EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION. POLICY AND PLANNING INNOVATIONS

Angioletta Voghera [1]

Abstract

The landscape valorisation is a central objective in Europe, since the approvation of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, ELC, 2000). ELC gives centrality to the sustainability strategy, stimulated the development of an innovative system of policies aimed at protecting natural and cultural heritage of the landscape, managing and planning the landscape as a framework of the population lifestyles, as an expression of regional and local identity and diversity, and as an important resource of social-economic and territorial development. The Convention introduces in the pan-European context a reference strategy for action in order to disseminate a common approach in different landscape planning traditions, aimed at valorizing the landscapes for the sustainability of the territories.
The paper discusses the legislative innovations, policies, plans, design methodologies which were developed by various countries during the ten-year period following the approval of the ELC. The recent landscape policies and implementation approaches can be traced to the interaction between European guidelines and historical tradition of heritage protection, planning and management of each Country. In this direction, the paper analyzes the approach, the criticity and the recent results of policies, programs and projects for the valorisation of landscape identity and quality of some countries (as The Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Denmark, France, Spain and Italy). This comparison outlines the role of the different landscape cultures in respect of their tradition of protection of the natural and cultural heritage and with reference to the spatial planning, highlighting the role of heritage for the socio-economic development. The analysis will also evidences: the individual track of each planning culture developed to implement the Convention; the relation among landscape planning and other planning; the role of participation to define policies and projects to enhance identity; the interrelation among different levels of landscape planning; the relation between landscape planning and the projects. It will also describe participative landscape governance and urban design tools aimed at valorize the local identity integrating development and conservation especially in small towns.

1. Introduction

The European Landscape Convention (ELC, 2000) has been ratified by 31 member countries of the Council of Europe (by 23 member countries of the EU). The ELC stimulates development of a set of integrated landscape protection, planning and management policies as a framework embracing the life of the populations, an expression of identity and diversity, a resource for sustainable

[1] Assistant Professor in Urban and Regional Planning and Urban Design at the 2 Faculty of Architecture, DIST, Politecnico di Torino- angioletta.voghera@polito.it

development (Déjeant-Pons, 2006; Jones et al., 2007). It introduces a pan-European reference framework for actions aimed at: basing recognition of identity and landscape values on the populations (art.6c, ELC, 2000; Jones, 2007; Jones and Stenseke, 2011); constructing new values, moving from the protection of significant sites to participation of local municipalities in valorising all types of landscapes (art.5 c, ELC, 2000); integrating landscape valorisation in territorial, economic and social policies (art. 5d, ELC, 2000).

In Europe over the last decade, actions have been taken to support social, cultural, political and economic identity as developed also according to the European Landscape Convention (ELC, 2000).

Many initiatives, international researches and policies in Europe have followed, stressing different aspects of European landscape (Antrop, 2006). Natural (Wascher, 2000), rural (Dramstad and Sogge 2003; Parris 2004; Claval 2004), multifunctional land use (Brandt and Vejre 2004; Mander and Antrop 2003), historical and archaeological (Fairclough and Rippon 2002; Van der Knaap, Van der Valk, 2006) issues has been addressed in many studies and researches, but a transdisciplinary consideration of landscape is caused by the ELC in order to define protection, management and planning policies for the heterogeneity and complexity changes and thus also processes and functions in the landscape.

In this view the paper will try to discuss:

1. What are the influences of the European policies on the landscape? How and if the European level, that has not competence on landscape, could contribute to ELC territorial applications? How to square the system of landscape planning introduced by the ELC with European territorial policies?

2. What are the major innovations of the ELC as compared to national and regional legislation in the countries represented in the study? How do the ideal types of the southern European sectorial system of landscape planning and management and the northwestern European system compare?

3. Which are the major innovative approaches in landscape systems that can be traced to the ELC?

2. ELC and European policies

The innovative scope of the ELC is however hampered by the absence of a European Union landscape policy that, today, is an aspect that undermines its application.

The strong importance of landscape in Europe was already given in the First (Dobríš) Assessment of Europe's Environment: "The richness and diversity of rural landscapes in Europe is a distinctive feature of the continent. There is

probably nowhere else where the signs of human interaction with nature in landscape are so varied, contrasting and localised. Despite the immense scale of socio-economic changes that have accompanied this century's wave of industrialisation and urbanisation in many parts of Europe, much of this diversity remains, giving distinctive character to countries, regions and local areas" (Stanners and Bourdeau 1995). So in the EU the need of a specific landscape policy is strongly evidenced.

Although the EU is not competent for landscape matters, the concept of landscape introduced by the ELC is considered only in part in EU strategies and Laws. The art. 191 of the European Union Treaty affirms the objective of "prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources" which is common to European Landscape Convention and the principles of precaution and prevention prescribed should also apply to landscape policies (Cartei, 2011). In the absence of a specific policy, in the European policies landscape is considered prevalently in terms of effects and impacts (such as transport sector policy, measures for energy, …), that should be controlled and contrasted by specific actions. Only recently landscape is considered a development factor, but landscape importance and value was identified in general in relation to specific aspects (economic, ecological, aesthetic, social, …) in a sectorial way.

The landscape is influenced to a major extent by Community territorial policies, which influence localisation of activities in the territory and generating transformations of the landscape. Community actions with more direct fall-out on the landscape include: the policy of socioeconomic cohesion; transport sector policy; environmental policy; common agricultural policies (CAP); measures for energy; measures for tourism.

The cohesion policy aims to monitor socio-economic imbalances that could be exasperated by completion of the single market, addressing the territory with targeted plans, actions and structural funds. The structural funds for the 2007-2013 planning period are directed towards enhancing competitiveness and developing the local economy, generating long-term effects on landscapes. So far, the EU has dedicated very little attention to these effects. The relationships between the new infrastructures, territory and landscape are, in fact, observed considering the critical issues they generate, reflected in environmental assessments that analyse the positive effects in terms of accessibility, and their negative repercussions on the environment and the landscape.

Adopting various strategic instruments and measures, the policy for the environment, directed towards sustainable development, focuses on management of natural resources and of biodiversity that are important landscape values (reflected mainly in Directives for the protection of natural habitats and of migratory species). In fact, the VI European Program for the Environment (2001, 2007) identifies measures for establishing new relationships between the environment, and government of the territory includes the landscape on the axis of "biodiversity" actions, intended to valorize functioning of the ecological systems.

From the market liberalization with the decoupling of subsidies, the CAP was promoting overproduction and causing – directly or indirectly – severe impacts on European agricultural landscapes (Potter & Tilzey 2005), such as: intensification, pollution, erosion, overuse of water resources, and the loss of natural habitats and value cultural landscapes especially in northern Europe. From the 1999, common agricultural policy tried to reflect an integrated concept of rural development, considered to be an "instrument for establishing a coherent, long-lasting context for the socioeconomic and environmental future of rural areas". From this perspective, the landscape is deemed to be a development factor, necessary to guarantee the multi-functionality and the modernisation of agricultural economy through diversification of activities. The rural policy contributes to consolidate the conceptualization of multifunctional landscapes evolved recently in Europe around the recognition that agriculture produces commodity outputs (e.g. food, fiber and fuel) as well as various non-commodity outputs for society (habitat, scenic values, recreational opportunity, jobs, regional identity). So in this view we can define such landscapes as "providing multiple environmental, social, and economic functions in a given area of land, taking into account the interests of landowners and users" (Lovell and Johnston 2009, p. 214) and social needs.

The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP, 1999) expresses an innovative consideration of landscape, proposing a strategy for Europe inserted in a framework of sustainability and linking European spatial policies for infrastructurisation of the territory to urban development, safeguarding and management of the landscape, the protection of nature and of biodiversity.

Considerable stress is laid on European landscapes and on the more representative and sensitive areas to be managed with integrated policies. The concept of landscape that emerges from the ESDP is undeniably interesting and pro-active as it does not simply view the landscape as an "object" influenced by the effects and impacts of territorial policies but considers this to be the basis of a European and local collective identity (Pedrazzini, 2005; Röhring, 2011).

Although a separation remains between "natural" and "cultural" landscapes, the dynamic vision of the landscape that seeks to weave new relationships with planning and government of the territory is interesting.

However, two scarcely integrated concepts of landscape can be still observed in Community strategies:

— The landscape as an eco-mosaic, i.e. as the connective tissue of natural or para-natural habitats, able to promote systems of useful connections for combating the fragmentation of the landscape that threatens biodiversity (IUCN, 2003).

— The "socio-cultural" dimension of the landscape (Gambino, 2008) in policies for rural development and cohesion. In accordance with the latest UNESCO strategies (ICCROM, 1998; UNESCO, 2005), these policies are considerably

broadening the categories of excellent "cultural landscapes" to also include systems able to attract tourists, investments and inhabitants.

These two different concepts also influence national policies, especially in the countries that have a not integrated way to manage territory and natural and cultural landscape (such as the Mediterranean countries as Italy, Spain, France, see p. 3). In the absence of competencies, strategies, and ad hoc financing, activation of the ELC is now assigned to countries that are setting up initial experiments in a diversified and as yet fragmented framework.

In this view the research is focusing on the landscape culture in each country so that the results achieved by activating the ELC can be interpreted, and EU wide visions and strategies developed out of shared knowledge and the methods of acting on and in the landscape.

3. European visions for the landscape

The application of the ELC on the territory, in the various national approaches and results, is the expression of a new social recognition of landscape values and correlated administrative commitment. Furthermore, it is also the effect of a process of "Europeanization" of landscape policies, in two directions: as a top-down effect of European strategies that produce regulatory indications or policies on a national scale (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999) or as an influence for the mobilization of states in the construction of international strategies ("bottom up approach"; Börzel and Risse, 2000). The ELC is in fact a soft law (Bulmer and Radaelli, 2004), proposing a common model of governance for CoE member states – adhesion to which is "voluntary" - defined by discussing and exchanging experiences (Prieur, 2004).

There are the following requirements needed to give territorial application to the ELC:

— Legislative innovations inspired by the ELC and/or national strategies to define goals for reinforcing the landscape resource and cooperation between stakeholders, promoting and/or monitoring quality (such as established national and/or regional observatories);

— Actions for community involvement and empowerment in order to create public projects to promote social awareness;

— Developing new projects for landscape based on assessment to analyse the dynamics, characteristics, values and negative values and to establish common goals for enhancement;

— Landscape coherence in territorial policies and the sector at various administrative levels (vertical and horizontal integration);

— Subsidiarity, which requires the definition and implementation of actions starting with the local perception of landscape (bottom-up), in accordance with the European Charter of Local Self-Government (CoE, 1985).

The ELC envisages two interwoven levels of application: the adhesion of the states, and the construction of a common national policy in regional contexts (top-down), with strategies and practices shared by the population (bottom-up).

So the following paragraphs describe the landscape cultures and systems identifying the specific evolution aspects in some study cases relating them to the above key aspect of the ELC application.

States	Signature	Ratification	Entry into force	Notes	R.	D.	A.	T.	C.	O.
Albania										
Andorra	23/3/2011									
Armenia	14/5/2003	23/3/2004	1/7/2004							
Austria										
Azerbaijan	22/10/2003	30/8/2011	1/12/2011							
Belgium	20/10/2000	28/10/2004	1/2/2005							
Bosnia and Herzegovina	9/4/2010	31/1/2012	1/5/2012							
Bulgaria	20/10/2000	24/11/2004	1/3/2005							
Croatia	20/10/2000	15/1/2003	1/3/2004							
Cyprus	21/11/2001	21/6/2006	1/10/2006							
Czech Republic	28/11/2002	3/6/2004	1/10/2004							
Denmark	20/10/2000	20/3/2003	1/3/2004					X		
Estonia										
Finland	20/10/2000	16/12/2005	1/4/2006							
France	20/10/2000	17/3/2006	1/7/2006							

Georgia	11/5/2010	15/9/2010	1/1/2011							
Germany										
Greece	13/12/2000	17/5/2010	1/9/2010							
Hungary	28/9/2005	26/10/2007	1/2/2008							
Iceland										
Ireland	22/3/2002	22/3/2002	1/3/2004							
Italy	20/10/2000	4/5/2006	1/9/2006							
Latvia	29/11/2006	5/6/2007	1/10/2007							
Liechtenstein										
Lithuania	20/10/2000	13/11/2002	1/3/2004							
Luxembourg	20/10/2000	20/9/2006	1/1/2007							
Malta	20/10/2000									
Moldova	20/10/2000	14/3/2002	1/3/2004							
Monaco										
Montenegro	8/12/2008	22/1/2009	1/5/2009							
Netherlands	27/7/2005	27/7/2005	1/11/2005					X		
Norway	20/10/2000	23/10/2001	1/3/2004							
Poland	21/12/2001	27/9/2004	1/1/2005							
Portugal	20/10/2000	29/3/2005	1/7/2005							
Romania	20/10/2000	7/11/2002	1/3/2004							
Russia										

San Marino	20/10/2000	26/11/2003	1/3/2004							
Serbia	21/9/2007	28/6/2011	1/10/2011							
Slovakia	30/5/2005	9/8/2005	1/12/2005							
Slovenia	7/3/2001	25/9/2003	1/3/2004							
Spain	20/10/2000	26/11/2007	1/3/2008							
Sweden	22/2/2001	5/1/2011	1/5/2011							
Switzerland	20/10/2000									
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	15/1/2003	18/11/2003	1/3/2004							
Turkey	20/10/2000	13/10/2003	1/3/2004							
Ukraine	17/6/2004	10/3/2006	1/7/2006							
United Kingdom	21/2/2006	21/11/2006	1/3/2007					X		

Notes:

a: Accession - s: Signature without reservation as to ratification - su: Succession - r: Signature "ad referendum".

R.: Reservations - D.: Declarations - A.: Authorities - T.: Territorial Application - C.: Communication - O.: Objection.

Table 1 – Ratification (source: CoE, 2011, http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=176&CM=8&DF=&CL=ENG)

Table 1 – Ratification

4. Cultural landscape approaches

This paragraph discusses the landscape culture in the study cases, referring it to some ideal types models, such as the southern European sectorial system of landscape planning and management and the northwestern European system.

Today, landscape is a central theme of international cultural, social and political innovation (IUCN, 2004), inspired by ELC. The ELC has in fact inspired recent innovations in the legislative framework, strategies, plans and projects for landscape of many countries, integrated with "landscape traditions" reinforcing the historical-cultural roots relevant to protection, planning and management, as well as providing guidelines for experimentation in ways sometimes far from the cultural origins. The roads taken by the counties are the result of participation and the reciprocal fertilization between countries discussing the ELC innovations.

North European countries of Germanic-Anglo-Saxon origin (Voghera, 2004, 2006) such as Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark and Great Britain have been developing actions for the protection of landscape heritage with territorial policies since last century; while France, Spain and Italy - countries with Central-Mediterranean historical-cultural root (Voghera, 2004, 2006) – have drawn up landscape protection policies separated from territorial development and planning. These last nations in fact created, through the development of their legislative framework, a separation between the management of land uses for settlements and landscape conservation. This separation has produced distinct and non-interrelated management tools: territorial planning and safeguard restrictions.

The root also has its own particular terminology.

In the Germanic-Anglo-Saxon world, the term landscape (Landschap in the Netherlands, Landschaft in Germany and Austria, Landscape in Great Britain, …) means cultivated land. In Germany the term also indicates a close relation between the rural territory and local political-institutional and social culture; in fact in these countries "landscape referred both to the conditions and character of the land as well as to the policy within which the people's shaping of the land occurred" (Jones, Howard, Olwig, Primdahl & Sarlöv Herlin, 2007). Venturi Ferriolo (2003, p.24) mentions that the term was used as far back as the 9th century to indicate a juridical-administrative system based on the common identity of those living in the Landschaft. The idea of Landschaft corresponds to the Aristotelian idea of Polis, a territorial area of cultivated land and settlements, in view of the resident population, and visited daily.

In Central-Mediterranean culture however, the term paysage, paisaje, paesaggio (landscape) derives from paese (land-town). The Latin root of paese is pagus, the boundary stone sunken in the ground to mark a limes, the boundary between two properties and systems. From pagus derives pagensis – the root of paese (land or town) – a built-up settlement, which can be distinguished in its structure, form and function from the rest of the territory.

In this sense, landscape refers to the way man inhabited and organized the land (Jackson, 2003).

The terminological roots of Landschaft and pagensis, correspond to opposite interpretations of territory and landscape as a social representation (Turri, 2006), as well as different management models.

If landscape is a selective process with which a society demonstrates how it meets its needs (Morris, 1954), the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon world puts the emphasis on the environmental and territorial resources that the population makes sparing use of in order to live, while the Mediterranean interpretations put the focus on man.

In this sense, landscape is an excellent window for interpreting the culture of a society and understanding the way in which it defends its resources today.

The ELC places landscape at the centre of territorial government, with regulations, strategies, plans and projects on the basis of these cultural roots. Today, the different historical roots correspond to more operative governmental actions in the Anglo-Saxon world and more conservative actions in the Central-Mediterranean culture, as described in the following paragraphs that compare the study cases to the ELC application key aspects (see 2.2.); many cultural and operational indications of the ELC are a traditional feature of the Austria or Germany landscape approaches. Although they have not ratified the ELC yet, they work in the landscape according to the ELC aims.

In fact the Council of Europe has identified The Netherlands and Great Britain as countries in the forefront of its activation by the Council of Europe, (CoE, 2010, Table 1 and 3). Dealing with the ideal type of landscape culture they are (such as in the paragraphs 3):

— Interpreting the approaches taken by legislative, procedural, and planning tradition in guiding the landscape project;

— Identifying innovative instruments to evaluate, finance, and plan the landscape in order to help the EU and other countries to activate a process of landscape policy reform in line with the ELC.

4.2.**The ELC application**

This paragraph will compare the major ELC innovations to national and regional legislation in the countries represented in the study. The declinations and the different speeds with which countries implement the ELC are due to the diversity of European landscapes, all of which cannot be planned and managed in the same way at the various administrative levels involved in landscape government (starting with national and local responsibility), and the tradition of management

(See Table 3). It may be useful to consider some questions that represent useful "windows" for interpreting different cultural roads and results:

— The ratification of the ELC;

— The historical origin of landscape policies;

— The legislative, strategic and operative competence for the implementation of quality goals;

— The definition of "ad hoc" laws, created and/or revised in accordance with the ELC;

— The definition of new analytical tools and tools for action;

— The integration at various governmental levels of landscape and territorial policies;

— The consideration of landscape quality as the goal of territorial and sector policies;

— The social perception and participation in establishing goals and scenarios.

4.2.1. **Ratifications**

The ratification of the ELC is the first step in the experimentation of innovative actions, chiefly aimed at defining synergies for collaboration between public and private stakeholders for the promotion of awareness and the development of new landscape tools. These actions are necessary to reinforce the landscape quality of the territories and to promote reciprocal fertilization between the demand of the territories and the societies concerned (bottom-up), creating a national (top-down) vision, to obtain common and shared results from strategies and policies.

Ratification should be followed by programmatic and legislative innovations from the countries, with the corresponding differentiation in the cultural approach of the regions, adapting and integrating decisions taken at a higher level. The objective of the ELC and the states is to develop and consolidate relations between the various levels. The differentiation between the regions helps explain the "formal" non-adhesion to the ELC of Austria and Germany, who have been working for landscape on the basis of the ELC since the 1960's, but have not ratified the same at a federal level. The ratification of the ELC in fact, requires considerable national and/or federal powers, with legislative competence and/or competence in the management of territory and landscape.

4.2.2. Competencies

Different administrative fields of competence can be some of the most useful elements for interpreting recent experimentation with the ELC.

In Great Britain, the Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (Defra) ratified the ELC in 2006. Defra, Natural England and English Heritage are the principal institutional stakeholders who, with the Countryside Agency, lay down the guidelines for implementation (2007). They have promoted landscape strategy based on new relations with: strategic tools for governing landscape and spatial planning, to define land use which is compatible with the requirements of enhancement, and on which to base policies for an inclusive approach of social stakeholders. These actions aim to:

— Coordinate the implementation of the ELC on a national scale;

— Promote the public distribution of information and best practices;

— Integrate landscape in planning, the SEA and the local projects.

In the Netherlands two ministries have traditionally competence over landscape action: the Netherlands' Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and Environment (VROM) – responsible for guaranteeing the integration of landscape strategies in physical planning at all governmental levels (national, provincial and local) – and the Ministry of Agriculture, management of nature and fisheries (LNV) – which controls the effects on landscape of rural development actions, biodiversity and planning open spaces. The Ministry VROM was merged with the Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management into the new Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (MIE) on 14 October 2010, integrating much more urban and infrastructure policy and quality living actions. In fact, starting to the National Spatial Strategy 2011 the spatial policy tries to balance urban, rural and water management, environmental and safety actions, defining basic quality standards for landscape, water areas, buffer zones and green spaces in and around urban areas. The Ministry LNV was merged with the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs to form the new Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (MEL&I) on 14 October 2010, contributing to reinforce the integration among economic, social and development of the quality of open territory and landscape.

The ministries worked in close collaboration and, since the 90's, have been the co-authors of national strategies for quality (such as the Landschap Agenda, 2008), the result of a process based on the assessment of social landscape perception.

In Germany and Austria, in the federal regulatory framework, the Lander are responsible for legislative, programmatic and operative landscape matters. These are characterised by a consolidated tradition in landscape planning and management, dating back to the common law of 1935 (Reichsnaturschutzgesetz, 1935), which laid foundations for the protection of nature and landscape in the post-war period (Ferry, 1994), although today this is no longer the case. In Austria, federal law requires that landscape plans and territorial government must correspond to various administrative levels, with subsequent national laws making the two tools independent. The landscape plan is a tool of protection, for the

functional and managerial organization of protected landscape-environmental areas and/or areas subject to considerable anthropic pressure, but it is an independent tool of territorial government and does not include urban areas.

In Germany however, since the 1970's the national Bundesnaturschutzgesetz (1976 and subsequent amendments) defines a common policy for the eco-compatible transformation and use of the territory. It lays the foundations for: going beyond the dichotomous vision of anthropic and natural environment, which characterized the origins of measures for protection; an evolution after establishing protected parts of landscape with significant value, to the definition of a specific discipline on use and transformation; establishing plans of action for landscapes. For this purpose, a system of landscape plans are envisaged – integrated at all levels of territorial government (federal, state, local) with territorial planning – and projects for including and/or limiting impact.

France and Italy are characterized by the separation of the protection of excellent landscape assets and the enhancement of the same.

In France – the paysage law of 08/01/1993 and decree no. 94.283-11/04/1994 directives de protection et de mise en valeur des paysages – gives the state the task of passing directives for the protection and enhancement of landscapes (excellent landscapes, art. 1), while local bodies draw up guidelines for the daily management – in the planning and project.

In addition to applying the Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code (2004 and subsequent amendments), the state in Italy protects the assets and values of the territory using Regional Superintendencies (Soprintendenze Regionali, responsible for the conservation of heritage and landscape), while the regional authorities implement policies for the enhancement and orientation of the transformation processes with the landscape plan. The Code introduces the action of protection with the creation of new values, disregarding the role of landscape in favour of economic development. There is the possibility that the regional landscape plan may be more effective on ordinary processes of territorial transformation (Peano, 2009b), in cases where the Code envisages the following contents of the plan: the limitation of land consumption, establishing guidelines for urban development, focus on rural landscapes and Unesco sites, the possibility of establishing guidelines and incentives for the project.

In Spain the competence, the approaches to landscape and the methods with which funds are made available vary notably from one comunidad autonoma (region) to another. The establishment of Landscape Observatories on a regional scale (such as in Andalusia, Cataluña, etc.) to promote awareness provides guidelines for implementation and integrates development and landscape policies, is an experiment worthy of note. The case of Cataluña is particularly interesting which, through the Observatory, set up in accordance with law 8 - 2005 (Ley de protecció, gestió the ordenació del paisatge), draws up a "catalogue" of

landscapes and develops a method of assessment for the integration of landscape goals in territorial strategies with the participation of social stakeholders.

4.2.3. Regulations

One of the main problems with the implementation of the ELC is the need to extend the action of landscape policies to include the entire territory. This requirement has obliged some countries – such as Italy – to reform the legislatory framework and the characteristics of governmental tools; in fact the approval of the Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code (2004 and subsequent amendments), extends the planning action to the entire territory including excellent, ordinary and degraded landscapes.

The new season of planning is very much focused on landscape (innovation in Sardinia, Piedmont, Veneto, Liguria, Tuscany, Umbria, Abruzzo, Molise, Apulia). In fact in the regions, starting with "the analysis of landscape characteristics, dictated by nature, history and the interrelations of the same" (art.143a) the positive and negative values of landscape are represented to provide guidelines for protection, planning and management.

Landscape planning, for the protection and enhancement of landscape assets, is organized in descriptive, constructive and prescriptive terms (art. 143); the historical, natural and aesthetic values of landscapes and their interrelations are established through knowledge of the same, to: identify the "ambits" (135, 2) and draw up regulations for landscape use and quality goals. The Code – interpreted in different ways by the various regional authorities – is subject to discussion and experimentation to: define State-regional agreements and establish new relations between the regional authorities and the Superintendencies for the relevant competence in the construction of the plan and procedures for authorization; the form of the plan and its relationship with territorial and local planning, responsibility for interventions; the form and contents of the regulatory framework of landscape plans.

Great Britain, the Netherlands, Spain and Denmark have failed to approve a specific law for governing landscape, with reference to various legislative documents and for the orientation of policies for the protection of nature, monuments and territorial governance. In 1993 France passed a landscape law (Law of 08/01/1993 for the protection and enhancement of landscapes, the so-called Loi Paysage), integrated by Decree no. 2006-1643 – 20/12/2006. The law of 2006, while partly implementing the ELC, makes a distinction between territory and landscape. Territory is "an administrative entity, and dealt with as such", to be managed and organized along common lines, although for individuals and the society living in the territory however "a landscape can be, and will be perceived subjectively, by an individual or social category". In comparison with the law of 1993, which made no clear distinction between territory and landscape, the new law provides an aesthetic-perceptive view of landscape. Furthermore, it

requires that the SCOT (regional plans) and PLU (local plans) must be compatible with the "directives for the protection and enhancement of landscapes", establishing indications for excellent landscapes. The most important part of the law concerns the management of rural environments and gives prefects extensive decision-making powers.

These innovations give institutional bodies more powers (top-down) in Central-Mediterranean countries, partly contradicting the spirit of the ELC, which promotes the involvement of the populations.

4.2.4. **Historical roots**

Landscape is in continuous transformation; it is a "metamorphic entity" (Pesci, 2004, page 13), which lets us interpret the culture of places or non-places and the historical evolution of the same. By interpreting the function and role of landscape, we can see the change in cultures and their ethical and social structures in the 20th century.

The origin of landscape theory, as well as regulatory and planning action, is the way in which a society has learned to acknowledge and reinvent lost "wilderness" (Zanzi, 2004, page 24). The origin of social sensitivity for landscape for the most part dates back to the middle of the 19th-century, as a reaction to major changes associated with processes of industrialization and urbanization as a consequence of poetry, literature and paintings created thanks to new possibilities for travelling (Bonesio, 2007, page 101). This sensitivity, then as now, has manifested itself in various forms in different countries.

In many cultures (such as in the Germanic-Anglo-Saxon world – the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany and Austria) landscape policies aimed at promoting productivity and preserving diversity and quality stem from the conservation and management of agricultural land. In rural management – which can be found also in the terminological root of landscape – there is specific focus on protection and planning through a multi-scale project (on a vast and local scale). This project has influenced territorial government, generating regulations, plans and implementory tools (financial and managerial) with strategies for the organization and management of rural landscape. The rural root of the policies refers to a distinctly operational approach; the original operativeness can be seen in integrated policies for protection, planning and management, and in the complementary actions of the project (the creation of databases, guidelines, and in the study of economic resources).

From this common root- which developed by a different cultural, political-institutional, and procedural history- emerged the environmental issue, which gave birth to the search for interaction between the safeguarding natural and cultural contexts and the transformation of territory adapted to economic development. Territory and environment in the political-cultural and regulatory

histories are closely linked. This link is evident in the ecological-functional analysis of: the environment as a place from which man extracts the fundamental resources necessary for his own survival (Scazzosi, 1999, p. 18); nature and landscape as social and economic resources. These concepts explain the interrelation between territorial use and natural processes in sustainability policies. The integration between socio-economic and territorial development and the safeguarding of natural and landscape contexts is therefore the characterizing element of the Germanic-Anglo-Saxon tradition.

In Central-Mediterranean culture, the terminological root of paese (a land or town considered as a built-up area) corresponds in Italy and France to an action on the landscape to protect historical-cultural assets, and in Spain to conserve the physical, natural and "material" resources, necessary for the survival of man (see cultural movement of regeracionismo; Gòmez Mendoza, Ortega Cantero, 1999, p. 137). The principle of stock-taking assets, including new categories in time (from monuments to principal ecological-environmental values and systems), is still a characterizing element of the protective action, for which today landscape is a parallel/superimposed element of functional, perceptive and symbolic integration between the "systems of assets and values" in the/of the territory.

In Central-Mediterranean countries the cultural approach, created through the development of their legislative framework, a separation between the management of land uses for settlements and the conservation of the territories of exceptional ecologic, aesthetic, and historical-cultural value. In fact, even if by means of different cultural and technical paths, this separation has produced distinct and non-interrelated management tools: territorial planning and safeguard restrictions. However, in both cases, limitations characterized the conservation efforts that found, until recent years, some interaction with territorial planning, aimed essentially at the transformation of territory for socio-economic development.

4.2.5. Identification and assessment

The first result in the implementation of the ELC is the processes for the identification and assessment of landscape (art. 6c). In fact "landscape, in other words the relation in terms of aesthetic sense and investment, does not exist unless the relation with natural space is perceived, interpreted and produced by a specific culture, which in turn is the recipient of an image" (Bonesio, 2007, page 24). Interpretation and assessment of landscape are the first operations in the selection process to define landscape guidelines and projects. Landscape assessment goes in this essential direction, and must be an argumentative process for the identification of positive and negative values for planning policies, to be created thanks to dialogue with the stakeholders and populations concerned (Brunetta and Voghera, 2008). The shared perception and representation of a landscape, through the social legitimation of values and criticalities, can only be guaranteed through a process of assessment. Despite the diffusion of good practices to identify landscapes (such as the International ECOVAST), a clear

methodology is required to define a structured program of actions for sustainability – starting from the legitimation of "values".

The assessment of landscapes must become the tool on which decisions are made and for communicating quality goals of landscape and territorial planning (CoE, 2008, Recommendation for the implementation of the ELC). In this direction, the most consolidated experiences are represented by Landscape Atlases (Peano, 2009a) or Landscape inventories set up years ago in many national contexts to identify landscapes on a vast scale (national or regional), through landscape units as in France, the Netherlands, Slovenia, France, Great Britain, Denmark and Germany. These methods of analysis attempt to integrate the objective and subjective descriptions associated with collective imagination and sensitivity for the places in question.

Jacobs (2002) on this subject mentions that there are two main approaches to research for the interpretation of landscape: "the descriptions in and of the landscape" (Tress B., Tress G., Fry, 2006, page 15). The first approach hails to the methods established by natural sciences from Descartes on, and makes a distinction between the subjective and objective dimension, separating the populations from the landscape as the context in which they live their daily life. The second "constructivist" approach is related to social sciences and acknowledges that landscape is constructed through daily interaction with society; this second approach puts greater focus on the values associated with the sphere of subjectivity such as sustainability, livability, beauty, utilization value and the potential value connected with possible future transformations.

The descriptive experiences, developed in European countries, are based too often on the first approach. In fact, we are still far from a real and effective involvement of the local social and economic stakeholders.

Furthermore, while these experiences appear to be effective in describing landscapes, they do not however represent the dynamics and trends associated with socioeconomic and territorial processes and are therefore all but ineffective for outlining prospects for action.

The most interesting methods have been developed in north European countries with a more consolidated landscape tradition. In Norway, Denmark, England and Wales there is widespread use of fact-finding GIS database systems to describe and distribute information on landscape as a "cultural environment", which constitutes a spatially delimited area the characteristics of which depend on the society that created and continues to use and transform the same (Etting and Møller, 1997). These methods have a similar approach as they develop a repeatable system of analysis, consistent in the quantity of data and qualitative type assessments, characterized by the focus on the relations between the historical-cultural characters of the places and landscape from an ecological-environmental point of view (Møller, Stenak, 2006). There is need for greater

integration with the planning tools used for the territory and landscape, and with those used to support the assessment processes (in particular the EIA).

Germany, Austria, Great Britain and the Netherlands base action for landscape on description and assessment. Guidelines and projects, coherent with the expectations for development of the socioeconomic stakeholders, are based on knowledge of the landscape. The result is landscape planning used as a concerted tool for the quality of landscapes. In these countries, the process of assessment is based on techniques that attribute judgments and degrees of value to the landscape units or ambits and – through the association of qualitative criteria and quantitative parameters – define strategies and interventions (Landscape and Historic Character Assessment in Great Britain, assessments on a Land scale for German landscape plans, Wardewolle Cultuurlandschap or the monitoring of perception and landscape appreciation in the Netherlands). Landscape guidelines are a strategic tool for the orientation of policies and projects in Great Britain, and are the source of the process of negotiations between public and private stakeholders to define common actions (such as the Village Design Statement).

There are also interesting attempts at innovation in France. The Atlases and the Charte Paysagère interpret current landscapes characters, the dynamics of socio-economic and territorial transformation, the pressures to define operational indications, based on paysage directives (for the transformation of excellent landscapes) and the territory plans of government.

In Germany however, the contents of landscape planning, coordinated on all administrative levels with territorial programs and plans, are defined by a complex mechanism of inter-institutional cooperation and, on the local scale, with social participation. Landscape assessment at every level of planning develops in the following phases (Brunetta and Voghera, 2008): description of the characters and state of use; qualitative and quantitative definition of goals for protection and enhancement; assessment of the state of use in relation to the goals; establishing criteria for action.

From the construction of analytical and interpretative landscape tools, landscape planning provides a framework of planning, economic-managerial lines and indications for the enhancement of landscapes, which involve local subjects in actions of sustainability, defining a territory and landscape project for biodiversity, the use and mitigation of anthropic pressures.

In Spain there has also been some experience in the assessment of landscapes with reference to the National landscape atlas Atlas de los paisajes de España (2002) and the Plan nacional por los paisajes culturales (Salamanca2002), for the long-term transformation and enhancement of cultural landscapes, through measures for the management of natural, rural and urban territories.

The Atlas divides the territory into characterizing landscape units, landscape types and associations starting with the interpretation of land use, dynamics, values and

perception. Furthermore, to support landscape planning, the Spanish Ministerio de Medio Ambiente has drawn up a Guide for the assessment of natural, ecological-perceptive characters and land use of the territorial landscapes; the assessment methodology interprets the value of landscape using qualitative and quantitative type indicators. Some significant components of the landscape such as the ecological fragility and visual quality are evaluated, integrating the vision of the experts with that of the population in different phases. The intention is to describe the landscapes using the more qualitatively interesting and integral values and aspects to the best effect in the construction of policies for protection and/or enhancement.

4.2.6. Integration and participation

Landscape studies are based on three major systems (Jacobs, 2006, page 11): Matterscape, Powerscape and Mindscape. Initially based on a reworking of the theory of Habermas (1984), the focus in each case is on:

— The real or objective world (Matterscape);

— The regulatory sphere (Powerscape), which depends on the indications, regulations and policies as a whole;

— The system of perception and thought, which derives from the expectations and emotions of the populations living in and visiting a certain landscape (Mindscape).

The ELC on the other hand indicates that the landscape derives from:

— Its objective characters, the ecological-environmental, historical-cultural and settlement aspects, land and economic use;

– The regulatory and political processes as a whole, which contribute to its continuous re-construction;

— The social perception of positive and negative values and policies.

Landscape studies and policies must both integrate these systems. It is only through integration on all levels of territorial government between materiality, rules and perception of the landscape that we can draw up plans and projects to establish shared visions for the daily management of landscapes.

Nevertheless, the landscape object is all too often interpreted as the passive effect of policies and processes based on plans and strategies that do not give due consideration to the populations. An important step in this direction can be the assessment for the explicit definition of values and criteria for selection, to identify quality goals for planning and management (Brunetta and Voghera, 2008). Participation plays a central role in the process of assessment because it is

a tool of communication and support to integrate decisions and policies, as well as acknowledge shared values and identify possible planning scenarios.

The integration of policies and the participation of populations (CoE, 2006) are in fact key aspects in the implementation of the ELC. The integration of policies must be interpreted as: integration of European recommendations in national strategies, inclusion of landscape in sector planning and policies (art. 5d).

Integration must envisage the construction of strategies and actions, which are coherent on various levels and allow for different landscape and territorial contexts, as well as also economic goals and resources, and the processes regulated by the plans. This integration requires also a different model for the construction of decisions, through extensive social participation.

In this sense the Dutch model is in line with the idea of the integration of policies indicated by the ELC. In fact, in the Netherlands the latest landscape policies are drawn up with a significant amount of information gathered on the social perception and appreciation of landscapes. To assess the social perception and appreciation of landscapes, a GIS model was developed to combine the data on the physical-morphological characteristics, land use, and historical-cultural information with data on appreciation of the aesthetic qualities obtained in interviews carried out in 2006 on a sample of 4,500 people (Farjon, 2007). This method made it possible to test the effective representation of landscapes with a national value, subject to actions of enhancement, to define shared strategies as in the Agenda Landschap (2008); this is a strategy for the enhancement of landscape, structured on the basis of types of action (rural environments, urban landscapes, green and protected areas, etc.), based on a programmatic-operational model which associates economic resources and responsibilities for implementation on the various scales of government with the actions - in accordance with the budget-programming system (Faludi, 1994). Landscape policies are therefore the result of a shared process, starting on a local scale, and implemented in the project.

In Germany, integration between landscape choices is guaranteed by construction in mutual coherence of strategies and goals for landscape and territory plans, from the national to the local scale. The planning and management of the English landscape is also characterized by a system of coherent strategies at various administrative levels; through the assessment, methodologically consolidated and based on participation, shared guidelines are defined, to be implemented in plans and projects.

Also in Denmark there is an interesting example of participative approach for defining landscape visions; the study combined scenario technique, photorealistic visualisation and stakeholder participation to identify the interests of stakeholders in the future countryside (Tress & Tress, 2003). Scenario visualisation by photorealistic design techniques proved to be a helpful tool for researchers in communicating the proposed landscape changes to stakeholders.

While research into the integration of policies for landscapes and for the development of the territory is a common element of Germanic-Anglo-Saxon tradition, there are significant differences in terms of social participation.

The Aarhus Convention (UNECE, 1998) identifies three occasions in which participation is necessary for:

— Decisions concerning specific activities,

— The construction of plans, programs and policies,

— The preparation of laws and regulations.

It indicates that the "public" must be informed effectively and in good time, to be able to analyse the proposals and express an opinion in verbal and/or written form, and exercise their own influence; it is only through a process such as this, with interesting applications in Great Britain, that the decisions taken can be considered the result of a process of public participation.

There are different forms of participation for making shared choices (CoE, 2006):

— Public discussions to assess studies on landscape impact (as in Belgium);

— Public communication of the results of the studies on impact or on scenarios of transformation (as in France);

— Written public observations on plans or scenarios for the transformation of landscape (as in Spain, Italy, Austria, ...);

— Discussions with the population for the construction of landscape scenarios (The Netherlands, Germany, Great Britain);

— The organization of a public referendum on landscape choices (in Turkey and France).

Great Britain, the Netherlands and Germany have consolidated experience in the promotion of awareness and the education of economic operators and the population, more frequently involved in maintenance and management (especially farmers). It is only in the Netherlands that landscape strategies, implemented in physical planning, are based on the negotiated construction of decisions taken with institutions, economic and social stakeholders from the phase for the identification of the values of landscape identity and appreciation, to the operational phase. However there is greater focus in both the Netherlands and Great Britain on the "strategic" dimension in the vast area of landscape policies, from which also actions on a local scale derive. On a local scale, actions for protection, enhancement and planning concern the ecological, aesthetic-perceptive and physical quality of small town centres or rural territories (UK Village Design Statement), where it is easier to involve the populations. The town and its private

and public spaces are in fact too marginally involved in landscape enhancement and innovation processes.

5. The Dutch and United Kingdom study case

5.1. Policies for landscape and the Agenda Landschap

Without a national physical planning document until after the Second World War, strategies for rural development were used to define action to be taken for landscape. Because measures for protection and fruition of the territory are intimately related to the agricultural-productive exploitation of the territory, the Law for development of agricultural territory (1924, revised in 1938) promoted largely innovative improvement programs and land reorganization.

Conservation of the historic-cultural character of agricultural landscapes by including production has become the central aim of agricultural economic diversification projects that play an important role in the ecology and identity of the territory. Local landscape plans (Advieslandschapsbouw) for rural landscapes have been experimented with and are co-ordinated by provincial Structural Plans for Landscape (Landschapsstruktuurplannen). Both of these instruments are "voluntary" and are used to solve specific problems (ecological, aesthetic, fruition, production) and are activated through local urban plans (bestemmingsplans).

During the 1970s the policy for landscape quality became an integral part of the all-inclusive territorial and environmental valorisation strategy and were included in physical planning at the various levels of territorial government. In fact, the policies are applied in:

— Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (MEL&I) (MEL&I) strategies to rationalise agriculture;

— Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (MIE) action on the government of the territory;

— Specific measures to protect historic-cultural monuments by the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science;

— Valorisation and transformation projects defined by physical planning (national, provincial, and local).

Each ministry published its own policies through "memorandum documents" for decades. Each document defined partially co-ordinated strategies identifying their own management and protection categories.

Moreover, an ad hoc law for the landscape has never been passed while theoretical references and objectives for its valorisation are found in the

Conservation of Nature Act, the Land Redevelopment Act, and in the Physical Planning laws (1965, 1985, revised 2008).

Landscape objectives are expressed in various documents, programs, and economic resources contributing to:

— The construction and development of landscape including through reclamation in order to satisfy demand for land for residential and economic-productive uses.

— Maintaining and valorising existing landscapes from the ecological-environmental and historical-cultural points of view.

These needs are reflected in the physical planning (at local and provincial levels), responsible for co-ordinating the landscape policies. The rules, planning choices, financial conditions, and the responsibilities for putting the policies into practice are defined in the physical planning.

The Agenda Landschap (2008) is an innovative national strategy promoting policies and transformations to protect, plan, and manage both excellent and ordinary rural and urban landscapes, starting from the study of social appreciation of the landscape (see section 1.2). This document follows the ratification of the European Landscape Convention (2002), and integrates the sectorial landscape policies and identifies financial resources, instruments, and responsibilities in order to guarantee their implementation. In applying the Agenda Landschap, The Netherlands reinforces the interesting experimentation with policies and operating methods (such as the Dutch Landscape Funding Task Force) initiated in part in the 1990s.

5.1.2. From the Appreciation index to a landscape strategy

Evaluation of the social appreciation of landscapes forms an essential preliminary study used by the Agenda Landschap. A GIS model that combines data for the physical-morphological features with data for appreciation of the aesthetic quality was used to evaluate perception and social appreciation of landscapes. Perception of the physical features was evaluated by interviews carried out in 2006 on a sample of 4500 people (representative by age, income, education, interests, etc. who had already replied to the SPEL questionnaire for social evaluation of landscape answered every twenty years; Coeterier, 2001). The study sample was invited to vote for the landscape in 300 areas identified in 15 photographs, selected because they represent the physical aspects that condition social perception.

Since appreciation decreases the further away from home the landscape is, the study shows the degree to which Dutch society appreciates the landscape of their place of residence. Furthermore, the high-income earners sampled evaluate the landscape of their residence positively: the naturalness, rurality, peace and quiet, and visual coherence of flat landscapes.

Social factors influencing perception are: age, income, and origin. The elderly appreciate the landscape quality more while natives attribute greater value to the landscape of residence with which they have a fruitful relationship every day, frequenting it for recreational purposes too. In addition, the promotion of the landscapes in the media influences appreciation, especially the rural and natural ones.

The relationship between physical features in the landscape and attractions was studied using a GIS system according to the following formula (Farjon, 2007):

ATTRACTION = 1.129 + 0.4 (quantity of natural areas) + 0.09 ("spontaneity" of nature) + 0.11 (historic identity) + 0.06 (height of the relief) + 0.07 (quantity of water) + 0.17 (unity)

The calculation shows that the physical factors influencing landscape appreciation are: naturalness, unity, historic identity (recognized by protective measures), and absence of urbanisation or rurality correlated with naturalness. These indicators have made it possible to map the influence of physical factors on landscape perception nationally.

This analysis is useful also to read the role of changes in landscape (such as fragmentation, urbanization increment, pressures in rural areas, changes in farming). In fact they are affecting people that derive a large part of their identity from the landscape in which they grew up, but numerous developments have steadily weakened their ties with that landscape.

From the appreciation index the government knows that the state of the landscape quality has a score of 7.3 in a 10 scale. The Government's aim with the Landscape Agenda (2008) is to raise that score to 8.0 by 2020. The objective is to achieve an attractive and varied landscape in which people are able to carry out their living activities was at the same time enjoying the landscape. The following three tasks are intended to give direction to this goal:

-"Careful use of space", in order to consider the scarcity of space in decision-making, in spatial planning and in building activities. The accessibility of and a recreational opportunities offered by the landscape need to be increased to develop green spaces for people and preventing and remedying the cluttering of the landscape. Also a set of clear rules to transform landscape is needed (such as innovative solutions in the landscape),

- "A landscape of and for everyone" that has a role to play in thinking about the landscape, taking action for the landscape, and paying for the landscape. Particularly the business community that can also do a great deal about the landscape, reducing the distance with/to citizens, investing in the (green) living environment and ensuring it is well maintained and managed will make it more attractive for everyone.

- “Sustainable funding of the landscape”, integrating private donations, gifts and contributions. However, the government funds far and away the largest part of the expenditure on landscape consolidation and management. New ways of funding at regional level are being explored in four pilot areas and at national level, the government has installed a Task Force which has issued recommendations on the sustainable funding of landscape consolidation and management.

This strategy could innovate the landscape policy, responding to the actual landscape problems and weaknesses in ELC policy implementation.

OBJECTIVE	TASK	ACTION	When	By whom *
Careful use of space	Clear rules for maintaining city/countryside balance	Start pilots detailing core qualities at area level	2009	MIE/ MEL&I , provinces and municipalities
		Symposium on building in National Landscapes Restoration management by Staatsbosbeheer in National Landscapes	2009 2009-2013	MIE Staatsbosbeheer/ MEL&I
		Complete the study of simplification of area categories. A spatial framework for areas with a green recreational function	2010 2009	MIE, provinces and municipalities MIE/ MEL&I
		Integral policy evaluation for National Landscapes	2010	MEL&I /MIE
	More green space for people	Decision to expand National Buffer Zones and initiate public-private implementation partnership	2008	MIE/ MEL&I, provinces, business community
		Exploration of green key projects	2009	MIE
		Include connecting nature with landscape in the brief for *IBO on nature	2009	MEL&I
	Promote innovation, design and quality	Subsidise innovation and specific projects to improve green space near the cities via the Attractive Netherlands innovation programme	2009-2012	MIE
		Introduce landscape protocols	2010	MEL&I /OCW
		Last use of LOP by municipalities.	March 2009	Municipalities
		New landscape quality incentive scheme for municipalities, focused more on implementation and integration	2010	MEL&I, municipalities
		Explore landscape impact analysis		MEL&I, provinces, municipalities and civil-society organisations
		Encourage integration of landscape quality in area development	2011	MEL&I, MIE, provinces
		Cleanup programme for unwonted buildings	2010	MIE, MEL&I, provinces
		Buildings in local style	2009	Chief Government Architect, National Advisor for the Landscape

	Strengthen heritage	Compile heritage asset map	2009	OCW/RACM
		Modernisation of monument conservation from building to environment	2009	OCW/RACM
Landscape of and for everyone	Partnership in thinking	Promote involvement of citizens in policy formulation with an experiment	2009-2010	MEL&I, MIE, provinces Dutch Landscape Management, municipalities, citizens
	Partnership in action	Support ten pilot projects for social initiatives	2009-2010	MEL&I, provinces, municipalities, civil-society organisations, citizens, farmers, other entrepreneurs
		Involve young people more in the landscape	2010	MEL&I, NME
		Increased scope for community internships aimed at landscape maintenance	2009	MEL&I, OCW, civil-society organisations
		Set up Recreation and Space innovation programme, make research capacity available	2009	MEL&I, MIE, EZ, recreation entrepreneurs
		Map out contribution of more accessible landscape in current projects and consultation of citizens on the accessibility of these areas	2009	MEL&I, MIE, citizens, provinces, municipalities, water authorities
		Encourage multifunctional agriculture by linking the work of the Multifunctional Agriculture Task Force to objectives from the Landscape Agenda		MEL&I, provinces, farmers
		Strengthen (functional) agrobiodiversity. This will restore economic significance to arable field edges, for example		MEL&I, farmers
		Implement at least 42 pilots in the area of sustainable enterprise		MEL&I, MIE, provinces, farmers, recreation entrepreneurs
	Contact with citizen	Start communication campaign aimed at making citizens and businesses aware of how they can influence the landscape and at prompting them into action.	2009	MEL&I /MIE, provinces, civil-society organisations
		Communication campaign aimed at informing residents, businesses and recreationalists about National Landscapes	2008	MEL&I /MIE, provinces
Sustainable funding of the landscape: investing in happiness and euros	Clarify funding requirements for the landscape (working up of Task Force proposals)	Map out funding requirement for maintaining or where necessary restoring the landscape	2009	Provinces, MEL&I /MIE
		Investigate possibilities for creating (provincial) landscape funds	2009	Provinces, MEL&I /MIE
		Investigate possibilities for management of area funds.	2009	National Fund for Rural Areas, MEL&I
		Set up national co-funding construction	2009	National Fund for Rural Areas, MEL&I, MIE
		Advice on optimum mix of instruments	2009	MEL&I /MIE, Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB)
		Investigate possibilities for giving provinces the power to prevent minorities from blocking projects	2009	MIE, MEL&I, provinces
		Dissemination of knowledge on investing in the landscape		MEL&I /MIE, provinces

	Have citizens and businesses help pay for the landscape	Seriously consider extending existing fiscal instruments for the landscape	2009	MEL&I /Fin
		Broad study of planning levies	2009	MIE, Fin, MEL&I
	Explore new and adapt existing (CAP, Nature Management Programme) constructions for investments in the landscape.	Further detailing of value of landscape as set out in the Outline Sketch on the Future of European Agriculture Policy up to 2020	2009	MEL&I
		Take decision on broadening landscape management in new provincial regulations for nature and landscape management	2010	Provinces
		Pilot areas to produce results on the new funding constructions for the landscape	2008-2011	MEL&I, MIE, pilot areas
		Share knowledge and experience gained with the submitted projects through a Community of Practice	2008-2011	MEL&I, pilot areas

Table 2. Actions from the Agenda Landschap (2008), updated and integrated by the author.

5.1.3. Implementation of the landscape policies

The Dutch experience is distinguished by the defining of action programs for landscapes in line with the strengthened.

Convention in which social, economic, ecological, and aesthetic aims converge. This integration is mainly the result of participation of social, economic, and institutional actors in defining the programs and projects for developing new landscape values that correspond to a precise subdivision of responsibility between the actors involved in their activation and management:

— Institutional actors, especially the provinces, who co-ordinate the negotiated development of valorization policy and provide up to 75% of the finance required, with the balance being made up by central government;

— The economic operators who must invest in the landscape and co-finance projects as environmental compensation;

— The social actors prepared to pay local and national taxes (Landschap Taxxes of 2% of the local tax and 0.2% of the national tax are set aside for landscape projects, 60 Euro per person, 2008) that are used to valorise landscapes, factors of identity, and quality of life.

Social participation is essential in the Agenda Landschap in order to initiate landscape action not only through the campaign to evaluate social appreciation and sensitisation, but also in the methods used to define plans and projects.

This approach is strictly related to the Dutch planning culture. Innes and Booher (1997, page 7) talk of "a process of constructing a consensus is required in order to allow the society and national policies to adapt and respond effectively to transformation of collective needs". An efficient participative process must construct networks and a feedback system that makes it possible to understand the landscape and environmental changes. The failure arises out of agreements between local actors based on inadequate discussion or consideration of the relationships and values on which the collective identity or processes in which the participants use their dominant position to divide the parties affected and maximize their own benefits. Unfortunately, this is also what has happened in the Netherlands in recent years, as social participation in construction of policies and projects has too often been a formal requirement but not a substantive part of the process. The provinces and the economic actors (large companies) have operated independently, guiding the negotiation process and controlling the choice of local actors (local authority and people) with evident effects on the effectiveness of landscape policies.

In spite of the strategies for improving its quality, landscape is becoming increasingly fragmented (Landscape Cluttering) as the pressure from suburbs and motorways has increased in recent years in the form of separate projects (individual transformations or groups of microurban transformations) according to an apparently casual model. Landscape Cluttering is the unintentional result of the objectives of various uncoordinated bestemmingsplan (local plans) in addition to expansion of the suburbs and poor integration of rural development programmes and landscape planning (Landscape Development plans). These have produced new building, greenhouses, windmills, motocross sites, camping sites, plant nurseries, and fish-breeding ponds causing the traditional open landscape to disappear and compromise the historic landscape of polders, protected by The Belvedere Memorandum.

The Landscape Perception Monitoring Program has also studied this phenomenon and has identified the areas affected, which are largely composed of the northern part of the province of Noord-Holland, Noord-Brabant, and Limberg in Randstad Holland in addition to the provinces of Overijssel and Gelderland (characterised by protected historic landscapes). In fact, between 1990 and 2000, 31,000 hectares of open space were swallowed up by urban development and periurbanisation in rural areas relating to the new composition of the family (singles, the elderly) and the growing demand for housing in open spaces.

Today climate change has resulted in the need to rethink methods and techniques of water drainage, dyking, and flood protection and this provides new opportunities to make the landscape "more attractive" but this needs the co-ordination of protection and creation of landscapes provided for in the physical plan to be strengthened. The current reform of the Physical Planning Act (2008) follows in this direction by assigning specific jobs in checking the landscape quality at provincial level, for example, co-ordination and checking of the sustainability of local plans and projects. In fact, notwithstanding that the

bestemmingsplan refer to national and provincial directions in valorisation, it is at the local level of the bestemmingsplan, responsible for controlling the landscape project, that the greatest criticalities are found, which have initiated territorial transformations including some near “protected landscapes” and above all in the fringes bordering the Randstad and Green Heart that lack landscape placement and preliminary evaluation of their sustainability.

Agenda for a living contryside (2006) also follows in this direction. This is promoted by the ex Ministry of Agriculture, Nature, and Food Quality (LNV) to help Provinces activate landscape policies. In particular, the government has decided to allocate 3.2 million Euros to strengthen the structure of the landscape and in particular to guide landscape placement of motorways (Motorway route design programme) as well as transformations of the Green Heart and protected national landscapes. The document dwells on protecting the view along the motorway in suburban areas between city and countryside (involving the ex VROM, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Public Works and Water Management, Ministry of Economic Affairs, and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science). The Provinces are responsible for protecting the views and are behind in reviewing and revising their plans and in controlling local planning (Netherland Environmental Assessment Agency, Nature Balance, 2007). In fact, the Provinces should have proceeded with the redefinition of the boundaries of protected landscapes identified at national level from the The Belvedere and the V Note (2001) so that urban areas are excluded from prevalently rural tracts of territory susceptible to future expansion (20 landscapes selected). This choice arose out of two interrelated questions: the aim of keeping the structural features, the integrity of the values, and the views present in the protected landscapes; negotiating “neutral borders” with the Provinces, that is, flexible areas shared by the Local Authorities to be developed in the provincial plans by planning at local level in order to guarantee “sustainable” management. However, this aspect is now strongly criticised, because in the absence of appropriate recognizable development and appropriate information and advice for planning and managing this landscape at the provincial level, the local authorities have been and are promoting transformation projects in border areas of many of the National Landscapes due to the natural growth of the population and commercial enterprises with a resulting impact on the value and openness of the views “from ordinary territory”.

Tribunal has suspended some bestemmingsplan for the absence of criteria to guide the projects of new buildings in the boundary areas and for the lack of local and regional planning regulations (Sources: Provinces of Utrecht, Zuid-Holland, Zeeland, and Noord-Brabant, 2007; Statistics The Netherlands, 2003).

From this point of view improved integration between physical planning and government of the landscape is required, especially at provincial level. As seen in several case studies, the provincial governments play a crucial role in integrating and co-ordinating policies.

In fact, poor integration of development and protection of the landscapes is seen in the National Landscape of Arkemheen-Eemland where new residential developments have been provided for to balance a fall in the number of dwellings and lack of financing by getting other public organisations on board through negotiation between national and provincial governments. The only effect has been the decision to keep expansion outside the boundaries of the national landscape, but this has allowed radical transformation of the views and quality features in this "extremely open" territory. Not only has planning information of large areas not been activated in Arkemheen-Eemland but conflicts have also arisen between the decision-making processes with inevitableconsequences on the planning of the objectives and resources (case programmes, National Landscape, disposal of materials).

Planning paying attention to landscape can be seen in the integrated plan for the regions of Ijssel and Veluwe, Gelderland for which the Provincial Government studied options for the transfer of companies in the recreation-tourist sectors that affect the wild fauna in less sensitive areas.

The public and private actors in both the IJssel delta and Veluwe, involved in the process of defining the local plan, have initiated experiments to improve the integration of territorial and sectorial planning. The integrated planning of the territory (functions and uses) has brought about a coherent plan with individual elements/values. On the one hand, the territorial and landscape restraints and on the other the construction of significant infrastructure (such as Hanzelijn, a new motorway and railway connection) have proved to be important incentives in adopting an integrated approach. Furthermore, the "protected River space" provided for by V Note prohibits building in the IJssel delta and Nature 2000 also limited expansion of recreational activities in the Veluwe region.

The development of a general strategy at provincial level co-ordinating local choices has made it possible to activate national directions to the benefit of the landscape.

Although an integrated approach is able to provide added value, this occurs at the expense of sectorial objectives. The cases demonstrate the strategic role of the provincial governments in evaluating the conflict between the planned objectives of valorisation of the landscape quality and the uses of the territory provided for in the local plans.

The new Territorial Planning law being developed strengthens the role of the central and provincial government in landscape policy. The conditions for expansion of settlement in National Landscapes and in their border areas need to be attached to the plans, compensation provided, and the building of new housing and commercial sites limited. The initiative strengthens the provincial level by obliging the local authorities to take the preparation of local plans into consideration.

The Beautiful Netherlands2 project is also one of the current priority policies of the ex VROM Ministry (2008).

It promotes actions to oppose landscape fragmentation. Landscape fragmentation can be opposed through specific actions but above all by using knowledge of the value and disvalue of landscapes. The Ministry intends to use the project to stimulate public debate on this topic and involve the population in perceiving the landscape, as required by the ELC, and in creating new landscape values (dissemination of information, identification of possible scenarios involving local actors). By using the shared knowledge of the values diffused among the population, the ex VROM Ministry feels it can activate local control of landscape transformations and stimulate opposition to local plans and actions that may cause irreversible damage to the landscape.

5.2. Evaluation to participative planning in Great Britain

5.2.1. Historical roots of landscape protection

Landscape protection in England originated in the first half of the 19th century in policies for the countryside that aimed at promoting interaction between technical-agricultural development and protection of the natural and historic-cultural environment. This interaction permeates the national history of the protection movement that, influenced by romantic ideas, addresses the planning of new urban settlements in equilibrium with the countryside that finds reference in the garden-city projects of Howard and in the protection and management of public use of historic rural landscapes. In fact, the movement to protect rural landscape developed under the guidance of Ruskin who tried to find an appropriate equilibrium between economic needs, modernisation of production techniques, and the safeguarding and management of the ecological-landscape integrity of the countryside in order to promote its public enjoyment. At the same time the most significant experiments, integrating urban settlement and the simultaneous protection of nature and the agrarian landscape, lie in the garden city projects of Howard. In fact, the garden-city concept is connected with the need to plan new urban nuclei – to control the disorderly growth of the industrial city and to guarantee better living conditions for the workers – defending green spaces and peri-urban agriculture (Howard, 1898). The conservation of rural and natural landscape is strictly integrated with the design of the built city while simultaneously meeting the need to contain urban development, self-sufficiency in food production in the city, and improve the quality of the environment and life.

The integration of technical-agricultural use and enjoyment compatible with the ecological and aesthetic equilibrium of the natural, rural, and urban environment has therefore been the most important characteristic in the English tradition from the very beginning.

Conservation is always included in the landscape valorisation project.

This cultural tradition found its first institutional regulation in the Town and Country Planning Act (1947), in the Scott Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas (1942), and in the National Park and Access to the Countryside Act (1949) that were the first legislative framework to protect nature. These laws activated experiments with innovative national programs that assigned the local development plans with the job of guaranteeing compatibility between initiatives to protect and manage protected areas and conservation policies of agricultural land use and the system of farms, essential for the care of the landscape and local economic development.

With the setting up of the Department of Environment (DoE) (1970), now replaced by the Department of the Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (Defra), and by the Countryside Commission, the need to strengthen interaction between economic growth and attractivity in the local rural context by protecting the landscape became priority, which has favored diversification, combating the growing phenomenon of depopulation and an aging population. Policies provided with economic resources have been closely co-ordinated: helping the local community to provide services for public enjoyment and reorganise accessibility to protected rural landscapes (Countryside Act, 1968); setting up experiments of agricultural practice compatible with the ecological equilibrium of the fragile natural environments; and projects to diversify the companies in the hospitality sector (New Agricultural Landscape, 1977). This is the context in which strategic planning in the landscape sector was conceived in order to orient transformation projects eco-compatible with landscapes and to diversify the economy of rural territories: the landscape guidelines, developed by processing identification and evaluation of landscape (landscape assessments; Countryside Commission, 1987).

The guidelines are based on the dynamic dimension of landscapes that accompany the evolution of rural landscape in social, economic, and environmental transformations.

5.2.2. Evaluation and planning

In anticipation of the ELC, strategic planning in the landscape sector has extended protection to the entire territory and makes it an integral part of the complex project of managing sustainable use of environmental resources.

In fact, sustainable use of environmental resources and of the landscape in the countryside has been at the centre of national policy for territorial protection and development since the end of the 1980s. Indeed, it is the central government, co-ordinated by the British Government Panel on Sustainable Development and by the UK Round Table on Sustainable Development that provides the impulse to produce strategies and directions for sustainable development in the territory and landscape. Since 1997 the National Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs) notes, recently replaced by the National Planning Policy Statement and the Regional Spatial Strategies (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act of 2004), has through a process of participation of institutional actors defined environmental, landscape,

and life quality strategies by valorising nature and landscape as a condition for regional development.

These strategies are the outcome of consultation with institutional actors and associations with responsibility for government of the territory and have been strengthened – by approval of the Planning White Paper (2007), the programs being defined more clearly, more effectively, and able to operate at local (Local Development Frameworks) and regional level (Regional Spatial Strategy).

The definition of the Planning Policy Statement (from 2007; for example in 2007 especially action strategy no.7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) has oriented valorization of the landscape in this direction by basing it on national evaluation of the landscape (Landscape Character Assessment, LCA) that is characterised by an ample process of social participation, co-ordinated by the English Countryside Agency and by Scottish Natural Heritage. Today this activity is the first effect resulting from activating the ELC. Through knowledge of the features and values of the landscape, directions for planning the development and managing the use of the territory are defined, which help strengthen the quality and features in the landscape. The strategies now required are the substitution of the institutional procedures of new protected areas with criteria for the protection, use, and valorisation of the landscape founded on identification of its value and features using the LCA.

5.2.3 Instruments and methods

The evaluation and resulting strategies for the landscape are considered to be the most effective method of conservation and valorisation of the territory. In fact, in measuring landscape capacity and sensitivity, the aim of LCA Guidance (Swanwick, 2002) is to contribute to finding solutions to organising the territory not only compatible with the ability to support the various types of transformation but also capable of creating a new identity.

The evaluation provides the knowledge required to identify and define measures to evaluate the landscape at different territorial levels (local/district, regional, and national). On the large scale the geographical and morphological structure of the territory can be catalogued while on the local scale transformation measures and plans can be defined. The common goal at each territorial level is to define landscape protection and management policies in order to promote ecological and aesthetic quality. In fact, the evaluation subdivides the national territory into patterns (landscape units), recognisable and distinct in the colors and progressive numeration used. The patterns are then subject to further examination in the process of analysis (classification) at smaller scale (county or district) with character types being identified by combining the morphological, natural, and historic-settlement aspects. Initial indication emerge from the evaluation of very large areas for the succeeding process of qualification and legitimation of the values and development of guidelines that are put into practice in the local plans, in the transformations contained in the Village Design Statements, in the Countryside Character Programs, and in the projects.

The method used refers to national criteria: an initial phase of knowledge gathering and classification of the landscape unit known as landscape description, followed by a second phase of evaluation of the condition of the landscape and environmental structure known as landscape evaluation, and thirdly the knowledge acquired is used to define measures to safeguard, manage, and plan projects for the landscape known as landscape guidelines. The Landscape guidelines refer to planning at different scales and are a strategic instrument orienting the landscape transformations (Swanwick, 2002):

— Conservation of areas of particular historic, landscape, or ecological importance in what is known as conservancy strategy;

— Valorisation of degraded or abandoned landscapes in what is called enhancement strategy using restoration, reconstruction, and creation projects for new landscape forms that respond to functional and aesthetic needs.

The approach to landscape evaluation is based on conservation and strengthening of historic, ecological, perceptive, and economic values of various types and areas of landscape, through direct survey and written description. The current state of the landscape is examined (condition and integrity of the elements) and the processes, dynamics, trends, and potential pressures caused by development scenarios are evaluated.

This process passes from the determination of ability to support and respond to transformation in the long term (Landscape Capacity – LC) for each type of landscape by improving the ecological and visual quality and the economic use of landscape resources. Landscape capacity is the ability of every landscape type or area to support the pressure associated with processes of territorial transformation (such as development of settlements and infrastructure, changes in land use, introduction of new ecological elements such as areas designated for planting, rows of crops and trees, etc.).

An aspect correlated with the process of landscape evaluation is landscape sensitivity, stability of the landscape values and features, and ability to recover from any losses and/or damage. High sensitivity values, which if compromised are difficult to recover, correspond to the need for a specific policy.

This indicator is used in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), an essential component of Environmental Impact Assessment, useful in checking, evaluating, mitigating, and/or compensating the impacts on the landscape produced by the transformations. Evaluation of the sensitivity involves various methodological considerations:

— Some values have greater weight in certain types of landscape that must be expressed in the process of evaluation and identification (landscape characterisation);

— Some features and elements are more vulnerable than other;

— The ability to support the anthropic pressure and/or react/recover from notably varied stimuli and demands in each type of landscape.

Sensitivity makes it possible to evaluate the relationship between pressure generated by the policies of transformation and development, and various features of the landscape such as: the significance, vulnerability, substitutability, stability, and resilience of the landscape compared to the planning choices (Swanwick, 2002). The techniques used for the evaluation must of necessity be in proportion to the scale and type of planning (strategic, landscape, land use) with which the landscape is evaluated.

From this point of view three methodologies are used to evaluate landscape and orient decision-making in governing the territory:

— Determination of the overall landscape sensitivity, which is a function of the characteristic sensitivity of each individual landscape resource and the visual ones independent of the type of transformation planned. It is usually used to prepare strategies for large regional or sub-regional territorial areas or for LVIA;

— Identification of the sensitivity to a specific type of development or transformation. This is given by the interaction of the landscape, its values and features, and the way in which the population perceives the proposed transformations;

— Measurement of the Landscape Capacity (LC), ability to respond to different processes of territorial government. LC depends on the sensitivity to visual, general, and specific transformation of the individual elements in the landscape. The LC is used to evaluate the effects of relevant anthropic transformation policies in the territory such as introducing wind farms, infrastructure, and development of settlements (such as the building of at least 1000 new dwellings).

5.2.4. Instruments used to activate the Convention

Great Britain led the process of preparing for the ELC through Michael Dower, Director General of the Countryside Commission (1992-1996). Since its reception in Great Britain in March 2007, the ELC has caused serious reflection on the policies and methods in protecting, planning, and managing the landscape in order to adopt the new ideas, strengthen the subsidiarity of the landscape choices and develop methodologies to interpret the “subjective” component of the perception of the population. Characterized by a very decentralised territorial planning and management system, Great Britain based the activation of the Convention on the interaction of DEFRA, English Heritage (EH), and Natural England (NE) in the framework provided by the England Project Group (EPG) who drew up a

document: European Landscape Convention – A Framework for Implementation (2007, 2009).

The document responds to the need to conserve the value of landscape in its current condition, especially rural ones (91% of the sample interviewed by the Countryside Agency) by applying planning actions by 2020 (Countryside Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage, Landscape character Assessment guidance for England and Scotland). These actions are the result of work by the commission composed of DEFRA, NE, and EH, and define possible scenarios for the activation of ELC through gradual progressive innovations such as: the strengthening of current landscape policies oriented by Action Plans, improved knowledge of the features, dynamics, and both historic and current processes affecting the landscape in order to develop plans and projects shared by the population.

5.2.5. Participative Planning and the Landscape

Of great interest among the instruments used to activate the ELC is the Village Design Statement (VDS) introduced by the Countryside Commission in 1996 as a local planning landscape instrument to oppose the process of standardisation towards urban territorial models in rural areas. Focusing on ideas of regional diversity, local identity, harmony between settlements, individual buildings, open countryside, and introducing a new method for understanding and directing landscape projects in rural centres and small urban settlements, the VDS was put forward by the Countryside Commission in 1996 (Village Design –

Making local character count in new development) as an experimental project piloted in four areas, namely, Cottenham (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Cartmel (South Lakeland District Council), Elstead (Waverley Borough Council), and Down Ampney (Cotswold District Council) – for the purpose of making the urbanism and development plans compatible with the values and identity of the local territory. In doing this, the VDS is an instrument that influences the methodology used in territorial planning at the local level by approving Supplementary Planning Guidance, an instrument to govern socio-economic and territorial transformations, beneficial to the landscape, environment, and territory (Moseley, 2000).

The VDS is a process of direct involvement of the population in identifying and defining shared landscape policies (Nadin, 2007). This participation makes it possible to recognize the social perception and appreciation of places, effect a campaign of sensitisation to the importance of and role played by landscape in addition to using shared strategies to recognise and strengthen the “unique and subjective” value of landscape in terms of “materials, scale, form, and dimension” (Countryside Commission, 1996).

It is an instrument of social and community interpretation of the landscape that makes it possible to perceive the local and collective importance of places, spaces,

and symbols on which uniqueness and identity are based, resulting in the past and current processes being interpreted through collective perception of the territory in order to guide sustainable transformation.

In finding a balance between memory and development, between a feeling of belonging and innovation, landscape strategies to be incorporated into the instruments of local landscape governance can be defined.

For the participative landscape project, the VDS:

— Describes the identity of the rural centre and its contextual landscape;

— Interprets the landscape features and values through "the eyes" of the population by identifying three levels: the rural landscape, the form of settlement, and the type and character of the buildings; — develop planning principles based on local identity, allowing the population to "feel part of the planning and decision making process" (Countryside Commission, 1996, page 8);

— Work in partnership with other government actors in the landscape and in the territory in order to interpret the present and develop evolutionary scenarios.

Therefore, it is a local consultative and voluntary planning instrument directed at the ELC distinguished by its great flexibility and adaptability in its contextual form and objectives, and in the expectations of the population (Countryside Commission, 1996) that support the policy and institutional choices and decisions.

After approval by the County Council following a request from the Local Authority, the VDS is applied in the Local Development Framework as a Supplementary Planning Document, providing a shared transformation scenario, based on planning principles and directions for sustainable local development that is initiated by evaluating social perception of the landscape.

	ORIGIN	COMPETENCE	ELC RATIFICATION	SPECIFIC LAWS	ANALYSIS	POLICIES	VERTICAL INTEGRATION	HORIZONTAL INTEGRATION	PARTICIPATION	APPROACH
AUSTRIA	**Protection of landscape resources from anthropic pressures**	**NO**	**LANDER**	**NO** **Landscape is embodied in various other laws, e.g. nature protection laws, spatial planning laws, forest law, etc.** **Autonomous Lander laws**	**ECOVAST** **- ethod to help population identify the landscape unit and of the identity** **- construction and diffusion of a good practices manual**	**Landscape plans with different content and characters for the various Lander Landscape and territorial policies are integrated at regional level by Laws on Spatial Planning of the Federal States (Raumordnungs gesetze der Länder)**	**NO**	**NO**	**On trial**	**ANALYTICAL to define policies and projects**

FRANCE	**Conservation of exceptional values**	**Ministry for Ecology and Sustainable Development** **Municipalities, Departments and Regions.** **Inter-municipal level**	**YES (2006)** **In force since 1/4/2006**	**Loi Paysage, 1993**	**ATLAS**	**Directive paysagère** **Plan de paysage** **Charte** **For knowledge: photographic observation of the landscape**	**On trial**	**On trial**	**On trial**	**ATTEMPTS TO INTEGRATE PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT**
GERMANY	**Movement for the protection of the homeland and landscapes (in the 30's)**	**- Bund** **- Land** **- Gemeinde**	**NO**	**Bundesnaturschutz gesetz, 1976 and subsequent amendments**	**In landscape plans on different scales**	**Landscape plans integrated with territorial plans**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES** **on the local scale**	**OPERATIONAL**
DENMARK	**Protection of historical-cultural heritage**	**Counties**	**YES (2003)** **In force since** **1/3/2004**	**NO** **General references in Protection of Nature Act (Actno. 9, 3 January 1992) and in Planning Act (Act no.551, 28 June 1999).**	**ATLAS**	**Landscape plans for historical-cultural aspects**	**On trial**	**On trial**	**On trial**	**CONSERVATIVE/** **DEVELOPMENT** **- centrality of** **the protected** **landscape in** **policies**
ITALY	**Protection of historical-cultural, natural and landscape phenomena (laws of the 1939)**	**State and Regional Authorities**	**YES (2005)**	**Constitution's Article 9 (the Republic safeguards the landscape and the** **historical and artistic heritage)** **Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code, 2004, and subsequent amendments**	**Studies for the assessment of landscapes and the adjustment of landscape plans**	**New landscape plans (Veneto, Piemonte, Ligura, Tuscany, Lazio, Abruzzo, Umbria, Molise, Apulia, Sardinia)**	**On trial in some regions**	**On trial in some regions**	**On trial in some regions**	**ATTEMPTS TO INTEGRATE PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT**
THE NETHERLANDS	**Rural development (in the 20's)**	**The Netherlands' Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (MIE) and Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (MEL&I)** **Operative role:** **provinces and municipalities**	**YES (2006)** **In force since** **1/11/2005**	**NO** **General laws dealing with landscape are: Nature Conservation Act,** **Land Redevelopment Act and Spatial Planning Act**	**Monitoring landscape perception and appreciation through interviews with the population**	**AGENDA LANSCHAP (2008) = NATIONAL GUIDELINES to be implemented in physical planning**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**PROGRAMMATIC - OPERATIONAL**
GREAT BRITAIN	**Protection of the Countryside (1850)**	**DEFRA, Countryside Commission, Nature England, English Heritage**	**YES (2006)** **In force since 1/3/2007**	**NO, several provisions embodied in laws for environmental nature, such as National Parks** **and Access to the Countryside Act 1949; Environment Act 1995, Countryside and Rights of** **Way Act 2000 and Natural Environment and**	**Landscape Character Assessment**	**Landscape strategies (NPG's and RPG's) to be implemented in local plans, New landscape planning tools: Countryside Character Programme and Village Design Statement Researches to guide ELC implementation: establishment of**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**STRATEGIC**

				Rural Communities Act 2006. **Implementation of the ELC, 2007**		**a baseline for monitoring policy change in relation to the ELC (commitment: Defra); Research to Support the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention in England (commitment: Natural England)**				
SPAIN	**Protection of natural resources from development (1985, regeneracionismo)**	**Ministry of Environment is the competent authority in such environmental policy issues (water, coasts, and biodiversity) having landscape influence on the whole of the state; it support regions with specific programmes.** **Land Act 8/2007, May 28th seeks to improve the operative rules aimed at sustainable territorial and urban development (Art. 2; "public policies concerning land regulation, planning (…) must support conservation measures for cultural heritage and landscape)** **Regional authorities are responsible for environmental and heritage management, and arte the exclusive authority over spatial planning issues (art.148.1.3ª, Constitution).**	**YES (2000)** **In force since** **1/3/2008**	**Various sectorial laws, such as for the environment, spatial planning and cultural heritage both at a national and a regional level.** **L4/1989 (Conservación de los Espacios Naturales y de la Flora e de la Fauna Silvestres)** **L. 13/1985 (Spanish Historical Heritage)** **Two regions has a Landscape law (Valencia, 2004, and Catalonia, 2005)**	**Observatories set up (Cataluña, Andalusia, ...)**	**Integration of the landscape in territorial and sector planning**	**Diversity in the regions**	**Diversity in the regions**	**On trial with a wide range of diversity in the various regions**	**ATTEMPTS TO INTEGRATE PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT**

Table 3. Comparison of the ELC application in some countries.

6. Conclusion

The implementation of the ELC helps creating interest in landscape, in its ecological-environmental, historical-cultural, perceptive, economic dimension and in the physical characterization of spaces, throughout territorial government – on the basis of various interpretations. In fact the ELC defines a common approach

and establishes programmatic indications to meet the growing demand to acknowledge landscape as one of the foundations of identity and the basis of territorial roots that let “man to renew his bond with the earth” and/or territory of the past, present and future “that modern times have dissolved” (Berque, 1995).

The need for landscape quality in European society therefore corresponds to the process of re-appropriation by the populations of the living environment, so the local community can structure elements and symbols that characterise landscape for common development.

Landscape is therefore the common representation of a territory (Raffestin, 2005) to be governed with shared policies and projects for sustainability.

Today, landscape and sustainability are two closely related requirements, referred to the ELC, which requires to review policies at European and at the state level for protection starting from the acknowledge of the landscape essence, inherent in local territories, and to the landscape enhancement with actions for the protection, management and planning of the same.

In this view a first key aspect to stress is the need of a joint pan-European landscape policy (Wascher, 2000) in order to integrate and coordinate EU sectorial policies and to control their effects on landscape, but also for stimulating directly the 23 EU member countries that had ratified the ELC in order to implement its innovative issues on their territories. A European landscape specific policy is necessary because:

— Many landscapes of European importance are the offshoot of natural and cultural processes that require transnational strategies;

— In recent years, many transformations in uses of the territory and of the landscape have been triggered by Community strategies;

— Landscape policies may play a strategic role in the sustainable future of Europe.

In this light, the EU must undertake to promote a framework of action for the landscape, starting from ratification of the ELC, in order to improve the quality of the territory through:

— Wide-scale coordinated actions for the landscape defined at Community level with reference to the national and trans-border dimension;

— “Special” actions intended to address and finance protection, planning and management actions of sensitive, unstable and downgraded environments of the regions of Europe;

— The development of new synergies between Community planning of policies, territorial strategies and the project of the regions and territorial communities who identify themselves in the same landscape values (bottom-up approach);

— Urban policies able to exert a strong influence on the aesthetic-perceptive and physical qualities of public and private spaces, and EU programs for urban regeneration that take social and economic effects in consideration have in fact made a very limited contribution to landscape valorisation in the urban environment.

Therefore the European states are taking actions, differently within the landscape cultures, on various timescales and with varying effects to study new forms of sustainable landscape development, with reference to (ELC, 2000, art. 6):

- Establishing landscape as one of the foundations of identity;

- Indicating landscape quality as the goal of planning actions on all governmental levels;

- The acknowledgement that the enhancement and creation of landscapes is based on institutional and social planning;

- The conviction that the quality of the landscape is based on a project of physical, economic and social spaces;

- The awareness of the institutional and socio-economic stakeholders and training specialists in the sector of landscape information and intervention;

- The landscapes identification and assessment to analyse the characteristics and define landscape quality goals.

Nevertheless, while each countries is establishing landscape goals in territorial and sectorial policies, the implementation of landscape policies is not so simple.

The result in landscape policies and ELC implementation is different in countries. Using the interpretative metaphors, the Germanic-Anglo-Saxon root (Voghera, 2004, 2006) corresponds to an integrated approach between actions for the protection and development of territory and landscape that guarantees the operational implementation of policies and projects. In the Netherlands, landscape action is dictated by a programmatic-operational approach closely related to planning the actions for the project and establishing responsibilities and economic resources. In Great Britain, common strategies and scenarios for the enhancement of landscape on a local scale are defined through shared assessment, an important legitimisation of policies and project for implementation.

In Germany the full-scale integration between plans for territory and landscape helps reinforce the operational character of policies and projects.

In Austria and Denmark the analytical approach, based on methods of interpretation and the legitimation of landscape values, makes it possible to draw up policies and projects. In these countries the central-national institutional role is strategic to define coordinated landscape policies, to individuate actions and economic resources to implement the landscape interventions. These policies find also references in plans at regional and local level.

Instead the Central-Mediterranean root (Voghera, 2004, 2006) corresponds to a more conservative approach for landscape values, although recently there has been an experimental and fragmentary attempt to integrate actions for protection and development. The role of Regions in Italy and Spain contributes also to make many diverse approaches and results in the ELC territorial implementation.

The countries are also trying to experiment participatory landscape plans and projects. People's participation has a key role for the identification of values through the comparison and contrasts that they make among the many potential meanings, interests, and expectations (as the UK and Dutch experiences demonstrate). In fact, participation promotes, supports, and directs a great number of actions that—because they are not produced by the institutions alone—generate a substantial reinforcement of the results of the strategies, communicating and legitimizing shared decisions and values that could reinforce human, social, and landscape capital (Brunetta and Voghera, 2008) and guarantee implementation.

In the diverse cultures and planning practices, the key features of ELC implementation are:

- The definition of protection measures aimed at conservation of the excellent landscape and collective identity values;

− The construction of new management methods, declined in relation to the institutional and social actor responsibilities;

− The definition of strategies, criteria, rules and economic resources, in order to implement the actions.

In this direction the countries are developing a landscape planning as follow:

- Strategies and vaste scale policies for the transformation of the landscapes, legitimized through social evaluation processes and aimed at development of landscape and life quality (Landschap Agenda, Landscape guidelines in Great Britain,…);

- Strategies and sectorial plans - like those for the development of agriculture, of mobility, for the energetic grids or those for water management, etc. - in which the landscape is an objective for the sustainability

- Strategies and sectorial plans - like those for the development of agriculture, of mobility, for the energetic grids or those for water management,… - in which the landscape is an objective for the sustainability.

They are trying to develop plans, policies and project for the landscape aimed at sustainability, integrating actions at different levels and linking territorial and landscape aims.

The innovative influence of the ELC has not been able to fully "transform" the territory and landscape project to date. While this is partly a reality on a territorial scale, it is to a lesser extent for the local urban dimension. Experimentation refers to the dimension of the territorial project (in a vast national and regional area), acting on a local level, with shared actions that mainly concern projects for small villages and rural centres, often popular with tourists. There is still no real and effective consideration of the urban dimension of the project. In fact, the many experiences in urban regeneration, supported also by EEC policies and programs, have contributed to socio-economic recovery and the integration of resources, but with scarce consideration of the physical and aesthetic dimension of the landscape (the form, structure and organization of common and relational spaces). This is one of the dimensions of the landscape project, which should be relaunched by the ELC.

7. Bibliography

Antrop M. 2006. "From holistic landscape synthesis to transdisciplinary landscape management". Tress B., Tress G., Fry G., Opdam P.(edited by). From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning. Aspects of Integration, Education and Application. Wageningen UR Frontis Series, Vol. 12, Springer, Dordrecht.

Berque A. 1995. Les raisons du paysage. De la Chine antique aux environnements de synthèse. Hazan, Paris.

Bonesio L. 2007. Paesaggio identità e comunità tra locale e globale. Edizioni Diabasis. Reggio Emilia.

Börzel T. and Risse T. 2000. "When Europe hits home: Europeanisation and Domestic Change". European Integration online Papers (Eiop), 4(15), http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-015a.htm.

Brunetta G. and Voghera A. 2008. "Evaluating Landscape for Shared Values: Tools, Principles, and Methods". Landscape Research, 33(1), 71 - 87.

Bulmer S.J. and Radaelli C. M. (2004) The Europeanisation of National Policy?. Institute of European Studies. Queen's University of Belfast. Belfast.

Brandt, J. and Vejre H. 2004. “Multifunctional landscapes, motives, concepts and perceptions”. Brandt, J. and Vejre, H. (eds.), Multifunctional landscapes. Vol. 1. Theory, values and history, WIT Book Press. Southamptom.

Cartei G. 2011. The Implementation Of The European Landscape Convention: The Legal Perspective. Rivista quadrimestrale di diritto dell’ambiente. Vol. 1/2011. Giappichelli Editore.

Claval, P.L. 2004. The languages of rural landscapes. Palang H. (ed.), European rural landscapes: persistence and change in a globalising environment. Kluwer Academic. Dordrecht, 11-40.

CoE 1985 European Charter of Local Self-Governament, Strasbourg.

CoE 2000. European Landscape Convention. Florence.

CoE 2006. Landscape and sustainable development: challenges of the European Landscape Convention. Editions du Conseil de l’Europe. Strasbourg.

CoE 2010. Synthesis of The Received Information Concerning Summary Descriptive Note on The Landscape Policies Pursued in the Council of Europe Member States. CEP-CDPATEP (2009) 3 Add. Final Strasbourg, 8 June / 8 juin 2009.

CoE 2008. Recommendation No R (2008) 3 on the guidelines for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 6 February 2008, Strasbourg.

Coeterier J.F. 2000. Landschapsbeleving; toepassing van de meetmethoden landschapsbeleving in vier gebieden in Nederland. Wageningen University & Research Centre.

Communication Com 2001. Sixth Environment Action Programme of the European Community, “Environment 2010: Our future, Our choice”. n. 31 final.

Communication Com 2007. Mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme. n. 225 final.

Cottenham Village Desing Group 2007. Village Design Statement, Cottenham.

Countryside Commission 1987. Landscape Assessment – a Countryside Commission Approach. CCD 18. Countryside Commission, Cheltenham.

Countryside Commission 1996. Village Design. Making local character count in new development. CCP 501. Countryside Commission, Cheltenham.

Déjeant-Pons M. 2006. The European Landscape Convention. Landscape Research, n. 31/ 4.

Dramstad, W. and Sogge, C. 2003. Agricultural impacts on landscapes: developing indicators for policy analysis. Proceedings from the NIJOS/OECD expert meeting on agricultural landscape indicators in Oslo, Norway, October 7-9, 2002. Norsk Institutt for Jord- og Skogkartlegging, Ås. NIJOS rapport 7/03.

DEFRA, EH, NE 2007. European Landscape Convention – A Framework for Implementation, DEFRA, EH, NE, upgraded in 2009.

Dirección General de Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales, Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España, 2002. Plan Nacional de Paisajes Culturales, Salamanca.

EC 1999. ESDP. European Spatial Development Perspective. Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union, Office for Official Pubblications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Etting V. e Møller P. G. (eds.) 1997. De kulturhistoriske interesser I landskabet. The Danish Forest and nature Agency, Ministry of Environment.

Faludi A., van der Valk A. 1994. Rule and order – Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century. Kluwer Academic Publisher. Dordrecht.

Fairclough G. and Rippon S. (eds.) 2002. Europe's cultural landscape: archaeologists and the management of changes, EAC Occasional Paper no. 2, EAC, Brussels.

Farjon H. 2007. "Monitoring Program of perception and valuation of landscape changes in the Netherlands". Landscape Indicators. Challenges and Perspectives, Barcellona, 29-30 november.

Ferry L. 1994. The new ecological order. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Gambino R. 2008. "La conservazione del paesaggio nella pianificazione d'area vasta". Teofili C., Clarino R. (eds.), Riconquistare il paesaggio. La Convenzione Europea del Paesaggio e la Conservazione della biodiversità in Italia. WWF Italia, MIUR, pp. 220-232.

Gòmez Mendoza J., & Ortega Cantero N., 1999. Interplay of State and Local concern in the Management of Natural Resources: Hydraulic and Forestry in Spain (1855-1936), in Buttimer A., Wallin L. (ed.), (1999). Nature and Identity in Cross-cultural Perspective, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academics Publishers, pp. 137-149.

Habermas J. 1984. The theory of communicative action I: reason and the rationalization of society, Heinemann, London.

Howard E. 1898. A peaceful path to social reform, Londra.

ICCROM 1998. Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites. ICCROM, Rome.

Innes J., Booher D. 1999. "Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning". Journal of the American Planning Association, 65(4) December 1999, pp. 412 - 423.

IUCN 2003. Benefits beyond boundaries, Vth World Park Congress.

IUCN 2004. People and Nature: only one World. IIIth World Conservation Congress, Bankok.

Nadin Y. 2007. The emergence of the spatial planning approach in England. Planning Practice and Research, 22(1), 2007.

Moseley M.J. 2000. Innovation and rural development: some lessons from Britain and Western Europe, Planning Practice and Research.

Jones M., Howard P., Olwig K. R., Primdahl J. & Sarlöv Herlin I. 2007. "Multiple interfaces of the European Landscape Convention". Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography, 61(4), pp. 207-216.

Jones M and Stenseke M, 2011. The European Landscape Convention. The Issue of Public Participation in the European Landscape Convention, Landscape Series, Volume 13.

Jackson J.B. 2003. A' la découverte du paysage vernaculaire. Actes Sud, Arles.

Jacobs M.H. 2002. Landschap 3: het ware, juiste en waarachtige landschap. Alterra, Wageningen.

Jacobs M.H. 2006. The production of mindscapes: a comprehensive theory of landscape experience. PhD Thesis published at Wageningen University.

Jones M. 2007. The European Landscape Convention and the question of public participation, Landscape Research, n.32/5.

Knill C., Lehmkuhl D. 1999. "How Europe Matters. Different Mechanisms of Europeanization". European Integration Online Papers (EioP), Vol. 3, n. 7, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1999-007a.htm.

Lovell, S. T. and D. M. Johnston. 2009. Designing landscapes for performance based on emerging principles in landscape ecology. Ecology and Society 14(1).

LNV 2006. Agenda for a living countryside 2007-2013, Den Haag.

Mander Ü. and Antrop M. 2003. Multifunctional landscapes, vol. 3. Continuity and change, Advances in ecological sciences. vol. 16, WIT, Southampton.

Ministerio de Medio Ambiente 2002. Atlas de los paisajes de España. MMA, Madrid.

Møller P. G., Stenak M. 2006. "Mapping Historical Landscapes and Environments – Morfology or Function?". Van der Knaap, Van der Valk A., Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present (eds.). Ponsen & Looijen, Wageningen.

Morris C. 1954. Lineamenti di una teoria dei segni, Paravia, Torino.

Netherland Environmental Assessment Agency 2007. Nature Balance.

Jones M, Howard P, Olwig KR, Primdahl O. & Sarlöv Herlin I. 2007. Multiple interfaces of the European Landscape Convention. Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography. Volume 61/4.

Parris, K. 2004. "Measuring changes in agricultural landscapes as a tool for policy makers". Brandt, J. and Vejre, H. (eds.). Multifunctional landscapes, vol. 1. Theory, values and history, pp. 193-218. Advances in ecological sciences, vol. 14, WIT, Southampton.

Peano A. 2009a. "Atlanti del paesaggio in Europa". Urbanistica, vol. 138, pp. 7-9.

Peano A. 2009b. "Per l'operatività della pianificazione paesaggistica". Urbanistica Dossier, n. 112, attached to n. 225 of Urbanistica Informazioni, pp. 2-4.

Pedrazzini L. 2005. Applying the ESDP through interreg IIIB: a southern perspective, European Planning Studies, Volume 13, Issue 2, 2005.

Pesci E. 2004. La terra parlante. Dai paesaggi originari ai non-luoghi alpestri. CDA&Vivalda Editore, Torino.

Potter C. and Tilzey M. 2005. "Agricultural policy discourses in the European post-Fordist transition: Neoliberalism, neomercantilism and multifunctionality". Progress in Human Geography, 29(5), pp. 581–600.

Porter R., & Teich M. (Ed.) 1988. Romanticism in National Context, Hardback.

Prieur M. 2004. "L'intégration du paysage dans les politiques et programmes internationaux et les paysages transfrontaliers". Conférence de la Convention Européenne du Paysage à l'occasion de son entrée en vigueur, Editions Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg.

Raffestin C. 2005. Dalla nostalgia del territorio al desiderio di paesaggio. Alinea, Firenze.

Roe M., Jones C. and Mell I. C. 2008. Research to Support the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention in England. Contract No. PYT02/10/1.16 Final Report, Natural England.

Roe M. 2010. "Policy Change and ELC Implementation: Estabilishment of a basiline for Understanding the Impact of The European Landscape Convention in the UK". LIVING LANDSCAPE The European Landscape Convention in research perspective, vol. I, pp.371-385. Bandecchi&Vivaldi Editori.

Stanners and Bourdeau 1995. Europe's environment: the Dobrìs assessment. European Environment Agency. Luxembourg. Environmental Assessment Report no. 1. [http://reports.eea.eu.int/92-826-5409-5/en/tab_content_RLR].

Scazzosi L. (ed.) 1999. Politiche e culture del paesaggio. Esperienze internazionali a confronto, Roma

Gangemi Editore.Swanwick C. (coord.) 2002. "Judging Capacity and Sensitivity", in Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland, The Countryside Agency.

Röhring A 2011. Cultural landscape as action arena – an identity-based concept of region-building. Regional Studies Association Annual International Conference 2011.

Tress B. and Tress G. 2003. Scenario visualisation for participatory landscape planning – A study from Denmark. Landscape and Urban Planning, 64: 161–178.

Tress B., Tress G., Fry G. 2006. "Defining concept and the project of knowledge production in integrative research". Tress B., Tress G., Fry G., Opdam P. (eds.), From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning. Aspect of integration, Education and Application, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 13-26.

Turri E. 2006. Il paesaggio come teatro. Dal territorio vissuto al territorio rappresentato, Marsilio, Venezia.

UNECE 1998. Aarhus Convention. Convention on Access to Information. Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, Aarhus.

UNESCO 2005. Vienna Memorandum (Managing the Historic Urban Landscape), World Heritage Convention, Durban.

Van der Knaap, Van der Valk A. (eds.) 2006. Multiple Landscape. Merging Past and Present, Ponsen & Looijen, Wageningen.

Venturi Ferriolo M. 2003. Etiche del paesaggio. Il progetto del mondo umano. Editori riuniti, Roma.

Voghera A. 2004. “Sustainability in territorial management. A European comparison”. Scienze Regionali Italian Journal of Regional Science, n. 1, pp. 109-142.

Voghera A. 2006. Culture europee di sostenibilità. Storie e innovazioni nella pianificazione. Gangemi editore, Roma, pp. 159.

VROM 1999. The Belvedere Memorandum. A policy document examining the relationship between cultural history and spatial planning. VROM, The Hague.

VROM 2001. Résumé Créer l’espace, partager l’espace. Cinquième rapport gouvernemental sur l’aménagement du territoire 2000/2020 (V Nota). VROM, The Hague.

VROM, LNV 2008. Agenda Landschap. Landschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen voor iedereen, VROM, LNV.

Wascher D. M. (edited by) 2000. The face of Europe: policy perspectives for European landscapes, European Centre for Nature Conservation ECNC, Tilburg. ECNC Technical Report Series.

Zanzi L. 2004. Pensare la wilderness, orizzonte selvaggio dell’anima, Fondazione Enrico Monti, Anzola D’Ossola.