

THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION — REBALANCING OUR APPROACH TO LANDSCAPE?

Paul Selman

*Department of Landscape, University of Sheffield,
Arts Tower, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK
p.selman@shef.ac.uk*

Key words: *landscape policy, landscape objectives, multifunctionality, futures*

Landscape policy has tended to be very conservative and has often concentrated on retaining traditional cultural landscapes. However, in many cases, these landscapes have lost their primary economic and social functions and can only be maintained through payments to farmers or by direct purchase. Whilst this is appropriate in some circumstances, it cannot be a general solution for all European landscapes in the 21st century. The European Landscape Convention (ELC) affirms that landscape planning is about “strong forward-looking action to enhance, restore or create landscapes”; it defines protection and management in equally positive ways. The ELC is also emphatically concerned with “ordinary” places in town and country that people experience in their daily lives, as well as with exceptional rural landscapes. In the 21st century, we are becoming more positive about the inevitability of landscape change in relation to “drivers” associated with a range of future scenarios. This requires new scientific capacity in order to facilitate strong forward-looking action that is related to sustainability, multifunctionality and stakeholder participation. This paper will address the progress that needs to be made in relation to landscape objectives in order to pursue legitimate future strategies for planning, protection and management. In a context of cultural, economic and environmental uncertainties, the paper will consider how the ELC can provide a basis for accepting and influencing landscape change rather than simply seeking to preserve the inherited patterns.

Introduction

Interest in landscape as an object of government and voluntary activity principally emerged during the 19th century. This reflected both a romantic concern about the cultural and picturesque landscapes of the “Old World” in the face of industrialisation, and a proto-ecological concern for the sublime landscapes of the “New World” in the face of conquest. During the 20th century, this evolved into a more scientific and ad-

ministrative concern to delimit and safeguard designated spaces as cultural heritage or biodiversity refuges. Scientific knowledge further supported a growing interest in the reclamation and restoration of damaged landscapes in areas of industrial decline (Selman, 2010). In these expert activities, there was relatively little scope for community involvement in design, planning or management.

In recent decades, there has been rapid diversification of the landscape agenda — essentially shifting it from a sectoral, visual and

static entity to an integrative, functional and dynamic one. Thus, there is a trend to represent landscape not as a policy sector, but as an integrative system. It is no longer seen as simply one more natural resource to be factored in alongside others such as biodiversity, forestry and hydrology, but as an overarching framework that synthesises the “services” (Termorshuizen and Opdam, 2009) delivered by all these social-ecological subsystems. Further, there is a growing realisation that landscape is everywhere and matters to all people (Natural England, 2008a), often in subconscious ways. Landscape policy has historically focused on scenic hotspots, and has either overlooked or physically sanitised “the urban centre, the (sub)urban fringe and the rural countryside of the urban network” (Antrop, 2004). Now, we are moving towards the orchestration of a green infrastructure that connects people and place across entire territories (CABE, 2009). There is also a growing importance attached to the multifunctionality of landscape — it is not just something to be spectated, but something that regulates water quality and quantity, helps adapt to and mitigate climate change, supports biodiversity and natural resource production, sustains soil fertility, promotes health and wellbeing, gives delight, supports sustainable economic activity and energy production, and helps people to attach themselves in time and place (Gill *et al.*, 2008; Landscape Institute, 2009; Selman, 2009). Along with this more functional view of landscape, comes a more dynamic one. Thus, landscape actions increasingly acknowledge the inevitability of contemporary economic and cultural drivers (Natural England, 2009d). Rather than trying to stop landscapes changing, the focus is now on securing appropriate rates of change, from slow to fast, and trying to ensure that drivers are sensitive to local character and scale. More positively, we may even seek to couple contemporary drivers to the creation of new multifunctional social-ecological sys-

tems. Alongside all this, is our growing competence in mapping stakeholders, of involving them in assessments of landscape character and value, and engaging them in decisions about landscape protection, planning and management.

The European Landscape Convention as a change agent

Into this changing context has come the ELC. I would like to suggest that the ELC will accelerate substantive changes in theory and practice regarding the European cultural landscape. However, it is an instrument whose effect may be evolutionary and subtle rather than revolutionary and dramatic. Over the past century, our approach to landscape has essentially been twofold: recognising the finest cultural landscapes as heritage, and protecting them through legal measures; and implementing various improvements in ordinary or damaged landscapes. Further, we have provided and managed large areas of urban open space, although we have often not regarded them as strategically connected landscape. Some actions, such as landscape protection and visual impact assessment, have been systematised in law, whilst others have often been opportunistic and reliant on intermittent finance and enthusiastic project officers.

A central issue associated with the present European landscape is the problem that many of our finest cultural landscapes are economically and socially obsolescent. The drivers that spontaneously and serendipitously produced them have largely disappeared, and we are apprehensive about what the new drivers are bringing. Our cultural landscape is therefore changing and it cannot be ubiquitously cocooned, even though it is of profound importance to our shared heritage and identity.

I argue that the ELC is making us look again at the meanings and implications of protection, management and planning, whilst

at the same time subtly mainstreaming landscape into policy, practice and governance. I suspect that its effect may not be dramatic and perhaps not easily disentangled from other influences. Indeed, when we evaluate the ELC we may be disappointed in its lack of measurable and directly attributable impact on legislatures and budgets. However, I think the effect of the ELC will be subtle yet profound: first, in the ways we think about landscape as an integrative framework, principally by liberating it from the policy silo that we associate with “scenery”; and, second, through raising our consciousness about the need for landscape actions, in both town and country, that respond to contemporary drivers in positive, democratic and imaginative ways.

In the text of the ELC, the Preamble promotes what is essentially a multifunctional perspective, referring to sustainable development, culture, ecology, environment, society, economic activity, heritage, well-being, identity, quality of life, rural resource production and civil society. The Convention also uses a generic term for policy and practice interventions, namely, “actions”. These actions comprise a combination of protection, management and planning conducted over mappable territories. Parts of a territory can be protected, parts may be intentionally adapted, and all of it can be managed in various ways (Council of Europe, 2008; Land Use Consultants, 2009a–c). This terminology subtly draws us away from our inherited mindsets and practices. In particular, it reminds us that conservation of our finest cultural landscape heritage, important though it may be, is not the be-all-and-end-all. Indeed, somewhat to our surprise, conservation does not even constitute “planning”, but is “protection” — “planning” is defined as something altogether different. I suggest that there are three ambushes that the ELC sets for the traditional landscape professional. First, it promotes a modern view of landscape as a multifunctional system providing

a rich variety of landscape services that are not only desirable for people’s enjoyment, but essential for human wellbeing. Second, it democratises landscape by emphasising the role of civil society, often in challenging and unsettling ways. Third, it re-balances our actions, away from an excessive concern for scenic heritage protection, towards more urbanised landscapes and the active accommodation of change. Landscape actions may be protectionist, but they may also be radically adaptive, stimulating the emergence of new cultural landscapes by working with the grain of inescapable economic and cultural drivers.

The UK as a case study

I suspect that the UK Government’s approach is fairly typical in relation to the ELC: presenting an argument that it is already compliant, and that any supplementary action is based on goodwill rather than obligation. In this perspective, refinement and targeted exemplary action are desirable, but no urgent substantive changes are needed. Thus, the Government’s expressed priority is to raise awareness of existing measures and to make the statutory and regulatory framework more fully effective at different administrative and spatial scales. When key policy areas are being reviewed — for example, planning, energy, marine, agri-environment, heritage, forestry, housing, infrastructure etc. — the Government’s intention will be to “raise the bar”. There is an acknowledgement of the scope to improve, but no suggestion of any need for a paradigm shift. The nature of the UK response to the ELC can now be tracked through several policy documents, research studies and action plans that have recently become available.

Policy guidance in England (Natural England, 2009a) suggests that implementation of the ELC will entail:

- Improving performance within the current legal and regulatory frame;

- Influencing future legislation, regulation and advice, and identifying any gaps;
- Improving the understanding of landscape character and dynamics, and monitoring changes and trends;
- Engaging people through activities that raise awareness and understanding, and more generally through, promotion, education & training.
- Sharing experiences and best practice.

If effective, this should allegedly mean that: “all England’s diverse landscapes are valued and well looked after... all landscapes will be more effectively planned, well-designed and sensitively managed with people in mind.” This will be promoted through a series of action plans within different organisations in order to:

- strengthen institutional frameworks — promoting a landscape perspective to influence spatial planning, land use and resource management nationally, regionally and locally.
- create an inclusive, people centred approach — raising public awareness and fostering community engagement, as well as working with professionals, specialist bodies and politicians.

In England, the production of action planning is initially centred on three organisations, Natural England, English Heritage and The National Forest (Natural England, 2008, 2009; English Heritage, 2008; National Forest Company, 2008).

Some of the clearest evidence of the UK’s current landscape policy position has been made available through a qualitative content analysis of national and regional documents, undertaken by Newcastle University (Roe *et al.*, 2008). This study revealed the degree to which policy documents espoused the intent of the ELC, and it reminds us that one of the most subtle yet telling impacts of the ELC will be the way that it leads to changes in

the language of official landscape discourses. Nuances of meaning can transform the status of landscape from a cosmetic optional extra to an holistic framework. By subjecting key documents to “intent assessments”, the Newcastle study found that even the more progressive documents often only made implicit references to landscape, because they used proxy terms, such as environment or countryside. The use of terminology typically reflects the focus and intended audiences of particular departments, so that even if they use the term “landscape” it may not necessarily convey the human-landscape interactions that are central to the ELC. The researchers found that “the environment sector tends not to use the term *landscape* or other proxies in a way that provides a reflection of the Convention’s intent”, and hence it would be desirable to introduce:

- stronger use of landscape-related language generally;
- more consistent and precise use of language, providing greater clarity in documents;
- explicit use of “landscape” instead of “environment” or other proxies more generally, especially whenever the holistic meaning is indicated;
- specific use of ELC terms, particularly referencing the definitions set out in Article 1.

We could speculate that one consequence of the more explicit use of ELC terms could be a foregrounding in policy of modern ideas about landscape as an integrating framework.

Another research study, by the International Centre for Protected Landscapes (ICPL) (2008) for the Scottish Landscape Forum, centred on an assessment of what makes for “quality”¹ and “good practice” in the context of landscape protection, management and planning. The study drew particular attention to the capacity of the ELC to mainstream landscape into decisions, and to ensure that

it is fully built-in to the process at the outset, rather than as a late entrant. The ICPL study related the idea of mainstreaming to whether signatory countries had:

- a strategic policy vision for landscapes;
- public involvement in landscape matters (ideally supported by legislation);
- indicators to help measure improvements in the quality of people's lives; and
- measures to conserve the natural and cultural diversity of landscapes.

To date, these ingredients are rarely made explicit, and so the researchers had to detect them as “silver threads” running through policies, programmes and projects. The study identified a number of good practice exemplars and sought to explain the reasons for their success.

It also undertook SWOT² analyses of landscape policy in Scotland and other countries' experiences in implementing the ELC. Success appeared to be principally dependent on a willingness to pursue integrated initiatives, and exemplary action was frequently associated with individual champions, active and iterative public involvement and ownership, and ongoing political support and funding. Even so, there appeared to be a widespread reliance on episodic “initiatives” rather than embedded practice, and on rural (rather than territorially inclusive) expressions of landscape. Strengths and opportunities mainly related to: the intrinsic popularity of landscape and its capacity to engage people and connect them to place; the evolution of a more holistic view of landscape; the emergence of landscape as a policy driver in relation to topics such as climate change and spatial planning, and the emergence around Europe of some excellent new approaches towards landscape protection, planning and management. Weaknesses and threats, though, included inconsistent approaches towards implementing the Articles, the tendency towards elitist “no change” landscape agendas,

dilution of the landscape message because it is dispersed between professions and departments, widespread perception of landscape as a bolt-on rather than a mainstream factor, scarcity of clear national policies, traditional assumptions that landscape is restricted to “fine countryside”, and a perception of landscape as something that is used by objectors to oppose development.

A further research study (Roe *et al.*, 2009), undertaken for Defra and other UK departments analysed how the requirements of the ELC were being met across numerous sectors and identified areas of implicit and explicit landscape coverage. The study found:

- There is a sufficient but somewhat limited basis for “recognising landscapes in law”, particularly through National Parks legislation (natural beauty) and planning policy guidance (amenity and townscape);
- Actions concerning “landscape protection” are relatively strong, notably the designation of key areas (e.g. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and features (e.g. Tree Preservation Orders), safeguarding of amenity through general planning controls, and minimising visual intrusion of development through environmental impact assessment;
- “Management” provisions are also strong in places, such as direct implementation (e.g. nature reserves) and indirect care (farmers and foresters). This involves a range of incentive and penalty based approaches, and there is some evidence of a landscape-scale approach in the wider countryside. In towns and cities, there is a strong tradition of greenspace provision, but until the recent emergence of green infrastructure strategies there has been little appreciation of it as a coherent landscape;
- Delivery of “landscape planning” is variable, but landscape design occurs as an element within urban design, there is a growing awareness of green infrastructure,

there are isolated initiatives to create new urban and peri-urban landscapes and some of these are at the landscape-scale (e.g. central Scotland forest network), and some restoration programmes have been at the landscape scale;

- There has been some integration of landscape into spatial planning policies, though these often focus on fairly traditional “protection” measures. There is some recognition of the importance of landscape within other policy areas — such as health and wellbeing, climate change, biodiversity and inward investment;
- There is very little explicit development of Landscape Quality Objectives as a result of which it is difficult to say whether things are getting better or worse, or whether the ELC is having any impact. Whilst there are extensive procedures for public and stakeholder participation, these rarely touch upon landscape or lead to the production of LQOs.

Overall, the study found that provision for “protection” is broad and deep though predominantly rural, whilst provision for management is somewhat unsystematic, and provision for landscape planning tends to refer to “set pieces”.

Once again, the weak articulation of explicit LQOs makes it difficult to pursue actions that are appropriately balanced between conservation, reinforcement, restoration and creation — partly as a result of which landscape policy tends to default towards preservationism rather than work with the consequences and opportunities of “change drivers”. Some individual local authorities are now starting to adopt new criterion-based spatial planning policies and these have the potential to diversify our landscape actions. For example, the Shrewsbury and Atcham Council has published a “model” planning policy on Landscape Character, which states that:

The landscape character of the district shall be protected, conserved and enhanced. Proposals for development shall take into account the local distinctiveness and sensitivity of each character area. Development will only be permitted if it protects and enhances and does not adversely affect:

- i) The landscape character of the area including its historical, cultural and ecological qualities and sensitivities and its tranquillity;
- ii) The setting of, and relationship between, settlement and buildings and the landscape including view corridors;
- iii) The pattern of woodland, trees, field boundaries, vegetation and other features;
- iv) The special qualities of watercourses and waterbodies and their surroundings;
- v) The topography of the area including skylines and hills.

It will be interesting to see how such policies are interpreted in practice, and whether consistent and imaginative decisions are now taken that reflect a range of possibilities in relation to fast and slow landscape change.

Discussion

From the Council of Europe’s own workshops, and from various research studies, it appears that there is an adequate current level of compliance with the ELC. Indeed, there are some instances of very commendable action in all areas. However, realising the full opportunity of the ELC will involve considerably more than “raising the bar”. What evidence can we see that changes of a more radical nature are evolving?

First, the political requirement to demonstrate a respectable response to the ELC coupled with the rising prominence of the landscape agenda generally, are leading some organisations to set out their credentials as landscape champions. They are re-assessing their capacity to deliver landscape objectives, anticipating that an enhanced

and modernised landscape portfolio might increase their institutional resilience. For example, English Heritage (2008) has seized on the ELC as a vehicle to promote their role in relation to “place”, both re-asserting what they already do and re-directing their efforts towards areas that are seen to be growing in political and social significance. Thus, they define their aspiration as wishing to establish themselves as “a centre of excellence for the historic dimension of landscape in town and country, and in the marine zone”.

Second, the ELC is having an effect in shaping new legislation. In a few cases this may be primary legislation. More commonly it is likely to be secondary legislation and guidance. Most signatories concede that, whilst they have little primary legislation on landscape itself, they can brigade a range of other legislation which can be construed as satisfying Article 5a. For example, in England, the Draft National Planning Policy Framework reflects a multifunctional approach to landscape (DCLG, 2011), although it is not always explicitly worded as such. A substantial section on “Planning for Places” draws together various expressions of landscape in relation to climate change, flooding, coastal change, valued landscapes, biodiversity and historic environment. It recognises complementary roles for protection, restoration and re-creation, along with the need for landscape-scale biodiversity measures and green infrastructure networks. The National Planning Framework for Scotland (Scottish Government, 2009) both recognises the importance of new drivers, such as climate change, in promoting landscape changes such as afforestation, and advocates various ways in which building environmental capital at a landscape scale can deliver important benefits for the economy and communities.

Third, the ELC is having an effect in the democratisation of landscape, specifically the wider inclusion of civil society. This is not

an area in which we have been traditionally strong, and even now many of our attempts to involve non-experts in landscape assessment, planning and design seem simplistic and unsystematic. However, in relation to the ELC requirement for awareness-raising, English Heritage (2008) aims to “use the ELC as an opportunity and context to expand public initiatives to promote the historic environment at landscape level.” Within their in-house staff development programmes, they aim to “integrate the ELC concept of landscape into training and related initiatives.” More generally, the public is encouraged to take an active part in landscape management and planning, and to feel it has responsibility for what happens to the landscape. However, this is an area in which practice is often still primitive apart from, perhaps, in the assessment of local landscape character. Our relatively few attempts at involving people in landscape evaluations and decisions have sometimes been platitudinous and patchy. We will need to develop far more effective and systematic approaches to engaging the public in landscape options, and here the substantial rhetoric of the ELC may have a slow but insistent effect. There are effective ways of engaging people in the imaginative exploration of landscape possibilities (Moore-Colyer and Scott, 2005) and harnessing latent energy in the management and maintenance of green infrastructure, but expertise and resources are very unevenly spread at present.

Fourth, the ELC is opening a crucial debate about what we mean by landscape quality and how we set objectives in relation to this (CoE, 2007). Whilst we have made tremendous progress in mapping landscape character, structure and even change, we have achieved little consensus about landscape quality and the setting and monitoring of quality objectives. In regard to Landscape Quality Objectives (LQOs), even the ELC is inconsistent, stating at the outset that these

comprise “the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings”, a statement which is subsequently abated to one of LQOs being formulated by public authorities “after public consultation”. The latter view seems to prevail and indeed seems more realistic and workable. I would argue that the setting of LQOs is the key area in which the ELC will promote evolutionary change to revolutionary effect. Landscape planners face a peculiar problem: in most areas of public policy there is a self-evidently desirable “direction of travel”, for example we would not want to see an increase in homelessness or traffic congestion, or a decrease in educational attainment. However, except perhaps in relation to a small number of “perfect” cultural landscapes which we want to preserve intact for posterity, the desired direction of future travel for present landscapes is not necessarily obvious. Even apparently degraded landscapes may have important attributes that “insiders” value and want to retain rather than remediate, whilst significant cultural landscapes might properly be allowed to fade into a vestigial “remanence” rather than be conserved. We know that landscapes are changing but it is not always clear whether they are getting better or worse, or even what better or worse really means. The need for, and success of, landscape actions can therefore only be judged in relation to carefully negotiated and articulated objectives for that particular locality. Perhaps the biggest impact of the ELC will be to force us to develop explicit LQOs for all areas, ascertain their democratically informed “direction of travel”, and create broad and local strategies against which the nature and speed of change can be benchmarked.

Fifth, the ELC’s definition of landscape applies to the whole territory of states including all urban and peri-urban landscapes, towns, villages and rural areas, the coast and inland areas. It applies to ordinary or even degraded landscape (Ling *et al.*, 2007) as

well as those areas that are outstanding or protected. This sheer inclusivity of definition will, I suggest, have a far-reaching impact on our theories and practices. In effect, it is promoting two lines of action in relation to the “ordinary”. On the one hand, we are beginning to recognise that “all landscapes matter”: although this principle is now quite effectively articulated, it is rarely being given real meaning in front-line practice. Most practitioners still tend to think of landscape action as largely referring to the conservation of special rural areas, or to the design of urban public realm. Techniques such as Landscape Character Assessment, Seascape Assessment and Historic Landscape Characterisation are at least helping us to document and describe all landscapes including the mundane. On the other hand, having affirmed that local and undistinguished landscapes matter because of their associative and utilitarian uses for local people, what actions do we take in respect of the ordinary? We cannot promise to preserve every patch of “common ground” in perpetuity. We cannot offer to shower taxpayers’ money nor subsidise community actions in respect of them all. In sum, the ELC has underpinned an awareness that “all landscapes matter”, but it has exposed lacunae in terms of what we do about this.

Sixth, the ELC is subtly re-focusing the way in which we think about change. Whilst planners and managers have endorsed the notion of landscape change at a cerebral level, our frontline practice has tended to be very conservative in relation to the acceptable types, directions and rates of change. Few landscape planners are brave enough to really embrace contemporary drivers of change and couple them to the emergence of new and potentially very different landscapes. In some contexts slow change is desirable, but in other situations our conservative tendency towards the inherited landscape may exert an unhelpful inertial drag. Landscape is a dynamic, complex system of which the

reality, representations and perceptions have changed through history in response to physical processes and human intervention. The rate of change in the future is likely to accelerate further driven by natural environmental processes, induced climate change, technological advancement, economic and market trends, social and cultural trends, changing values, and policy and regulatory interventions (Land Use Consultants, 2009a). These drivers are strongly inter-related: most changes in the landscape are attributable to more than one root cause and their acceptability is filtered by changing social values. The need for creative and adaptive approaches towards landscape as a dynamic system are essential yet there is little in legislation or policy guidance to help or guide us about options for change.

Future prospects

There are mixed views about whether the ELC will have any real long-term impact on important areas of governance and enterprise. This paper has suggested that its effect may be subtle and gradual, perhaps only initially detectable in the use of more explicit terminology. However, it is quite likely that new and important things will be said, written and done as a consequence of the ELC, slowly leading to some fundamental shifts. Not least, the ELC, whether intended or not, is making us face up to some difficult problems associated with responding to contemporary drivers of landscape change, involving stakeholders and the wider public, celebrating the “ordinary” as well as the “special”, and negotiating measurable and place-sensitive objectives for landscape quality.

Returning to the title of the paper, I suggest that these shifts will be reflected in a re-balancing of some key landscape practices. First, the ELC awakens us to the fact that our actions must combine protection, planning and management. It forces us to

re-think what we mean by these distinct yet complementary activities and how we might strike a more even balance between them. In particular, it reminds us that landscape is not something that is simply inherited, but something that is constantly being managed, enhanced, restored and created.

Second, the ELC is leading us to find a new balance between conserving Europe’s outstanding landscape heritage, and giving meaningful expression to the axiom that “all landscapes matter”. Landscape is now seen as a multifunctional system that delivers a wide range of ecosystem services to diverse communities in all geographical settings. The realisation of these essential services cannot be left to scattered short-term projects, and they merit the same systematic attention that we have given to our national and regional parks.

Third, the ELC is promoting a new balance between insiders and outsiders in landscape. We have very good experience of expert management of special areas, scientific restoration and remediation of post-industrial landscapes, assessing landscape quality and impact, and designing public realm. We have become quite good at involving local people in the more fine-grained aspects of landscape character assessment, and have undertaken some research into people’s local landscape preferences. There are a number of good practice case studies of community level action to manage open space. However, I think we are a good way off really understanding how people perceive and value everyday landscapes, and of factoring this information into landscape quality objectives. The ELC requires a step change in this area, and will require new theories about subconscious appreciation of the landscape and people’s acceptance of change — otherwise I think the “public” input will tend to be banal and anti-development.

Fourth, the ELC is forcing a reassessment of the balance between town and country. In

popular mythology, the landscape is something beautiful and rural. In reality, landscape is everywhere, from the metropolitan centre, through the urban fringes and edge cities of polycentric urban clusters, to the remotest mountains. A major future task for landscape planners will be to re-connect social-ecological systems that have been severed, and to blur the boundary between urban and rural so that nature and food production sweep through the green infrastructure of cities.

Finally, the ELC requires a new balance between protectionist and proactive approaches. By distinguishing between the actions of protection and planning, the ELC firmly reminds us that the safeguard of our finest landscape heritage is only one side of the coin. Creating future landscapes, often by working with “change drivers” is going to be increasingly important, especially as we seek to re-connect systems in order to respond to environmental drivers such as climate, biodiversity, and the problems of too little or too much water.

The ELC, therefore, whilst perhaps only a background ripple on the overall political scene, has the potential to gradually bring about substantive changes in our science and policy. One further re-balancing effect that I think it will have is to establish Europe as a greenprint (McEwen and McEwen, 1987) for other parts of the world. Presently, there is an over-emphasis on the cultural landscapes and greenspace systems of the “old world”. These, of course, are incredibly important — but so are the urban and rural landscapes of the rapidly developing countries. There, the growth of megacities and intensification of agriculture pose major threats to landscape services, with profound implications for sustainability and liveability. I anticipate, therefore, that a new balance will be struck between the attention given to the landscapes of developed and developing countries. One lesson of the ELC is that Europe’s landscapes are so important that we need to share good

practice in all areas of protection, planning, management and education. Another lesson is that this experience is too important to keep to ourselves, and that we must encourage the rest of the world to access our greenprints.

References

Antrop, M. (2004). Assessing multi-scale values and multifunctionality in landscapes. In: J. Brandt and Vejre, H. (Eds.). *Multifunctional Landscapes: Theory, Values and History*. Volume 1. UK: WIT Press.

Commission on Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) (2009). Grey to Green, How to shift funding and skills to green our cities. London: CABE. <http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/Documents/Documents/Publications/CABE/grey-to-green.pdf>

Council of Europe (2007). *Proceedings of the 5th Meeting of the Workshops of the Council of Europe for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention. Landscape quality objectives: from theory to practice*. Girona, Spain. Strasbourg: CoE Publishing.

Council of Europe (2008). Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)3 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the guidelines for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/landscape/versionsorientation/anglais.pdf>

de Groot, R.S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., Willemsen, L. (2009). Challenges in integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision making. *Ecological Complexity*. doi: 10.1016/j.ecocom.2009.10.006.

Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2011). Draft National Planning Policy Framework — a Consultation Draft. <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/draftframework>

English Heritage (2008). English Heritage Action Plan for Implementation of the

European Landscape Convention. <http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.20574>.

Gill, S.E., Handley, J.F., Ennos, A.R., Pauleit, S., Theuray, N., Lindley, S.J. (2008). Characterising the urban environment of UK cities and towns: A template for landscape planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 87, 210–222.

International Centre for Protected Landscapes (ICPL) (2008). Identifying Good Practice From Countries Implementing The European Landscape Convention. Final Project Report submitted by ICPL, Project Reference: ICP/001/07.

Land Use Consultants (2009a). Guidelines For Implementing The European Landscape Convention, Part 1: What Does It Mean For Your Organisation? Prepared for Natural England by Land Use Consultants. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cemat/compendium/UKGuidelinesPart1.pdf>

Land Use Consultants (2009b). Guidelines For implementing the European landscape Convention, Part 2: Integrating the intent of The ELC into plans, policies and strategies. Prepared for Natural England by Land Use Consultants. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cemat/compendium/UKGuidelinesPart2.pdf>

Land Use Consultants (2009c). Guidelines For implementing the European Landscape Convention, Part 3: Preparing an ELC Action Plan. Prepared for Natural England by Land Use Consultants. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/cemat/compendium/UKGuidelinesPart3.pdf>

Landscape Institute (2009). Green Infrastructure: connected and multifunctional landscapes. <http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/PDF/Contribute/GreenInfrastructurepositionstatement13May09.pdf>

Ling, C., Handley, J., Rodwell, J. (2007). Restructuring the Post-industrial Landscape: A Multifunctional Approach. *Landscape Research*, 32(3), 285–309.

McEwen, A., McEwen, M. (1987).

Greenprints for the Countryside: the Story of Britain's National Parks. London: Allen and Unwin.

Moore-Colyer, R. & Scott, A. (2005). What Kind of Landscape Do We Want? Past, Present and Future Perspectives. *Landscape Research*, 30, 501–523.

National Forest Company (2008). European Landscape Convention Action Plan 2008–13. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/landscape/compendium/NationalForestActionPlan.pdf>

Natural England (2008a). All landscapes matter: Draft policy for consultation. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/naturalenglanddraftpolicynebpu0805_tcm6-3639.pdf

Natural England (2008b). Natural England's European Landscape Convention 2008/2009 Action Plan. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/landscape/compendium/NaturalEnglandActionPlan.pdf>

Natural England (2009a). European Landscape Convention: A Framework for Implementation in England. <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/landscape/compendium/ELCFramework09.pdf>

Natural England (2009b). European Landscape Convention: Natural England's 2009/2010 Action Plan. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/ELC-actionplan0910_tcm6-20278.pdf

Natural England (2009c). Experiencing Landscapes: capturing the *cultural services* and *experiential qualities* of landscape Commissioned Report NECR024 (The Research Box with Land Use Consultants & Rick Minter). <http://naturalengland.etraderstores.com/NaturalEnglandShop/NECR024>

Natural England (2009d). Global drivers of change to 2060. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR030. SAMI Consulting, St Andrews Management Institute and the Centre for Urban and Regional Ecology (CURE) at Manchester University.

<http://naturalengland.etraderstores.com/NaturalEnglandShop/NECR030>

Roe, M., Jones, C., Mell, I. (2008). Research to Support the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention in England Contract No. PYT02/10/1.16. Final Report of A Study for Natural England. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/ELC-NE-Research-March2008_tcm6-23598.pdf

Roe, M., Selman, P., Jones, C., Mell, I., Swanwick, C. (2009). Establishment of a baseline for, and monitoring of the impact of, the European Landscape Convention in the UK. Research Contract: CR 0401. <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/lcn/resources/elcresources/elcmonitoring.aspx>

Scottish Government (2009) National Planning Framework for Scotland. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/planning/National-Planning-Policy/npf>

Selman, P. (2009). Planning for landscape multifunctionality. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy*, 5(2), 45–52. <http://ejournal.nbii.org/archives/vol5iss2/communityessay.pselman.html>

Selman, P. (2010). Landscape planning — preservation, conservation and sustainable development. *Town Planning Review*, 81(4).

Termorshuizen, J.W., Opdam, P. (2009). Landscape services as a bridge between landscape ecology and sustainable development. *Landscape Ecology*, 24, 1037–1052.

Notes

¹ “Quality” was interpreted in the report as relating to quality of process in protection, planning and management, rather than landscape “quality” *per se*.

² An analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats.