015, 71–2). While the intersection between archaeology and environmental humanities has been discussed at various conferences, it has yet to generate many publications. However, it might help address criticisms of the ecosystem services approach, namely that the identification of historical value within cultural services primarily as 'sense of

---

[14] https://www.lexico.com/definition/environment

history' and 'sense of place', especially in terms of fostering well-being, overlooks not only other contributions from heritage, as mentioned above, but also other forms of affect in the landscape.

Geodiversity

'Geodiversity is the variety of rocks, minerals, fossils, landforms, sediments and soils, together with the natural processes which form and alter them... Geodiversity also links people, landscapes and their culture through the interactions of biodiversity, soils, minerals, rocks, fossils, active processes and the built environment' (Gordon and Barron 2011, 1).

The link between geodiversity and cultural heritage has been articulated by Larwood (2017), who sees geodiversity as a 'cultural template', a repeated relationship that influences 'where people choose to live, the provision of the raw materials that support our livelihoods, and characterise our architecture'. In a Scottish context, Gordon and Barron (2011) discuss it in terms of a '"sense of place" and "local distinctiveness"', especially in relation to how geodiversity connects 'built and natural heritage' and provides 'a foundation for biodiversity and many aspects of our cultural heritage'. Geodiversity may often be downplayed compared to biodiversity when thinking about 'nature' and environmental policy, but is clearly fundamental to any discussion of landscape, though there is always a risk of geological or topographic determinism: we might not go as far as Larwood (2017, 18) who suggests geodiversity has an 'often defining influence on cultural identity'. Fruitful approaches to collaboration might therefore focus on places and processes where the historic landscape demonstrates how perceptions and values of geodiversity have changed over time. There are also evident overlaps between Pleistocene/early Holocene geodiversity and the deep time of prehistoric human inhabitation of ancient 'lost landscapes' (White *et al* 2016), while the inclusion of soils in the definition provides plenty of opportunities for archaeological engagement.

Green infrastructure

'Green infrastructure is a network of multi-functional green space and other green features, urban and rural, which can deliver quality of life and environmental benefits for communities'[15]

'... the network of green spaces and natural elements that intersperse and connect our cities, towns and villages. It is the open spaces, waterways, gardens, woodlands, green corridors, wildlife habitats, street trees, natural heritage and open countryside.' (WMRA 2006)

'...a strategically planned and delivered network comprising the broadest range of high quality green spaces and other environmental features. It should be designed and managed as a multifunctional resource capable of delivering those ecological services and quality of life benefits required by

---

[15] https://www.tcpa.org.uk/green-infrastructure-definition

the communities it serves and needed to underpin sustainability. Its design and management should also respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area with regard to habitats and landscape types.' (Natural England 2009)

These definitions show that green infrastructure has a broader and a narrower definition, on the one hand referring to an explicitly designed element of the urban landscape, and on the other to virtually all undeveloped spaces within and between any kind of settlement. This ambiguity may have implications for the extent to which historic character is taken into account when mapping or planning such infrastructure. On the other hand, each definition includes the word 'network', emphasising the connectivity of places and akin to the broader idea of landscape as 'a network of related places' (Thomas 2001, 173). The practical concept of green infrastructure could therefore provide one way of thinking about the relationship between place and landscape in policy terms, especially in a (peri-)urban context.

Land
'The part of the earth's surface that is not covered by water... an area of ground, especially in terms of its ownership or use... Ground or soil used as a basis for agriculture... A country or state... A conceptual area.'[16]

The relationship between landscape and land is in some sense analogous to that between place and space, in other words that the landscape is 'humanised land' (see above). Wylie (2007, 160), discussing the work of Ingold, states that landscape is understood to be qualitative and heterogeneous, and explicitly contrasts landscape to 'mere land or acreage'. To that extent land might be simply a component of the environment, but on the other hand, some authors express the qualitative aspects of land, flowing from the subsidiary definitions above. As Kenneth Olwig (2005, 20) expresses it, this is land as 'something to which a people *belong*, as to a commonwealth' [original emphasis], while the definition of land as something owned has made the word a rallying cry against the power relations inherent in such ownership (Shoard 1987).

More benignly, in her classic work *A Land*, Jacquetta Hawkes (1951) seeks to evoke the image of 'an entity, the land of Britain, in which past and present, nature, man and art appear all in one piece'. This kind of relationship is also evident in the concept of **land art** (also earth art or environmental art), defined by the Tate as 'art that is made directly in the landscape, sculpting the land itself into earthworks or making structures in the landscape using natural materials such as rocks or twigs'[17], though forming 'a widely diverging collection of forms, approaches and theoretical positions' (Kastner 1998); the inspiration of archaeological landscapes is often apparent. Land art therefore inverts the original painterly meaning of landscape (see above), taking the form of art that

---

[16] https://www.lexico.com/definition/land

[17] https://www.tate.org.uk/art/art-terms/l/land-art

happens in or works with the landscape rather than the landscape portrayed in art. But it has also evolved over time, as discussed by Tim Collins (2013, 200), who suggests that 'the move from land art to environmental art tracks an evolution of … ideas about human interrelationships to environment, landscape and living things', which in many cases brings us back to politics: 'The project of environmental art has moved from a material engagement with landscape, through ethical relationships with natural systems and then to a sense of suspicion about how we relate and interrelate to the natural environment'. There is undoubtedly scope for further consideration of how archaeologists and artists might collaborate productively in historic landscape research.

Derivations from 'land', in particular **upland** and **lowland**, can also be unpacked in similar ways to the base term. For example, upland habitats have a quantified definition in terms of those that 'occur above the upper limits of agricultural enclosure, usually over 250–400 m altitude, and reflect differences in climatic conditions, under-lying soils, hydrology and management history'[18], but on the other hand 'upland' is also 'a setting and a frame of mind – a certain amount of distance (physical *and* psychological!) from the hustle and bustle of denser city and suburb existence. "Upland" used to be used interchangeably with "countryside," but now it connotes that and so much more'[19]. This is just one perspective but shows the potential richness of 'land' metaphors.

Landscape archaeology

Landscape archaeology is both a method ('non-intrusive analytical survey of all visible features of archaeological interest within a landscape': English Heritage 2007) and an approach: 'landscape archaeology explores the ways in which human beings have acted upon landscape and environments, the ways in which nature has acted upon humanity, and the ways in which human perceptions of the natural world have influenced their actions'[20].

Landscape archaeology is sometimes also equated with 'off-site archaeology', that is 'the study of diffuse human remains … that never fit comfortably within traditional operational definitions of "sites"' (Knapp and Ashmore 1999). And while the broader concept of landscape may be shared across Europe, as the ELC definition shows, landscape archaeology has its own national traditions, with the history of the Ordnance Survey a particularly important influence on British practice (Bowden and McOmish 2011).

There are historical reasons for the restriction (since at least the 1970s) of the methodological sense of 'landscape archaeology' to non-intrusive survey,

---

[18] http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1436

[19] http://www.uplandlife.com/about/upland_comments.asp

[20] https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/courses/arts/archaeology/landscape-archaeology-ma

reflecting the earlier extension of the meaning of the term 'field archaeology' from this kind of technique (Crawford 1953) to all work in the field, including excavation, which could then be privileged as 'the most detailed and the most destructive, and yet potentially the most informative, technique available to the field archaeologist' (Drewett 1999, 3). Landscape archaeology was therefore coined as a new term for the older practice of (primarily) non-intrusive fieldwork (M Bowden, pers comm). However, as the term landscape became enmeshed in archaeological theory, a new debate/polemic arose in the 1990s between proponents of phenomenological approaches to the archaeological landscape and practitioners of traditional 'muddy boots' fieldwork (Brück 2005; Fleming 2006). Arguably it was from the creative tensions between different approaches that progress emerged (eg Barrett and Ko 2009).

Similarly, it could be argued that restricting landscape archaeology to non-intrusive fieldwork left excavation too focussed on individual sites, especially in a development-led context where a site-by-site approach has worked to the detriment of synthesis and landscape studies. There may therefore be value in broadening out the term on the methodological side to include excavation, especially in an era when development sites can cover tens of hectares and include multiple archaeological 'sites' – so long, that is, as the suite of non-intrusive fieldwork techniques are still recognised as essential to any archaeological approach to landscape, however large our trenches may become. There is scope too, perhaps, for extending landscape archaeology away from its traditional foci and into less studied areas including the suburbs and edgelands, where it may meet not only a greater number of development-led excavations but also the burgeoning field of psychogeography (Richardson 2015).

This chimes with recent approaches stressing the diversity and contemporary relevance of archaeological approaches to landscape. In this wider sense 'Landscape archaeologies are often explicitly political', as Hicks and McAtackney (2007, 15) put it, and 'heritage studies can use archaeological ideas of landscape as a way of revealing the attachments and political relationships that develop between landscape and communities', including reflections on the archaeological process itself: 'A focus on landscape in its broadest sense – the heterogeneous, constantly shifting networks of places, people, institutions and objects – reveals how archaeology is a relational process, rather than purely descriptive and discovering' (Hicks and McAtackney 2007, 22). Using landscape to reflect on the practice of archaeology may also allow a critique of older archaeological narratives based on unacknowledged 'archetypal landscapes' (Barclay 2004).

Nature

'The phenomena of the physical world collectively, including plants, animals, the landscape, and other features and products of the earth, as opposed to humans or human creations… The physical force regarded as causing and regulating the phenomena of the world.'[21]

---

[21] https://www.lexico.com/definition/nature

The dictionary definition reminds us that 'nature' is not just the world out there (cf environment), it is also process. In that sense it comes closer to the idea of landscape, though Wylie (2007, 160), paraphrasing Ingold, states that 'landscape is not "nature", if by nature we specifically mean the Western notion of a realm external to human life and thought'. However, landscape is clearly related to nature as much as it is to culture, not least in the ELC definition, though here we run into the common critique of the nature-culture dualism which parallels that between subject and object, or mind and body (see above on the idea of 'ecology without nature', for example). Wylie (2007, 204) points out that 'new biogeographies have to some extent supplanted landscape as a medium for thinking through culture–nature relations; some proponents of the new topological geography seem intent upon discarding "middle terms" or synthetics such as landscape', but landscape seems well-suited to such thinking, especially if we follow Tsing (2019, 50) who argues that 'we need to make histories of landscapes that involve all kinds of beings, human and not human' if we are to understand the 'overlapping projects of world-making' through which 'a landscape emerges' (ibid, 45). Archaeologists may be well placed to develop this kind of thinking; as Whatmore (2006, 601) points out, archaeology is one of those disciplines, along with geography and anthropology, that 'took shape before the division of academic labours into social and natural science became entrenched'.

There are other connotations of the term, however, especially the use of 'natural' to mean something authentic rather than artificial. Sheail (2007, 330) reports George Peterken's remark that 'conservationists (in Britain at least) perceived "naturalness" as conveying everything ideal by way of diversity, grandeur, health and vigour' – making explicit connections between nature and well-being. However, as Peterken also recognised, this sense of 'nature' is challenged by the acknowledgement that in Britain at least, there is no natural environment that has not been affected or indeed created by humans over historical time. As Plumwood (2006, 131) points out, this has not stopped the term being used by 'conservative social forces' to hide 'the human social relations that have gone into places now presented as "nature", for example, the countryside of England... [and] possibilities for social change'. To counter this in policy terms we need to recognise 'a mutuality of values' which means that 'the understanding and protection of cultural and natural heritage should be approached in an integrated way', though this aspiration needs to overcome long-standing legislative and institutional separation (Phillips and Young 2017).

Natural beauty
Related to the sense of nature as authentic is the idea of 'natural beauty' that has long influenced landscape policy in Britain. The development of this concept has been discussed by Selman and Swanwick (2010, 11–12) who point out that:

> Despite its widespread use in legislation it has never been formally defined even though many over the years have found it a clumsy and unhelpful phrase... [I]n practice it contains many latent tensions, not least that of

deciding the point at which a landscape, however attractive, ceases to be "natural" by virtue of the intensity of human settlement and land use.

Today it is generally accepted as including 'rural landscapes which have been shaped by human activities, including, for example farmland, fields and field boundaries'. The government's 'natural beauty criterion' for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) is defined in terms of 'a combination of factors, such as:

- landscape quality, where natural or man-made [sic] landscape is good quality
- scenic quality, such as striking coastal landforms
- relative wildness, such as distance from housing or having few roads
- relative tranquillity, where natural sounds, such as streams or birdsong are predominant
- natural heritage features, such as distinctive geology or species and habitat
- cultural heritage, which can include the built environment that makes the area unique, such as archaeological remains or historic parkland'[22].

However, whether and how landscape protection should be based on aesthetic judgements remains an area worthy of further discussion.

Natural capital

'aspects of the natural environment that directly and indirectly provide value to people, now and into the future. The term is often used together with ecosystem services but they should not be confused. Natural capital refers to the stock of natural assets that provide value, while ecosystem services refer to the flow of benefits (goods and services) that stock provides' (Fluck and Holyoak 2017, 18).

While the debate in the heritage sector has focussed on whether a parallel discourse of 'cultural [heritage] capital' could usefully be developed, landscape theorists might take issue with both the idea of 'natural assets' and the implied quantifiability in the concepts of value and capital. An alternative approach to managing 'natural' and 'cultural' landscapes that addresses the 'contradictory Western wilderness construct of separation of natural heritage management from cultural heritage management' is provided by Taylor and Francis (2014, 37), who draw on the indigenous Australian understanding of 'country' as 'an holistic approach to the human-nature relationship' (ibid, 26). Recognition of indigenous priorities in the management of protected landscapes requires treating them as 'integrated environments'.

---

[22] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/areas-of-outstanding-natural-beauty-aonbs-designation-and-management#meet-the-natural-beauty-criterion

Rewilding

> The dictionary defines rewilding as the process of restoring an area of land 'to its natural uncultivated state (used especially with reference to the reintroduction of species of wild animal that have been driven out or exterminated)'[23]. Rewilding Europe provides a more fulsome definition: 'Rewilding is a progressive approach to conservation. It's about letting nature take care of itself, enabling natural processes to shape land and sea, repair damaged ecosystems and restore degraded landscapes. Through rewilding, wildlife's natural rhythms create wilder, more biodiverse habitats'[24].

In recent years rewilding has become fashionable both as a term and a practice, but has yet to be subject to any detailed analysis of its implications for heritage, be that the extent to which any desired end-state might make reference to palaeoenvironmental data or the impact it might have on the character of the historic landscape. While some forms of rewilding involve reintroducing locally extinct fauna in a highly managed way, others are more about simply reducing or abandoning the management of a particular area, which may of course have implications for heritage assets.

Certainly the term implies that there was once something 'wild' and it would be beneficial to return to that state of **wilderness**, a term that 'makes a claim to total human exclusion, while "nature" as a category only makes a claim to a measure of independence of the human' (Plumwood 2006, 135). Such usage may well reflect a lack of awareness of the millennia-long history of human impact on any British or European landscape, as well as the extent of human management that would be required to effect such a return, a contradiction noted by Holmes (2015).

Recent work in the Netherlands by Martin Drenthen and Andrea Rae Gammon has investigated some of the cultural implications of rewilding. Drenthen (2018) considers 'the tension between the idea of rewilding on the one hand, and the ... significance of human involvement in landscapes on the other hand' by examining the motives behind opponents and proponents of rewilding and the conflicts arising from 'the pull of competing and often incommensurable environmental values', concluding that while rewilding may offer 'an alternative interpretation of the landscape palimpsest' it cannot escape the fact that 'all rewilding landscapes are layered cultural landscapes'. Extending this approach, Gammon (2017, 82) sees rewilding as a form of place-making that may 'challenge received ideas of place' with arguably the most interesting being those like the Millingerwaard initiative that rebalance the non-human and human influences and perspectives without trying to erase or deny past and ongoing human intervention (ibid, 219).

---

[23] https://www.lexico.com/definition/rewild

[24] https://rewildingeurope.com/what-is-rewilding/

Likewise, George Holmes (2015) suggests that increased interdisciplinary working in this context, which has often been called for but less often realised, requires taking the humanities seriously in order to widen out the values attached to nature. For Plumwood (2006, 137), while 'wilderness' may not be the right term, 'given the disreputable or mixed history of the concept', it serves the important 'function of providing some pieces of the earth where the nonhuman has ethical priority… This sense of wilderness recognizes as precious a nonhuman presence … which is not at all the same as claiming absence of human influence in the land'. It seems high time that the heritage sector participated in more of these discussions.

Taskscape

'It is to the entire ensemble of tasks, in their mutual interlocking, that I refer by the concept of taskscape. Just as the landscape is an array of related features, so – by analogy – the taskscape is an array of related activities.' (Ingold 1993, 158)

Thomas (2017, 270) explains the notion of the taskscape, coined by Tim Ingold, as 'the structured patterns of inhabitation' of the landscape, in particular 'everyday activities and routine undertakings'. As he also points out, the idea of the taskscape was particularly embraced by archaeologists, although Ingold himself has subsequently argued that the term is redundant: introduced to show why we did not need it, it has tended to 'assimilate to the very assumptions it was brought in to dislodge', ie those 'that lead us to project human social activities against a backdrop of nature'. Indeed Ingold (2017, 25–6) has subsequently replaced it with the term 'meshwork'.

Ingold's (1993) original point was that the landscape (redefined as 'the congealed form of the taskscape') had temporality in the form of rhythms and flows of activity, and that temporality should be the concern of archaeologists. The problem is that archaeologists have tended to reduce the taskscape to the archaeological record at a landscape scale, the residue of the taskscape rather than the activities themselves. Nevertheless it has proved useful to those seeking a landscape approach to the distribution of artefacts recovered from surveys, though further development of the concept may perhaps come from using it as a means of investigating the accretive nature of the landscape as a whole, including drawing analogies between past practices and those of the landscape archaeologist, as described above.

Territory

'An area of land under the jurisdiction of a ruler or state… An area in which one has certain rights or for which one has responsibility with regard to a particular type of activity… Land with a specified characteristic'[25]

---

[25] https://www.lexico.com/definition/territory

The focus on rights and responsibilities shows the legal and political connotations of the term. However, the related term **territoriality** may have more relevance to historic environment concerns. This refers to 'a persistent attachment of people, culture and ways of life to a specific territory, sometimes within clear geographical boundaries, sometimes referring to more diffuse patterns' (Jansen-Verbeke 2009, 25). It has connotations of shared identity as well as shared space, and implies the presence of boundaries, physical or symbolic. Territoriality exists in tension with globalisation, perhaps, but in a rather different way to the local, for example in the form of the nation-state (itself a highly problematic concept but beyond the scope of this discussion). For Sheppard (2002, 312), in the context of globalisation, (economic) 'territories need not be geographically contiguous places'.

Territory has, like regionality (see above), increasingly been approached by geographers in relational terms. In setting out various controversies about the use of regions, Agnew (2013, 12) argues that while 'Dividing space territorially misses precisely what space does: it relates objects and has no meaning apart from them', nevertheless in practice 'social life remains regionalized.' For Cochrane (quoted in Meegan 2017, 1291), '"Relational" thinking does not mean the end of territory, but rather reinforces the need to identify how territories are made up, constructed or assembled'. Territories may have less administrative connotations if they are conceptualised in terms of areas with specific combinations of social and geographical individuality, whether in terms of the concept of *pays*, which relates to a sense of regional identity, or a more top-down assessment of regional landscape character, such as the National Character Areas in England.

4 AFFECT AND EMBODIMENT

Rather than attempting a similar terminological discussion to those above, this section merely skims the surface of an immense topic to identify some of its intersections with the spatial concepts of landscape and place. The primary concept identified in relation to current heritage discourse is '**well-being**', which includes ideas of enjoyment and the therapeutic; indeed Historic England's mission specifically involves the promotion of well-being (in the form of enjoyment). However, we also need to recognise aspects of historic places and landscapes that are melancholic and nostalgic, or challenging and disturbing. All these affective experiences are embodied in the people who shape and are shaped by particular places and landscapes. Indeed Atkinson *et al* (2012) state that 'Wellbeing, however defined, can have no form, expression or enhancement without consideration of place'.

Of course, we do not always go around thinking consciously about these things and Casey (2001, 686) has usefully invoked Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus' (ingrained habits and skills) as a way of mediating between body/self and place, while Crouch (2013) uses ideas of performance and performativity to consider how landscapes are felt and experienced. In this context it would be interesting to explore the difference between how people respond to familiar, habitual landscapes and places and how they might respond to the discovery of new ones (including archaeological landscapes).

For Historic England the link between the historic environment, sense of place and well-being (or social capital) was reviewed by Graham *et al* (2009), while more recently a framework has been set out by Reilly *et al* (2018), who argue that although the well-established 'beneficial link between nature and wellbeing' also applies to the historic environment, 'more research is needed to understand which historic characteristics of a place (building or landscape) best promote wellbeing'. Perhaps such work would reveal subtle differences between the forms of well-being associated respectively with historic landscape and place, at least for tourists and visitors: the guide to landscape is above all the map, with its implications of a freedom to wander, while the experience of particular heritage places is potentially more structured by the interpretative paraphernalia of guidebooks, audiotours and information panels. There is often a temptation to contrast the experience of visitors and residents: as Lowenthal (2007) puts it, 'we accord virtue to those who *live in* landscape as opposed to those who "merely" *look at* it' [original emphasis], but goes on to remind us that 'Emerson privileged the stranger over the sojourner in nature. "Beds of flowers send up a most grateful scent to the passenger who hastens by them, but let him pitch his tent among them and he will find himself grown insensible to their fragrance"'.

Much work on enjoyment has focussed on the individual site in terms of management of the visitor experience, but we also need to consider how it relates to historic places and landscapes beyond the site level. Tolia-Kelly *et al* (2017, 2) talk about challenging traditional perspectives by addressing 'a range of feelings, affordances and capacities that have worked outside the mainstream

and conventional renderings of the heritage debate'. There is still work to be done in extending 'heritage landscapes beyond traditional "ways of seeing" the picturesque towards an understanding of heritage as an encounter with active agentic life-worlds' (Tolia-Kelly *et al* 2017, 7), that is using the landscape as a vehicle to explore 'post-human' engagements, or perhaps 'more-than-human', emphasising, in line with the ELC definition, the role of nature and culture together in landscape. Another area for research concerns the sensory aspect of landscape, summarised by Casey (2001, 690), who talks about its 'sensuous display – that is, the panoply of features sensed on its surface that make it into a variegated scene of perception and action'; can we develop more immersive, multi-sensory approaches to the historic landscape, which is still largely presented as a visual phenomenon?

Place-based initiatives are seen as important to the development of a sense of community and individual well-being (Reilly *et al* 2018), while landscape's role in well-being is recognised in the ecosystem services model in terms of cultural services: for example, as spiritual or religious enrichment, recreation or aesthetic experience. Landscapes can also be explicitly therapeutic in terms of their role in providing psychological treatment for human stress (Farina *et al* 2007; Darvill *et al* 2019). In broader environmental policy this contribution is often seen only in terms of nature and beauty (eg Glover 2019, 68) so we need to do more to promote the benefits of the historic landscape; an interesting case study from Sweden found a positive association between the presence of historical remains and 'three self-reported indicators of well-being: neighborhood satisfaction, physical activity and general health' (de Jong *et al* 2012). However, more work is required to clarify exactly how the historic dimension of landscape contributes to well-being, for example the role of 'the archaeological imagination' (Hearne 2019). There is also a need to explore who is benefiting from historic places and landscapes and who is excluded (cf Glover 2019, 70).

Just as the heritage sector has a unique perspective on the historicity of the concepts of place and landscape, we might also consider how place and landscape may have worked affectively in the past, which could have been very different to today. This could draw on historical examples, such as the contrast between the early modern view of upland landscapes as barren and dangerous and the Romantic view of them as sublime and picturesque, which still influences our approach to landscape today (Priede 2009), as well as ethnographic ones, as with the difference between European and Maori perspectives on therapeutic landscapes in New Zealand, the latter of which 'encapsulates the needs to recognise and manage the interconnectedness of the whole environment celebrating culture and identity' (Hatton *et al* 2017).

It is important to acknowledge, as mentioned, that the experience of historic places and landscapes can (and should) sometimes be 'difficult', for example in the case of places connected to slavery, or industrial heritage in areas where the economic impacts of deindustrialisation are still felt. Melancholia is frequently implicated in the affective experience of heritage in the form of absence or displacement (Jones 2015). Heritage may engender feelings of exclusion, as

with the African-American experience of a historical park in Philadelphia, or loss, as with the destruction of historic Beirut during post-war redevelopment (Low 2017, ch 4). Therapeutic values may co-exist alongside the material residues of past struggle and exclusion, whether or not they are recognised: for example, in fieldscapes that now portray an enjoyable aesthetic but result from the contested enclosure of former common land (affectively conveyed through the poems of John Clare, for example). Here there is a link to the ethical dimension of landscape and concepts of landscape justice (Dalglish 2012; Egoz and De Nardi 2017). For Jorgensen (2016) 'it is inevitable that political, economic, social and cultural inequalities become enshrined in landscape itself' (see also Massey 2011) and justice in this context means 'At the very least … addressing unequal (human) access to landscape goods and resources, including cultural resources or unequal exposure to environmental degradation and risk', and perhaps also conferring 'rights upon non-human beings and entities'.

Finally, since they involve embodied experience rather than disembodied spectators, attending to concepts of well-being and affect helps expand the place-landscape axis to explicitly include people. For Casey (2001, 690), place is the link between landscape and body: 'The one widens out our vista of the place-world – all the way to the horizon – while the other literally incorporates this same world and acts upon it'. In other cultures the link between place or landscape and the human body may be more explicit; among the people of the Lelet peninsula mentioned above, 'the body and its tropes are central to the symbolic processes by which space is realized and possessed as place', for example 'the body comportment of seating is a trope for the ownership and habitation of place' (Eves 1996, 188, 181). We could perhaps reconceptualise place-making as the process of strengthening the embodied relationship between people and place through the dimension of heritage.

5   DISCUSSION: A PLACE FOR LANDSCAPE

Both 'landscape' and 'place' have a complex range of meanings and associations but that does not mean they are vague or trite; quite the opposite. Having attempted to set up a contrast between 'place' and 'landscape' it is clear, as discussed above, that they are also intimately connected – although as befits such complex concepts, the nature of that connection can be described and articulated in numerous different ways. As mentioned, this is not a question of scale since both are multi-scalar concepts: while this has been more discussed in relation to landscape (see above) neither does place have an inherent scale. Rodman (1992, 650), for example, suggests 'a focus on place can eliminate the micro-macro distinction, for region and village are points on a sliding scale'.

To understand their relationship it is hard to improve on Relph's (1976, 123) succinct statement that 'Landscape is both the context for places and an attribute of places', though his understanding of landscape perhaps concentrates too much on its superficial, purely visual aspects. He also suggests that landscape is somehow a less focussed (more pluralistic?) idea than place: 'With place intentionality is focused onto an inside that is different from an outside; with landscape intentionality is diffuse and without concentration'. This seems to reflect a sense in some of the literature that landscape is inferior to place, perhaps predicated on the lingering idea of landscape as something observed rather than directly experienced. For example, Wattchow (2013) suggests place is experienced from the inside and landscape viewed from the outside, taking this as justification for valuing the former over the latter (cf the definition of place-making above in which landscape is seen as [merely] setting). However, Lovell (1998, 8) argues such a conceptualisation of (external) landscape and (internalised) place as distinctive categories is 'highly European' – and the discussion above demonstrates how quickly the dualism breaks down as soon as we start to unpack these terms.

Cresswell (2002, 269) too prefers place to landscape, but for different reasons, namely that landscape is 'too much about the already accomplished and not enough about the processes of everyday life' and 'has become a well-worn metaphor'. He suggests that since landscape is solid, the term 'landscapes of practice' is an oxymoron and more work is needed to inject 'temporality and movement into the static' (Cresswell 2002, 280); he also argues that landscape is less widely understood than place: 'I find it easy to talk to people who aren't geographers and say Acton High Street is a place. But to say it's a landscape implies, to me, a specialist knowledge about it' (Merriman *et al* 2008, 207). While the discussion above shows that temporality and movement are clearly attributes of landscape, this kind of perception of place as straightforward and landscape as difficult may help explain why HE currently talks far more about place than landscape, from its place-making strategy (Historic England 2018) to the '100 Places' initiative (Wilkinson 2018). We need to rescue landscape from being seen as a specialist term, but without reducing it to the banality of scenery.

Other scholars appear to find landscape the more useful concept, especially in relational terms. For Tilley and Cameron-Daum (2017, 2), landscape is 'a set of relationships between places in which meaning is grounded in existential consciousness, event, history and association'. Wylie (2007, 171–2) notes that 'Tilley seeks to reclaim landscape as a holistic term, larger than place – a term that gathers together body, place, perception and relationships between people and between people and things'. Fairclough (2008) similarly sees landscape perception as the connection between people and place, while for Malpas (2011, 7), despite his articulation of the problem with landscape in literary or painterly terms, 'Landscape is a representation of place, and as such, it is the re-presentation of a relatedness to place, a re-presentation of a mode of "emplacement"' – or: 'It is in and through landscape, in its many forms, that our relationship with place is articulated and represented'.

As well as the relationship between people and place, landscape has something to do with that between space and place. Wylie suggests that landscape connects the *absence* of space and the *presence* of place, which he characterises as 'already too full … of itself' (Merriman *et al* 2008, 203), while Casey (2001, 689) argues that landscape distinguishes place from space, for there can be 'no landscape of space'. More pragmatically, but at the risk of reintroducing the nature-culture dualism, Hunziker *et al* (2007, 48–9) argue there are:

> two modes of landscape perception, one as space and one as place… In the space mode, people perceive the landscape primarily in terms of their biological needs; that is, they focus on the (instrumental) use of the landscape. In the place mode, however, people perceive the landscape primarily in terms of self-reflection (experiences, achievements) and social integration (values, norms, symbols, meanings).

However, Casey (2001, 689) also points out that while 'place is broadened in landscape' we need to be careful not to see landscape 'as a mere middle term between place and space… No matter how capacious a landscape may be, it remains a composition of places, their intertangled skein'. Or looking the other way: 'If landscape can be said to constitute the world's felt texture, place is the congealing of this texture into discrete here/there arenas of possible action' (Casey 1983, 87). This complexity and entanglement appear key to the distinction between place and landscape; it is not easy to define, as this discussion shows, but place and landscape seem constitutive of one another and both terms are essential for any consideration of the historic environment beyond the level of the individual asset; not interchangeable but complementary.

Indeed each concept seems stronger and more nuanced when understood in light of the other. Landscape viewed through the prism of place becomes more embodied and internalised than the external gaze with which it is traditionally and still often residually associated (especially in policy terms through the association with 'natural beauty'). But place viewed through the prism of landscape provides a sense of connectivity and movement ('action and

interaction', perhaps) that counterbalances the sometimes problematic emphasis on local identity and distinctiveness.

The argument advanced here, therefore, is that while current heritage discourse may be primarily focussed on place and place-making, landscape is a necessary complement, and indeed can be seen as a unifying concept beyond the heritage sector. It is clear that in giving rise to 'debates about its relationship to place and space, its specificity or universality, its association with particular ontologies, visualities, materialities and affects, and its condensation of particular kinds of politics and power relation' landscape is vital to any discussion of space and environment (Merriman *et al* 2008, 209).

More specifically, landscape complements place because if we reduce heritage to (local) identity then we overlook or undervalue the shared or universal, the environment (understood as an assemblage of people, animals, plants and things), mobility and temporality, especially (archaeological) deep time. In contrast a landscape approach brings all these elements into a spatial perspective. It helps develop what Massey (1991) refers to as 'a global sense of place' and Pierce *et al* (2011) term 'relational place-making'. Massey's approach to place (quoted in Meegan 2017, 1289) emphasises the stretching and tying together of social relations, which also seem to be a fundamental aspect of landscape:

> one way of thinking about place is as particular moments in ... intersecting social relations, nets of which have over time been constructed, laid down, interacted with one another, decayed and renewed. Some of these relations will be, as it were, contained within the place; others will stretch beyond it, tying any particular locality into wider relations and processes in which other places are implicated too... The global is in the local in the very process of the formation of the local.

And in terms of its unifying role, because landscape is also used across the other sectors to which heritage is connected, including the arts and the natural environment, it becomes a doubly useful unifier, 'a classic trans-disciplinary concept' (Wattchow 2013). This might also help rescue landscape from the criticism that it is too specialised a term; in describing the circumstances that led up to the creation of the ELC, Antrop (2013, 17) has noted that:

> a sole academic interdisciplinary approach was insufficient to cope with all issues related to landscape in society... Insiders and lay-people needed to be included in participatory processes for managing and planning landscapes... The need for a trans-disciplinary approach grew... In general, landscape research became more applied, more society oriented and less theoretical and academic.

Working together is not always that straightforward, however, and the ESF (2010, 7) states that 'Issues that need addressing to re-focus policy making include: insufficient communication and integration between research fields and academic approaches, and continued poor alignment between landscape

sub-disciplines', while Fairclough *et al* (2018, 10) refer to 'the struggle to bring together the disparate disciplines and professions that work with landscape'. Part of the problem is that landscape may have different meanings attached to it in different disciplinary contexts, as we have seen, and it will be important to ensure a shared term does not become a means of misunderstanding. One linking theme across heritage and ecology is the concept of conservation (see above), and we may be able to think about practical approaches that would sustain or restore both heritage values and biodiversity. Another may be a common sense of crisis: anxiety about changes in and to the landscape that come from both large-scale development and climate change (Thompson *et al* 2013). This kind of affect may be characteristic of the Anthropocene, itself a unifying term for different attributes of contemporary landscape. Fairclough (2008) argues that if we view heritage in terms of landscape then change also becomes an attribute rather than an impact, and can be discussed more productively.

Ethnographic approaches might provide further useful linking concepts for interdisciplinary work. One example is 'rootedness', as set out by De Boeck (1998, 48) in his study of the aLuund of south-west Congo, to whom place is 'a cultural product, while also stemming from natural production'; like trees, places are rooted but not necessarily immobile, since they can also be planted in order to 'grow' memory, history and belonging (ibid, 26). To the aLuund, and perhaps to us as well, the idea of rootedness and the image of the tree not only link the cultural and natural landscape, but place and history as well, though the metaphor may need extending to deal with the transience and 'placelessness' that also characterise the Anthropocene.

Reflecting more on how we talk about and represent landscape will not only balance the current focus on place and temper the emphasis on (local) identity, but also help address various outstanding objectives of the former English Heritage Action Plan for Implementation of the European Landscape Convention (2008–2013). These reflect the commitment of the government and its agencies to the provisions of the ELC in relation to the protection and management of landscape, providing an 'opportunity to treat heritage as ... the full context of peoples' lives' and 'help to ensure that the historic environment continues to takes its place within the wider environmental agenda'.

The specific objectives include:
- the promotion of understanding and use of ELC definitions and scope (Articles 1 and 2) across ... the heritage sector
- awareness-raising – use the ELC as an opportunity and context to expand public initiatives to promote the historic environment at landscape level
- training and education – integrate the ELC concept of landscape into ... training and related initiatives
- delivering the ELC's aspirations for landscape (because it embraces all disciplines and interests) as an integrative force for inter-disciplinary holistic collaboration.

These objectives can be supplemented, as suggested throughout the present document, by a deeper consideration of the historical dimension of place and landscape, so that it is not just a question of how heritage can be included in broader spatial policy and planning, but also a recognition that the heritage perspective can deepen understanding of these concepts. This could be done by showing, for example, how social meanings emerge historically from emplacement (lived practice in a place); how the nature of place and landscape have changed historically; and how time depth contributes to the present character of landscapes and places.

The significance of landscape is neatly summed up by Waterton (2005, 317) who states, following Casey (1996, 32), that 'landscapes hold the power to "gather" experiences, histories, memories and thoughts... thus somehow making it a seemingly general and universal category, but emphatically remaining specific and singular to particular locations'. Tellingly, however, the subject of Casey's paper is not primarily landscape but place; in it he offers a definition of place as 'singular enough to be unique to a given occasion and yet wide-ranging enough to exceed what is peculiar to it alone'. Again, therefore, the two terms emerge in parallel. It is from articulating the relationship between the general category and the specific case that understanding of the historic environment – landscape and place, character and significance – emerges. And it is through the affective qualities of landscape and place that people (as embodied agents) become entangled in their complexities; heritage ultimately is not a thing but a quality – how the historic environment is experienced by individuals or communities situated in a place or landscape.

6   SOME FURTHER QUESTIONS

As stated at the outset, this document is intended to stimulate further discussion. Having outlined why it might be useful for HE and the heritage sector to refocus on landscape, in particular through revisiting the previous action plan for implementation of the ELC, here I conclude by summarising some of the other questions that have emerged through consideration of such a diverse range of spatial terms:

- Rather than simply thinking about how heritage sites contribute to contemporary places, can we use our expert understanding of (pre)historic places to broaden and enrich discussions about place-making?

- What would an integrated interdisciplinary approach to the conservation of places and landscapes, heritage and biodiversity look like?

- How might we incorporate the idea of local distinctiveness into more global and networked understandings of how places work, in historical perspective?

- What do debates about locality and localism have to tell us about the role of heritage in creating and sustaining communities?

- Does the regional scale or the concept of territory ever make sense in historic/heritage terms?

- How can statutory terms like setting and significance be incorporated into wider-ranging discussions about historic places?

- As a counterpoint to ecosystem approaches can we widen our understanding of the historic landscape to better incorporate other species and non-visual sensory experience?

- How do we make the historic landscape more relevant to diverse communities across the country, and can we connect this to ideas of landscape justice?

- What does landscape archaeology have to offer the environmental humanities, and *vice versa*?

- How can we constructively contribute a cultural dimension to the current discourse around nature, natural beauty and rewilding?

- Could we write a history of well-being in relation to place and landscape, in order to help understand how heritage contributes to contemporary well-being?

REFERENCES

Agnew, J 2011 'Space and place', in Agnew, J and Livingstone, D (eds) *Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, 316–330. Sage

Agnew, J 2013. 'Arguing with regions'. *Regional Studies* 47, 6–17

Aldred, O 2016. 'Landscape biographies: geographical, historical and archaeological perspectives on the production and transmission of landscapes'. *Landscapes* 17(2), 185–6

Antrop, M 2013 'A brief history of landscape research', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 12–22. Routledge

Appadurai, A 1996 *Modernity at Large: cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press

Atkinson, S, Fuller, S and Painter, J 2012 'Wellbeing and place', in Atkinson, S, Fuller, S and Painter, J (eds), *Wellbeing and Place*. Ashgate

Augé, M 1995 *Non-Places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*. Verso

Barclay, G 2004 '"Four nations prehistory": cores and archetypes in the writing of prehistory', in Brocklehurst, H and Phillips, R (eds) *History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain*, 151–9. Palgrave

Barrett, J and Ko, I 2009 'A phenomenology of landscape: a crisis in British landscape archaeology?' *Journal of Social Archaeology* 9(3), 275–94

Basso, K 1996 'Wisdom sits in places: notes on a Western Apache landscape', in Feld, S and Basso, K (eds) *Senses of Place*, 53–90. School of American Research Press

Bender, B 2002 'Time and landscape'. *Current Anthropology* 43(S4), S103–S112

Bender, O and Schumacher, K 2008 'From protection to management: policies to sustain (pre-industrial) landscapes in Austria and Germany', in Fairclough, G and Møller, P (eds) *Landscape as Heritage: the management and protection of landscape in Europe, a summary by the Action COST A27 project 'Landmarks'*, 77–127. University of Berne

Bowden, M 2001 'Mapping the past: O.G.S. Crawford and the development of landscape studies'. *Landscapes* 2(2), 29–45

Bowden, M and McOmish, D 2011 'A British tradition? Mapping the archaeological landscape'. *Landscapes* 12(2), 20–40

Brück, J 2005 'Experiencing the past? The development of a phenomenological archaeology in British prehistory'. *Archaeological Dialogues* 12, 45–72

Bürgi, M, Silbernagel, J, Wu, J and Kienast, F 2015 'Linking ecosystem services with landscape history'. *Landscape Ecology* 30, 11–20

Carver, M 1996 'On archaeological value'. *Antiquity* 70, 45–56

Casey, E 1983 'Keeping the past in mind'. *The Review of Metaphysics* 37, 77–95

Casey, E 1996 'How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time: phenomenological prolegomena', in Feld, S and Basso, K (eds) *Senses of Place*, 13–52. School of American Research Press

Casey, E 2001 'Between geography and philosophy: what does it mean to be in the place-world?' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91(4), 683–93

Catsadorakis, G 2007. 'The conservation of natural and cultural heritage in Europe and the Mediterranean: a Gordian knot?' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 13, 308–20

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2014 *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* (https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GDBA_2.pdf)

Cloke, P and Jones, O 2001 'Dwelling, place and landscape: an orchard in Somerset'. *Environment and Planning A* 33, 649–66

Collins, T 2013 'Art, imagination and environment', in Howard, P, Thompson, I, and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 199–209

Conley, V 2012 *Spatial Ecologies: urban sites, state and world-space in French cultural theory*. Liverpool University Press

Convery, I, Corsane, G and Davis, P 2012 Introduction: making sense of place, in Convery, I, Corsane, G and Davis, P (eds) *Making Sense of Place*: *multidisciplinary perspectives*, 1–8

Cosgrove, D 1998 *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. University of Wisconsin Press

Cosgrove, D 2004 'Landscape and *Landschaft*'. *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute, Washington DC* 35, 57–71

Council of Europe 2000 *European Landscape Convention.* European Treaty Series 176, Florence (https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/0900001680080621)

Crawford, O G S 1953 *Archaeology in the Field.* Dent & Sons

Cresswell, T 2002 'Landscape and the obliteration of practice', in Anderson, K, Domosh, M, Pile, S and Thrift, N (eds) *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, 269–81. Sage

Cresswell, T 2004 *Place: a short introduction.* Blackwell

Cresswell, T 2009 'Place', in Thrift, N and Kitchen, R (eds) *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 169–77. Elsevier

Crouch, D 2005 'Flirting with space: thinking landscape relationally'. *cultural geographies* 17, 5–18

Crouch, D 2013 'Landscape, performance and performativity', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 119–27. Routledge

Crouch, D 2015 'Affect, heritage, feeling', in Waterton, E and Watson, S (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, 177–90. Palgrave Macmillan

Crumley, C 2018 'Historical ecology in archaeology', in Smith C (ed) *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology.* Springer (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51726-1_1779-2)

Dalglish, C 2012 'Archaeology and landscape ethics'. *World Archaeology* 44(3), 327–41

Darvill, T, Barrass, K, Drysdale, L, Heaslip, V and Staelens, Y (eds) 2019 *Historic Landscapes and Mental Well-Being.* Archaeopress

David, B and Thomas, J (eds) 2008 *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology.* Routledge

Davoudi, S and Madanipour, A 2015. 'Introduction', in Davoudi, S and Madanipour, A (eds) *Reconsidering Localism*, 1-7. Routledge

DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport) 2013 *Scheduled Monuments and nationally important but non-scheduled monuments* (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249695/SM_policy_statement_10-2013__2_.pdf)

De Boeck, F 1998 'The rootedness of trees: place as cultural and natural texture in rural southwest Congo', in Lovell, N (ed) *Locality and Belonging*, 25–52. Routledge

de Jong, K, Albina, M, Skärbäck, E, Grahn, P and Björk, J 2012 'Perceived green qualities were associated with neighborhood satisfaction, physical activity, and general health: results from a cross-sectional study in suburban and rural Scania, southern Sweden'. *Health and Place* 18, 1374–80

Debarbieux, B 2010 'The political meaning of landscape (through the lens of Hannah Arendt's The Human Condition)', in Malpas, J (ed) *The Place of Landscape: concepts, contexts, studies*, 131–49. MIT Press

Déjeant-Pons, M 2006 'The European Landscape Convention'. *Landscape Research* 31, 363–84

Dirlik, A 1999 'Place-based imagination: globalism and the politics of place'. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 22(2), 151–187

Dittmer, J and Waterton, E 2017 'Affecting the body : cultures of militarism at the Australian War Memorial', in Tolia-Kelly, D, Waterton, E and Watson, S (eds) *Heritage, Affect and Emotion: politics, practices and infrastructures*, 47–74. Routledge

Drenthen, M 2018 'Rewilding in layered landscapes as a challenge to place identity'. *Environmental Values* 27, 405–25

Drewett, P 1999 *Field Archaeology: an introduction*. UCL Press

Egoz, S and De Nardi, A 2017 'Defining landscape justice: the role of landscape in supporting wellbeing of migrants, a literature review'. *Landscape Research* 42(S1), S74–S89

English Heritage 2007 *Understanding the Archaeology of Landscapes* (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-archaeology-of-landscapes/)

English Heritage 2008 *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/)

Entrikin, N 1999 'Political community, identity and cosmopolitan place'. *International Sociology* 14, 269–82

ESF/COST 2010 *Landscape in a Changing World: bridging divides, integrating disciplines, serving society*. ESF Science Policy Briefing 41. European Science Foundations/COST Office (https://edepot.wur.nl/161371)

Eves, R 2006 'Seating the place: tropes of body, movement and space for the people of Lelet Plateau, New Ireland (Papua New Guinea)', in Fox, J (ed) *The Poetic Power of Place: comparative perspectives on Austronesian ideas of locality*, 173–94. ANU Press

Fairclough G 2008 'The United Kingdom – England', in Fairclough, G and Møller, P (eds) *Landscape as Heritage: the management and protection of landscape in Europe, a summary by the Action COST A27 project 'Landmarks'*, 269–91. University of Berne

Fairclough, G 2010 'Landscape and spatial planning in England: past achievements, present questions, future goals', in Gawroński, K and Herznik, J (eds) *Planowanie i zagospodarowanie przestrzenne jako instrument kształtowania krajobrazów kulturowych*, 125–42. Branta

Fairclough, G 2013 'Recalibrating through "landscape"'. *Landscapes* 14(1), 7–12

Fairclough, G and Møller, P 2009 'Character and change: heritage management and the future European landscape', in Orejas, A, Mattingley, D and Clavel-Lévêque, M (eds), *From Present to Past Through Landscape*, 197–220

Fairclough, G and Sarlöv Herlin, I 2005 'The meaning of countryside: what are we trying to sustain?', in McCollin, D and Jackson, J (eds) *Planning, People and Practice: the landscape ecology of sustainable landscapes*. IALE

Fairclough, G., Sarlöv Herlin, I and Swanwick, C 2018 'Landscape character approaches in global, disciplinary and policy context', in Fairclough, G., Sarlöv Herlin, I and Swanwick, C (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Landscape Character Assessment: current approaches to characterisation and assessment*, 3–20. Routledge

Farina, A, Scozzofava, S and Napoletano, B 2007 'Therapeutic landscapes: paradigms and applications'. *Journal of Mediterranean Ecology* 8, 9–13

Fleming, A 2006 Post-processual landscape archaeology: a critique. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 16, 267–80

Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH) 2015 *Historic Characterisation Thesaurus* (http://www.heritage-standards.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Historic-Characterisation-Thesaurus-Aug-2015.pdf)

Fluck, H and Holyoak, V 2017 *Ecosystem Services, Natural Capital and the Historic Environment*. Historic England Research Report 19/2017 (https://research.historicengland.org.uk/Report.aspx?i=15572)

Foster, C 2016 *Being a Beast*. Profile Books

Gammon, A R 2017 *Not Lawn, Nor Pasture, Nor Mead: rewilding and the cultural landscape*. Radboud University

Garden, M-C 2006 'The heritagescape: looking at landscapes of the past'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(5), 394–411

Giddens, A 1990 *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press

Glover, J 2019 *Landscapes Review: final report*. (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/designated-landscapes-national-parks-and-aonbs-2018-review)

Gordon, J and Barron, H 2011 *Scotland's Geodiversity: development of the basis for a national framework*. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report 417 (http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/19222/)

Gosden, C 2013 'Landscapes and scale: some introductory thoughts'. *Landscapes* 14(1), 3–6

Graham, H, Mason, R and Newman, A 2009 *Literature Review: Historic Environment, Sense of Place, and Social Capital* (https://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/2009-sense-of-place/)

Harris, O and Cipolla, C 2017 *Archaeological Theory in the New Millennium: introducing current perspectives*. Routledge

Harvey, D 2008 'The history of heritage', in Graham, B and Howard, P (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, 19–36. Ashgate

Hatton, W, Marques, B and McIntosh, J 2017 'Matauranga Maori and therapeutic landscapes', in *The IAFOR International Conference on Global Studies 2017: Official Conference Proceedings* (https://papers.iafor.org/submission35837/)

Hawkes, J 1951 *A Land*. Collins

Hearne, R 2019 '"The archaeological imagination": new ways of seeing for mental health recovery', in Darvill, T, Barrass, K, Drysdale, L, Heaslip, V and Staelens, Y (eds) *Historic Landscapes and Mental Well-Being*, 153–62. Archaeopress

Herring, P 2013 'Valuing the whole historic landscape', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 166–78. Routledge

Hicks, D and McAtackney, L 2015 'Introduction', in Hicks, D, McAtackney, L and Fairclough, G (eds) *Envisioning Landscape: situations and standpoints in archaeology and heritage*, 13–29. Left Coast Press

Historic England 2017a *Understanding Place: Historic Area Assessments* (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-place-historic-area-assessments/)

Historic England 2017b *The Setting of Heritage Assets: historic environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (2nd Edition)* (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/)

Historic England 2017c *Rural Landscapes: Register of Parks and Gardens selection guide* (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/drpgsg-rural-landscapes/)

Historic England 2018 *Places Strategy* (https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/place-making-and-design/)

Historic Scotland 2013 *Historic Land-use Assessment: type definitions* (https://hlamap.org.uk/content/about-hla)

Higgins, S, Mahon, M and McDonagh, J 2012 'Interdisciplinary interpretations and applications of the concept of scale in landscape research'. *Journal of Environmental Management* 113, 137–45

Holmes, G 2015 'What do we talk about when we talk about biodiversity conservation in the Anthropocene?' *Behaviour and Information Technology* 6, 87–108

Hooley, D 2017 'Shaping the Isles of Scilly, UK: the interplay of landscape and environment', in Pungetti, G (ed) *Island Landscapes*, 197–204. Routledge

Howard, P 2013 'Perceptual lenses', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 43–53. Routledge.

Hunziker, M, Buchecker, M and Hartig, T 2007 'Space and place – two aspects of the human-landscape relationship', in Kienast, F, Wildi, O and Ghosh, S (eds) *A Changing World: challenges for landscape research*, 47–62. Springer

Ingold, T 1993 'The temporality of the landscape'. *World Archaeology* 25(2), 152–74

Ingold, T 2000 *The Perception of the Environment: essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill.* Routledge

Ingold, T 2007 *Lines: a brief history.* Routledge

Ingold, T 2017 'Taking taskscape to task', in Rajala, U and Mills, P (eds) *Forms of Dwelling: 20 years of taskscapes in archaeology*, 16–27. Oxbow

Jansen-Verbeke, M 2009 'The territoriality paradigm in cultural tourism'. *Tourism* 19, 25–31

Jones, M and Woods, M 2013 'New localities'. *Regional Studies* 47, 29–42

Jones, O 2015 '"Not promising a landfall...": an autotopographical account of loss of place, memory and landscape'. *Environmental Humanities* 6, 1–27

Jorgensen, A 2016 'Editorial: 2016: landscape justice in an anniversary year'. *Landscape Research* 41, 1–6

Kastner, J 1998 'Preface', in Kastner, J (ed) *Land and Environmental Art*, 10–17. Phaidon

Knapp, B and Ashmore, W 1999 'Archaeological landscapes: constructed, conceptualized, ideational', in Ashmore, W and Knapp, B (eds) *Archaeologies of Landscape: contemporary perspectives.* Wiley

Kolen, J and Renes, J 2015 'Landscape biographies: key issues', in Kolen, J, Renes, H and Hermans, R (eds) *Landscape Biographies: geographical, historical and archaeological perspectives on the production and transmission of landscapes*, 21–47. Amsterdam University Press

Larwood, J 2017 'Geodiversity – a cultural template', in Larwood, J, France, S and Mahon, C (eds) *Culturally Natural or Naturally Cultural? Exploring the relationship between nature and culture through World Heritage*, 16–18. IUCN National Committee UK

Leitner, H, Sheppard, E and Sziarto, K 2007 'The spatialities of contentious politics'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33, 157–72

Lippard, L 1997 *The Lure of the Local: senses of place in a multicentered society.* New Press

Lipset, D 2014 'Place in the Anthropocene: a mangrove lagoon in Papua New Guinea in the time of rising sea-levels'. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(3), 215–43

Liu, E and Freestone, R 2016 'Revisiting Place and Placelessness', in Freestone, R and Liu, E (eds) *Place and Placelessness Revisited*, 1–19. Routledge

Lovell, N 1998 'Introduction', in Lovell, N (ed) *Locality and Belonging*, 1–24. Routledge

Low, S 2017 *Spatializing Culture: the ethnography of space and place.* Routledge

Lowenthal, D 2005 'Natural and cultural heritage'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11, 81–92

Lowenthal, D 2007 'Living with and looking at landscape'. *Landscape Research* 32, 635–56

Lowenthal, D 2013 [1993] 'Landscapes as heritage: national scenes and global changes', in Fladmark, J (ed) *Heritage: conservation, interpretation and enterprise*, 3–15. Routledge

Lund, K and Benediktsson, K 2010 'Introduction: starting a conversation with landscape', in Benediktsson, K and Lund, K (eds), *Conversations With Landscape*, 1–12. Ashgate

MacGregor, G 2016 'Neolithic past, Neolithic present: the socio-politics of prehistory', in Brophy, K, MacGregor, G and Ralston, I (eds) *The Neolithic of Mainland Scotland*. Edinburgh University Press

Malpas, J 1999 *Place and Experience: a philosophical topography*. Cambridge University Press

Malpas, J 2006 *Heidegger's Topology: being, place, world*. MIT Press

Malpas, J 2011 'Place and the problem of landscape', in Malpas, J (ed) *The Place of Landscape: concepts, contexts, studies*, 3–26. MIT Press

Malpas J 2015 'Timing space-spacing time', in Grant, S, McNeilly, J and Veerapen, M (eds) *Performance and Temporalisation*, 25–36. Palgrave Macmillan

Malpas, J 2019 'Topologies of history'. *History and Theory* 58, 3–22

Massey, D 1991 'A global sense of place'. *Marxism Today*, June 1991, 24–9

Massey, D 2011 'Landscape/space/politics: an essay' (https://thefutureoflandscape.files.wordpress.com/2020/08/landscape-space-politics.pdf)

Meegan, R 2017 'Doreen Massey (1944–2016): a geographer who really mattered'. *Regional Studies* 51, 1285–96

Merriman, P, Revill, G, Cresswell, T, Lorimer, H, Matless, D, Rose, G and Wylie, J 2008 'Landscape, mobility, practice'. *Social and Cultural Geography* 9:2, 191–212

MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) 2018 *National Planning Policy Framework* (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2)

Morton, T 2007 *Ecology Without Nature: rethinking environmental aesthetics*. Harvard University Press

Muir, R 2000 'Conceptualising landscape'. *Landscapes* 1, 4–21

Munn, N 1996 'Excluded spaces: the figure in the Australian aboriginal landscape'. *Critical Inquiry* 22, 446–65

Natural England 2009 *Green Infrastructure Guidance* (http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033)

Neimanis, A, Åsberg, C and Hedrén, J 2015 'Four problems, four directions for environmental humanities: toward critical posthumanities for the Anthropocene'. *Ethics and the Environment* 20, 67–97

Olwig, K 2005 'Representation and alienation in the political land-*scape*'. *Cultural Geographies* 12, 19–40

Pendlebury, J 2002 'Conservation and regeneration: complementary or conflicting processes? The case of Grainger Town, Newcastle upon Tyne'. *Planning Practice and Research* 17(2), 145–58

Pendlebury J 2013 'Conservation values, the authorised heritage discourse and the conservation-planning assemblage'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19(7), 709–27.

Pendlebury, J and Porfyriou, H 2017. 'Heritage, urban regeneration and place-making'. *Journal of Urban Design* 22(4), 429–32

Phillips, A and Young, C 2017 'Culture and nature – two sides of the same World Heritage coin', in Larwood, J, France, S and Mahon, C (eds) *Culturally Natural or Naturally Cultural? Exploring the relationship between nature and culture through World Heritage*, 1–8. IUCN National Committee UK

Pierce, J, Martin, D and Murphy, J 2011 'Relational place-making: the networked politics of place'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36, 54–70

Pink, S 2008 'An urban tour: the sensory sociality of ethnographic place-making'. *Ethnography* 9, 175–96

Pink, S 2009 *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. Sage

Plumwood, V 2006 'The concept of a cultural landscape: nature, culture and agency in the land'. *Ethics and the Environment* 11(2), 115–50

Priede, C 2009 *Understanding Landscape Values: a Scottish Highland case study*. British Archaeological Reports British Series 502. Archaeopress

Project for Public Spaces 2008 *A Guide to Neighborhood Placemaking in Chicago* (http://placemakingchicago.com/cmsfiles/placemaking_guide.pdf)

Reilly, S, Nolan, C and Monckton, L 2018. *Wellbeing and the Historic Environment.* Historic England (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/wellbeing-and-the-historic-environment/)

Relph, E 1976 *Place and Placelessness.* Pion

Relph, E 2018 'Place and Placelessness summarized' (https://www.academia.edu/36528536/A_Summary_Version_of_Place_and_Placelessness)

Richardson, T 2015 'Introduction', in Richardson, T (ed) *Walking Inside Out: contemporary British psychogeography*, 1–27. Rowman & Littlefield

Rippon, S 2007 'Historic Landscape Characterisation: its role in contemporary British archaeology and landscape history'. *Landscapes* 8(2), 1–14

Rodman, M 1992 'Empowering place: multilocality and multivocality'. *American Anthropologist* 94, 640–56

Roe, M and Taylor, K 2014 'New cultural landscapes: emerging issues, context and themes', in Roe, M and Taylor, K (eds) *New Cultural Landscapes*, 1–23. Routledge.

Schröder, I 2007 'Debates on space, community and locality in anthropology, and their usefulness for the study of region'. *Lietwos Etnologija* 7(16), 77–90

Selman, P and Swanwick, C 2010 'On the meaning of natural beauty in landscape legislation'. *Landscape Research* 35, 3–26

Sheail, J 2007 '"One and the same historic landscape": a physical/cultural perspective'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 13, 321–34

Sheppard, E 2002 'The spaces and times of globalization: place, scale, networks, and positionality'. *Economic Geography* 78(3), 307–30

Shoard, M 1987 *This Land is Our Land.* Collins

Swanwick, C and Fairclough, G 2018 'Landscape character: experience from Britain', in Fairclough, G, Sarlöv Herlin, I and Swanwick, C (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Landscape Character Assessment: current approaches to characterisation and assessment*, 21–36. Routledge

Swyngedouw, E 2004 'Globalisation or "glocalisation"? Networks, territories and rescaling'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17(1), 25–48

Szabó, P 2015 'Historical ecology: past, present and future'. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 90, 997–1014

Tait, M and Inch, A 2016 'Putting localism in place: conservative images of the good community and the contradictions of planning reform in England'. *Planning Practice and Research* 31, 174–94

Taylor, K and Francis, K 2014 'Culture–nature dilemmas: confronting the challenge of the integration of culture and nature', in Roe, M and Taylor, K (eds) *New Cultural Landscapes*, 24–40. Routledge

Terkenli, T 2005 'New landscape spatialities: the changing scales of function and symbolism'. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 70, 165–76

Thomas, J 2017 'Landscape, taskscape, life', in Rajala, U and Mills, P (eds) *Forms of Dwelling: 20 years of taskscapes in archaeology*, 268–79. Oxbow Books

Thompson, I, Howard, P, and Waterton, E 2013 'Introduction', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 1–7. Routledge

Tilley, C and Cameron-Daum, K 2017 *An Anthropology of Landscape: the extraordinary in the ordinary*. UCL Press

Tolia-Kelly, D, Waterton, E and Watson, S 2017 'Heritage, affect and emotion', in Tolia-Kelly, D, Waterton, E and Watson, S (eds) *Heritage, Affect and Emotion*, 1–11. Routledge

Torre, A 2008 'Un "tournant spatial" en histoire? Paysages, regards, ressources'. *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 63(5), 1127–44

Tsing, A 2019 'The buck, the bull, and the dream of the stag: some unexpected weeds of the Anthropocene', in Lounela, A, Berglund, E and Kallinen, T (eds) *Dwellings in Political Landscapes: contemporary anthropological perspectives*, 33–52. Studia Fennica Anthropologica 4

Tuan, Y-F 1977 *Space and Place: the perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota Press

Turner, S 2018 'Historic Landscape Characterisation: an archaeological approach to landscape heritage', in Fairclough, G, Sarlöv Herlin, I and Swanwick, C (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Landscape Character Assessment: current approaches to characterisation and assessment*, 37–50. Routledge

UK National Ecosystem Assessment 2014 *The UK National Ecosystem Assessment: synthesis of the key findings*. (https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/the-uk-national-ecosystem-assessment--synthesis-of-the-key-findings-and-technical-reports)

Van Dyck, H 2012 'Changing organisms in rapidly changing anthropogenic landscapes: the significance of the "Umwelt"-concept and functional habitat for animal conservation'. *Evolutionary Applications* 5(2), 144–53

Waterton, E 2005 'Whose sense of place? reconciling archaeological perspectives with community values: cultural landscapes in England'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(4), 309–25

Waterton, E 2010 *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan

Waterton, E 2013 'Landscape and non-representational theories', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 66–75. Routledge

Wattchow, B 2013 'Landscape and a sense of place: a creative tension', in Howard, P, Thompson, I and Waterton, E (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, 87–96. Routledge

Wentworth, J 2011 'The ecosystem approach'. *POSTnote* 377

Werlen, B 2009 'Regionalisations, everyday', in Thrift, N and Kitchin, R (eds), *International Encyclopaedia for Human Geography*, 286–93. Elsevier

Whatmore, S 2006 'Materialist returns: practising cultural geography in and for a more-than-human world'. *cultural geographies* 13, 600–9

WMRA (West Midlands Regional Assembly) 2006 *Green Infrastructure: a prospectus for the West Midlands Region* (https://issuu.com/healthygreenfutures/docs/wm_green_prospectis)

Wetherell, M, Smith, L and Campbell, G 2018 'Introduction: affective heritage practices', in Smith, L, Wetherell, M and Campbell, G (eds), *Emotion, Affective Practices, and the Past in the Present*, 1–21. Routledge

White, M, Bates, M, Pope, M, Schreve, D, Scott, B, Shaw, A and Stafford, E 2016 *Lost Landscapes of Palaeolithic Britain: the contribution of projects funded by the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund 2002-2011*. Oxford Archaeology

Wilkinson, P 2018 *Irreplaceable: a history of England in 100 places*. Historic England

Williams, D and Stewart, S 1998 'Sense of place: an elusive concept that is finding a home in ecosystem management'. *Journal of Forestry* 96(5), 18–23

Wylie, J 2007 *Landscape*. Routledge

Wylie, J 2017 'The distant: thinking toward renewed senses of landscape and distance'. *Environment, Space, Place* 9(1), 1–20

Young Foundation 2010 *How can Neighbourhoods be Understood and Defined?* (https://youngfoundation.org/publications/how-can-neighbourhoods-be-understood-and-defined/)

Historic England Research and the Historic Environment

We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment.

A good understanding of the historic environment is fundamental to ensuring people appreciate and enjoy their heritage and provides the essential first step towards its effective protection.

Historic England works to improve care, understanding and public enjoyment of the historic environment. We undertake and sponsor authoritative research. We develop new approaches to interpreting and protecting heritage and provide high quality expert advice and training.

We make the results of our work available through the Historic England Research Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our online magazine Historic England Research which appears twice a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside Historic England up-to-date with our projects and activities.

A full list of Research Reports, with abstracts and information on how to obtain copies, may be found on www.HistoricEngland.org.uk/researchreports

Some of these reports are interim reports, making the results of specialist investigations available in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation.

Where no final project report is available, you should consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in these reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of Historic England.

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within Historic England. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series, the Architectural Investigation Report Series, and the Research Department Report Series.